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<td>1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>61-06-05 ROUTINE 1, 2 AND 3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>61-07-06 ROUTINE 1A – PROBLEMS AND CONFRONT</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>61-07-11 ROUTINE 1A – PROBLEMS AND SECURITY CHECKS</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>61-07-04 ROUTINE 1A – PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>61-07-03 ROUTINE 1A-PROBLEMS</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>61-11-07 ROUTINE 3A</td>
<td>1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>61-11-15 ROUTINE 3D (CONTINUED)</td>
<td>1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>61-11-14 ROUTINE 3D</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>61-10-31 RUDIMENTS</td>
<td>1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>61-08-24 RUDIMENTS</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>61-08-17 RUDIMENTS, VALENCE S</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>61-11-21 RUNNING 3D</td>
<td>1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>61-06-22 RUNNING CCHS</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>61-09-13 SEC CHECK AND WITHHOLDS</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>61-06-20</td>
<td>SEC CHECK QUESTIONS, MUTUAL RUDIMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>61-12-12</td>
<td>SEC CHECKS IN PROCESSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>61-12-06</td>
<td>SEC CHECKS NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>61-10-05</td>
<td>SEC-CHECKING: TYPES OF WITHHOLDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>61-10-26</td>
<td>SECURITY CHECKING: AUDITING ERRORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>61-06-06</td>
<td>SECURITY CHECKS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>61-06-13</td>
<td>SEMINAR, QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>61-09-20</td>
<td>SEMINAR, QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: WHAT IS KNOWABLE TO THE PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>61-06-21</td>
<td>SEMINAR: AUDITING SPEED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>61-06-14</td>
<td>SEMINAR: WITHHOLDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>61-09-21</td>
<td>SMOOTHNESS OF AUDITING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>61-09-06</td>
<td>SUBJECTIVE REALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>61-09-26</td>
<td>TEACHING THE FIELD SEC CHECKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>61-10-03</td>
<td>THE PRIOR CONFUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>61-06-30</td>
<td>TRAINING ON TRS, TALK ON AUDITING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>61-08-16</td>
<td>UNKNOWN – CYCLIC ASPECT OF GOALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>61-12-20</td>
<td>UPGRADEING AUDITING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>61-10-18</td>
<td>VALENCE, CIRCUITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>61-08-31</td>
<td>WHAT IS AUDITING?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>61-06-29</td>
<td>WRONG TARGET, SEC CHECK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Okay. This is a talk on an E-Meter, 7 May, 1961, to HASI London technical staff.

Now, this instrument is probably the simplest instrument on Earth and is the least known. There's tremendous mysteries connected with this instrument, and nearly everybody using it has developed a whole bunch of technology of his own on it and a lot of that technology is actually in total avoidance of the purpose of the meter.

There's tremendous numbers of things that you could say are this, that or the other way about this meter and none of them are right. It is a very simple machine. That's the first thing I've got to tell you.

Now, any time you put a simple machine, a simple piece of data, in people's hands, what happens? You enter a simple datum, you blow off the confusion, right? Well, after all these years we're still blowing confusion off of E-Meters.

Now, the whole fact of clearing today depends on this meter. If you can read this meter well, you can clear people, and if you can't read this meter well, you certainly can't. That's just the long and the short of it. I've seen a veteran auditor do a bad read on a meter, audit somebody for a couple of hundred hours – factually, audit somebody for a couple of hundred hours – and wonder why they weren't getting Clear. It's just the meter. In SOP Goals a bad assessment – the – it looks so good but it's just not quite right – extends auditing time to ten thousand hours. I mean, simple! You just won't make it, that's all. It's an Aristotelian proposition: it's black or white.

And the funny part about SOP Goals is, it can be run on anybody; there's very little preparation actually necessary for it. If you get the right goal by Assessment by Elimination – once more, there's no judgment here involved: You just shake this meter down for every goal the person has. And when they no longer have any goals which they're withholding – secret goals, childhood goals, antisocial goals, goals: "What would you have to have happen to know Scientology worked?" You see, all those goals shaken down until they no longer produce a fall on this meter, when you got that complete list, whether it's 70 or 250, this meter goes numb. It goes completely null; it no longer registers, when you've got the list.

All right. Now, having that list, you go down until you washed out all goals but one. Just by going over the list and over the list and over the list and over the list and over the list, you'll find out, oddly enough – and this is almost an accident, and it just plays into our hands just madly – there's only one goal left that will register on the meter. I don't care if it takes you twenty-five hours to get the assessment right; if the assessment is right, you have saved all the hours of auditing the fellow will now invest without result. You see, it isn't that – it isn't that you waste time by taking a long time to do an assessment; it's you waste time by
getting a bad assessment. You get a wrong assessment, you've had it. I mean, the fellow just isn't going to go anyplace.

Now, you get a list of all the terminals, and when you finally run this meter completely null on a terminal list for the goal you've now got – you've the goal, now you run the thing completely null. You go right down the line: Terminal, another terminal, "What other terminal would represent that goal? Ah, good. What other terminal would represent that goal? What other terminal would represent that goal? What's another one now?"

Finally the needle goes null. It no longer registers. You – in other words, you get the list of terminals so long as the idea of a terminal for that goal is producing a reaction on the meter. Meter goes null, you got the terminal list, that's it.

Now, you go over this list and over this list and over this list and over this list, and mysteriously and wonderfully, if you go over it enough times, only one terminal – and boy, can you be fooled on this; I've seen an expert fooled on this. Enough times, only one terminal produces a drop. There isn't any single other reaction on the meter except one terminal.

Oh, for a while he'll look juicy. There's one that's going to fall and "Oh, boy!" you say, "That's it." And then all of a sudden that doesn't do it anymore. But another terminal falls like mad and then that's gone. And then – ah, what the hell.

You just go over them enough, and all of a sudden one terminal starts to fall. And it falls and it falls, and it doesn't matter how many times you say so, and it doesn't matter whether you kick the pc or drug him or dope him, it still falls. You get the idea? That's the terminal. Hh-sssss!

I don't care how many hours you take to do that. That's well-invested time, because the number of hours it takes to do a good assessment is compared to the infinity of hours in auditing you're going to spend if the assessment is wrong. You got the idea? Because the fellow is never going to go Clear, so you've consigned him to an infinity of auditing hours. Because he'll never go Clear on a wrong assessment. He won't even get better. How do you like that?

Now, we have lots of processes we can make him better on, which have no assessment, like "Put your finger in your ear. Thank you." And the fellow has finally got his earache over with and that sort of thing. We can do things with other processes, but not SOP Goals. It's infinity, or a finite. An infinity of hours in auditing is the result of a wrong assessment, and a finite number of hours is a result of a right assessment. It's just that bing-bang, you see? It's just black and white. It's either that or it isn't.

You're just about to get a new Prehav Scale, by the way, and it is a very – took me quite a while to figure out how I could deliver the thing properly, and exactly what it was. Well, we've got this in the works; actually it's in the typist's hands. But this is the point: What do you know? It does Assessment by Elimination. If you went over the key points of the scale enough times, only one point falls. Doesn't matter how many other points fall, only one point falls. So you do it Assessment by Elimination every time on the Prehav Scale – every time you do this Assessment by Elimination.
As long as you've got three levels falling, you are wrong to stop. If you've got three levels ticking, you're wrong to stop. You go over that until you've got one level falling. And that is the level. The rest will blow off; they'll not-is.

Well, heck, it may take you a couple of hours then to get the right assessment for the next level to run. Every time you flatten a level, why, it might take you another... I don't care if it does, you see? Because every moment that you run without the right assessment is totally lost in auditing.

So how do you waste auditing time? You waste auditing time -- well, various ways. One of the first ways is you run rudiments on somebody who is incapable of running a rudiment. That's a good way to waste auditing time. Let's spend fifteen hours on rudiments on somebody who cannot produce any reaction on the body by thinking. The reason he can't is he alter-is every command. So you say, "What part of that somatic could you be responsible for?" or some command. That'd be a bad process. "What part of a leg could you be responsible for?" You're going to cure up his PT problem: he's got a pain in his leg or something like that. And you could go on and on and on and on and on and on. Why? Because the fellow is running "What leg has responsibility?"

Look, auditing doesn't work if they don't do the auditing command. So that alter-isness has to be knocked out -- obsessive alter-isness has to be knocked out. And all of this is preparatory to SOP Goals. It's just preparatory.

Now, what processes do you run to prepare him? Actually the best known process is Attention. But Attention, or Change, or an assessed Change Scale or, actually, the new Prehav Scale, which you haven't got in your hands yet, simply run without a terminal. In other words, you can start assessing on the Prehav Scale with no terminal and run anything you can get your hands on, and then you loosen up the tone arm. And then you can come back and do an SOP Goals Assessment on the person if you've got him set up that way.

We have had some remarkable recoveries on just running on the Prehav Scale, by the way -- no terminal, no assessment, no nothing. Quite interesting. But it sets a person up to run -- the new Prehav Scale will, because it's got all varieties of change and alteration in it. So it'd take out all the obsessive change off of the case, all the alter-is of the auditing command.

But that's beside the point. This is actually not a lecture on how to set a case up, because that will be too easy. I could say: The best way I know of to do it is to take the new Prehav Scale and do an assessment directly without a terminal on the pc and you only do that when his tone arm won't move -- he's got a stuck tone arm. And you run the levels that do make it fall in spite of the fact that it's stuck, because those are the automaticity levels. Get the automaticities off the surface of the case and you immediately have somebody who can be assessed and who will follow an auditing command. And SOP Goals grips them so with interest, with the right goal, that they don't alter-is auditing commands. They are too interested. They're sitting right in the middle of it. You got it?

So we've got this thing made. And it's essentially a very simple regimen. It fortunately, perhaps, for us is one which requires technical perfection. That's fortunately for us! Because it means no screwball outfit -- but imagine some outfit like the Grand Temple of Ishtar or the Brothers of the Snake, or something, suddenly being able to pick up our technology, if it were
terribly, terribly simple, and use it to plow everybody in on Earth. This was one of the points that maybe you weren't looking at, but I was. If it came out at the other end too simple — all you had to do was say "bligablog" and the guy was — had a terrific mental effect, you see; or if you said "subba-hubba-hubba-hubbaboo" or something, and some terrific mental effect occurred in the individual, it was susceptible to being used as Black Dianetics — if it was too simple.

But we've come out the other end of the horn, and we get an actual look at what it really is, and it's simply this: perfect adherence to the Auditor's Code. Oh yeah, but your black operations can't follow the Auditor's Code.

Look, Freudian psychoanalysis is exactly reverse to the Auditor's Code the whole way. Everything we say in the Auditor's Code "plus," psychoanalysis says "minus." If you don't believe it, look it over some time. They do exact reverse to everything that's in the Auditor's Code. Well, therefore the Auditor's Code is not something they'd have any sympathy with, so therefore they'd never follow it, would they? So all right, that puts a barrier across their track.

Perfect TRs. It takes a person in pretty good shape to do a perfect TR. Why perfect TR? Well, the funny part of it is, if it isn't a perfect TR, your pc, as he comes up through SOP Goals, gets new PT problems and new ARC breaks with the greatest of ease. And if you're not administering it with perfect TRs, the individual is thrown off line and you're wasting auditing time like mad. And if your TRs were bad enough he never would get Clear. That's another barrier across the track, isn't it?

A total understanding of this meter and a perfect use of Model Session. Now, a black operation would only use this meter to blackmail; that's the total use they'd put the meter to. Once more it'd be booby-trapped: They'd never really learn how to run the meter. And Model Session: They couldn't learn Model Session because they can't duplicate. Those are the things that it actually takes to clear somebody, plus a perfect assessment.

And we have a new book, *E-Meter Essentials*, which is quite comprehensive. However, what I'm giving you today are — well, most of it is covered in *E-Meter Essentials*; but I'm going to give you, right now, a breakdown of the material on an E-Meter, which is probably even a little more simple than the take-off point of *E-Meter Essentials*. I've thought of a new point of take-off.

It's a very funny thing. I get better at explaining things, and I've got a better explanation today on E-Meters than I had when I wrote the book just two or three weeks ago.

Now, here's this explanation.

The reason I've given you, by the way, all of this rundown here on the subject of what it takes to clear somebody is just to try to tell you, "Look, guys, that's all it is." You know? I mean, there isn't anything else but those factors. There are no other factors. There are no sneak factors out someplace than those I have exactly mentioned. So if you say "Well, there's something more that Ron hasn't told us," or something like this, look around to find out what fact Ron has told you that you're dispersing on. Will you? Because I'm actually now giving you all the dope. It's taken eleven years to condense it, to find out all about it, to develop it, to
get it into every case line, to require no vast mental gymnastics for each particular different case.

I'll tell you how wide and varied Dianetics was. On several occasions I dreamed up a complete regimen that fitted a case, and the case started to run on it, and then went out and invented a whole new Dianetics that applied only to that regimen which was invented for that particular case. Fellow by the name of Altman in New York City, remember that? What did they eventually call that – Gestalt therapy or something? It was something real weird.

But it was something that was invented for Altman's case and it only applied to Altman. And he went out and he started a whole school of Dianetics. He might – he'd might better have called it "Altman's case."

To get something that embraced all cases and which you could use and which wouldn't betray you in your hands and which you didn't have to suddenly develop an enormous bleuh for this particular case because this case was all different, has been quite a trick, and it's taken eleven years. And that's probably a very long time.

But as Dick said the other day, in view of the fact nobody had done anything for the fifty thousand years preceding, that eleven years doesn't look very much. So don't feel betrayed that I didn't tell you all this yesterday as a favor, huh? It's taken me quite a little while to find out the words to fit the music.

Things like this. Now, I'm going to tell you about an E-Meter. Things like this. This is just a communication expression. And the moment I tell you this, I'm sure you're going to say "Well, what do you know?" This is a tension machine. That's all. That's all it measures. If you want to be idiotic and leave the electronics alone, it is a tension machine – not an attention machine, a tension machine. The more tense is the individual, the more offbeat is the read.

From the meter standpoint, the only thing you're trying to do is take the tension measurements out of this machine. That's the goal of clearing as viewed from an E-Meter.

Now, there's, oddly enough, the lowest zone of tension, which is, there is so much tension in the world that there is no sense in doing anything about anything anywhere, and you've got an ambulant, catatonic schiz. You got a dead thetan who is totally incapable – he thinks of himself as dead, you see – and he's totally incapable of influencing the machine. That's your first stage. But the machine even on that first stage, although it reads the way a Clear should read (it's the lower harmonic mockery of the Clear), still detects perfectly. Because he's Clear here, male, 3 on the tone arm dial and/or she still detects here, female, 2 on the tone arm dial, the needle is tense. You've got your sensitivity up to read him.

So the machine still detects this case. And as a cross-detection, the machine does not react favorably at all, and the individual cannot answer positively, to his own satisfaction or yours, any questions about help. That one he can't embrace.

If you just ask him, "Well, how could you help me?" – although he's sitting here at 3 and you say, "Well, he's sitting here at 3; when I ask him things, there's no action on the needle; so therefore, he must be a natural Clear!" You see?
Well, look at this needle, and you're going to find out something about Mr. Needle. The needle is going to be in some kind of a state of dishabille, and it will be almost as stiff, as you see that needle floating there, with the cans unplugged. The needle isn't going to move off of that.

Now, a severe test of it would be to kick him in the shins. The needle is still not going to move off of that. This does not look like a Clear. It doesn't even vaguely look like a Clear. The difference is the needle and the sensitivity knob.

Your sensitivity knob will have to be up to get a third-of-a-dial drop – sometimes way up. Otherwise the individual is at a Clear mockery. Do you follow me? That's a mockery. And that's the thetan who thinks of himself as dead, dead, dead, and actually "There isn't any use to have any tension anyhow because it's all so tense that if I just stay here nicely dead – ." And although he's walking and talking on the subject of machinery – you know, he's all machine motivated – you'll find in his normal course of endeavor if you ask him any questions, that he has all kinds of bad luck, that he doesn't quite groove in, but basically this: He doesn't believe anything can be done.

I had the perfect case of this tell me one day – he was actually working here on press – and he told me, "Well, you can't possibly produce a story about 'Tomatoes Feel Pain' every six weeks." He knew a lot about press – that was what he knew: "You can't possibly!"

See, there's no doingness. So there's no help, there's no doingness, there's no possibility – these are immediately detectable in the individual. They're not a deep, searching detection you have to take. You just say, "Well, let's get busy and sort out these papers," and you'll get the answer, "You can't do. There isn't any sense in sorting out the papers because ..." You got the idea? He says a "can't do."

Well now, doingness is the common denominator of the Prehavingness Scale. And an individual who can't do isn't even on the scale. See, everything is "can't do."

Now, don't be fooled by this case because the meter detects it at once. Sensitivity knob down here – look at your sensitivity knob. There is your best case detector – not your tone arm, not your needle, but the sensitivity knob, right down here in the lower left-hand corner of the meter. Now, that right there is your case detector. And don't forget it. That's a honey. And if you don't know anything else about the tone arm or the needle as case detection, know the sensitivity knob.

On these modern meters, if the sensitivity knob has to come up to 2 to get a read, the case is in bad condition. It's just as simple as that. Much less 3, 4, 8, 16. If you have to wind up this sensitivity knob at all, your case is in bad condition. You got that? That's di-ag-nosis, if you want to call it that.

Put the fellow on the machine. If you don't pay any attention whatsoever to the tone arm, if you don't pay any attention over here to the needle at all, you can tell on this sensitivity knob. If you have to crank the sensitivity knob up to get the case to get a one-third-of-a-dial drop on the needle for a test, case in bad shape. Otherwise it should sit down here, way down, way down.
Now, your first test of course, then, is when you hook up the meter, you balance the thing, you say, "Well now, it's sitting here at two", snap in your cable; fellow has got the cans, and you say "Squeeze the cans. Squeeze the cans." And he gets a sixteenth-of-a-dial drop. Bring the sensitivity knob up and you say, "Squeeze the cans." And you get an eighth-of-a-dial drop and you bring the sensitivity up and you say, "Squeeze the cans." And you finally get exactly one third-of-a-dial drop and his sensitivity is at 4 – don't pay any attention to your tone arm, that's it. The case is in lousy condition. That's all you have to know.

You don't even have to go psychiatric and say he's a catatonic ambiguousa. He's just in lousy shape.

Meaning this: That we'll have to do some preparatory work before we can do an assessment. And that's everything that means to you. We've got to do preparatory work before we do an assessment. Let's find out a little bit more about this case.

Now, you actually don't have to bring this sensitivity knob down here to its zero – you don't have to bring it down there for a third-of-a-dial drop to do an assessment. You can still assess these people long before they have recovered on their sensitivity. That's interesting, isn't it? But the probability is, you're going to have to do something with this case.

Now, if this is in real bad shape, you're probably have to – going to have to do something adventurous just to get him to sit in the chair.

All right. Now, let's look this over. Your diagnosis, we have said in the past, is tone arm and needle and sensitivity knob. Your first and foremost diagnosis – and most everything you want to know about the case – is told to you by the sensitivity knob. Now, we can progress with our diagnosis. Now, this individual, to get a third-of-a-dial drop when he squeezes the cans, which is the cans held in his hands relaxedly with his fingers not off of them but just touching them normally as he would in auditing, you say, "Squeeze the cans."

Now, sometimes they go like this, you know? It's very jerky and so forth, and they keep squeezing, squeezing, squeezing. To me, that's diagnosis. The guy can't follow a simple order. You say, "Give the cans a squeeze." I don't know what he's doing with them. But you have to then educate him in how to squeeze the cans. That's not very diagnostic, but he squeezes the cans properly just one squash and then back to relaxation, and you get a one-third-of-a-dial drop with the thing low. All right, that would be all right. But you get a third-of-a-dial drop with the sensitivity needle at 4 – ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah, oh-oh-oh-oh-oh! Individual is not going to have a lie reaction. He's going to be very hard to security check. He – all of these other things follow out. Why?

Because the guy is very, very, very surrounded by tensions of all kinds, sorts and descriptions. I'm using this word tension as just sort of an embracive thing of he's got all kinds of things going on, and he's got all kinds of tightnesses and tautnesses.

Now, this coordinates this way: If you were to reach over and squeeze this cord which comes out of his neck – a fellow who is up here at about 2 or 3 on the sensitivity knob will sometimes scream like a hog with his throat cut. That's painful! But if it is just exactly like a cable – you know, it's as though he had galvanized iron cable, not an upper muscle here on the upper part of his shoulder from his neck over to his shoulder pit and doesn't feel any pain
at all, you can expect this thing to have to ride at 16 for a third-of-a-dial drop. You got it? He's very tense and doesn't even know it.

Now, how tense is tense? Well, actually, the fellow that can be nervous about being tense, or the fellow that can be jittery about being tense, or the fellow that can jiggle his foot or scratch his head or fumble his chin is not in very bad shape. You go down scale and this fellow is getting into the rigidity of rigor mortis. Now, that's in bad shape. Can't move anything at all ever. That's your sensitivity knob telling you the story of your case.

And you do a Security Check, get your third-of-a-dial drop, and if this thing is up high, you know what you could really do? You could say to the fellow, "Well, why don't you get some auditing? Then we'll security check you later." Because frankly, any Security Check that you get on this individual is going to be very suspect. He will, however, fall on things where he has crimes. But to clear them – oh, my God!

Well, we just had one; we just did seven hours, or so, on a case to run a Joburg Security Check. Case isn't as bad off as cases go by an awful long ways.

So that forecasts that somebody reading at about sixteen, to clear every level you could get a tick on – what does that mean? That means a twenty-five-hour intensive for one Joburg Security Check. Well, oddly enough it would do him a lot of good; he'd get off a lot of withholds and you'd see that the needle was loosening up and this tone arm falling. And, you'd – more importantly for diagnosis, you'd see that the sensitivity knob didn't have to be so high. Okay?

Now, always run a meter with a third-of-a-dial drop. These meters are set, I check them over, and they do respond to that mechanical action. Another type of meter or another model or something like that, they might not respond that way, but this type of meter that I've checked out does respond that way. But you will get a proper fall if you have a third-of-a-dial drop on a squeeze of the cans on the needle.

Don't run one jacked way up with its sensitivity very high and with the needle flying around, because you don't get any significant read. A third-of-a-dial drop at any given time during a session will give you a significant read and it'll leave out all the heartbeats and so forth.

Now, in E-Meter Essentials it gives you a drill. Let's go a little bit further now. In E-Meter Essentials it gives you a drill, and the drill is a body movement-detection drill. And every auditor should do that drill. Just have somebody sit back and breathe and wheeze and cough and tell him to do these various things and watch the reactions on this needle. And this will teach you, after you've done it – with your meter set up properly – after you've done it, this will teach you that they are erratic, they are very fast, and that they don't in the least look like reads. And you will learn rapidly to differentiate between a read from the bank and a body reaction. The fellow who shifts his thumb on the can sporadically – keeps shifting his thumb or something like this: it doesn't even vaguely look like a read. You'll see that very soon. You'll see that after a while you don't even have to look up to see if he's doing something odd.
Now, you get into a rock slam, as one of the needle characteristics, and you'll find that you usually have to check the pc: "What are you doing?" All of a sudden you've got a wham-wham of the needle. Well, kind of check the pc: "What are you doing?" That's the only one that looks like a body movement. But then that keeps up. And he couldn't possibly be doing this rhythmic body movement this well. So even that is detectable. Now, it's the body movement that makes the erratic moves, and which the phrenologist – that is taught in most universities today – or is it Chaldeosis, or they read stars – horoscopy or something like that. These birds are so unaccustomed to a galvanometer that they never learned how to read one, and they think the falls are mostly attributable to body motions. They have been defeated by the body motion, so they say you never can tell on a lie detector, or this and that, because it's a body motion. And this is the first invalidative factor they give the meter.

Remember that the basis of this meter is one hundred years old. This is not a new meter. A century this thing has been around. And for nobody to have learned how to use it in a whole century was something weird.

Now, of course, we had to set it up so that it would read for our purposes. We had to redesign circuits. We brought it into a very compact package. The shelf life of this British – of the batteries in this British meter and the consumption rate are the same. Now, that's quite remarkable, isn't it? Did you know that you could take one of these modern Mark IV British meters and – don't do this – but you could leave it on in the case for weeks without running it down? Could just leave it on for weeks and weeks, because its consumption rate is the same as shelf life for the battery. Pretty interesting, huh?

Well, we've refined the living daylights out of the meter and we've made it read, and we've found out what these various components that can vary the meter mean, and we're not teaching you a new electronic instrument. All we're doing is teaching you a refined electronic instrument that nobody ever learned how to read.

So don't feel that you're dense or stupid, particularly, because you don't instantly and immediately pick up how to read an E-Meter. Because remember, it's been around for a century without anybody in the halls of learning even finding out anything about it.

You know that this thing is part and parcel of every lie detector in the United States. Men are actually sent to the electric chair on the evidence of one of these things, and the guys operating them don't know how to read them. They don't know anything about the mind. They don't know anything about the track. They tell you, "It reads only sweat. If the individual sweats suddenly, you get a drop. And then when he unsweats..." It gets silly, doesn't it? Actually, the fellow with soaking wet palms and the fellow with perfectly dry palms can read more or less the same, as far as that's concerned. It has no bearing on it, but that's what they tell you, and it's very amusing.

All right. State of case – sensitivity knob. Don't be fooled by it. If it's a high knob – it's just open-and-shut. If it's a high reading on the sensitivity knob, look out, because you're dealing with somebody who's going to alter-is commands. That's all. There's the possibility of his alter-is commands. Well, you're probably have to going to do something with this, straight on the Prehav Scale, to get the alter-is of [off?] the commands before you get anything run. You got it? Simple.
Let's put it this way; let's make another remark on this: He is not a Release. Now, the best person to run SOP Goals on is a Release. And if you were being terribly careful the whole way, you would make a Release before you started SOP Goals. The odd part of it is, if you're very good on SOP Goals, you can do an assessment on a person who isn't a Release and you will make faster auditing progress if you do it.

Normally, if you have a high sensitivity knob reading, it will assess only to a present time problem. Your whole SOP Goals will assess to a present time problem. That goal which is the present time problem for the case will be the goal you will usually get. Something to expect, huh? Something to sort of know about the thing.

But if you've released the person first, or got him up in that general direction one way or the other – . Well, after all, look at the technology we've had over the last many, many years, I mean, you can do all kinds of things with cases. You can soften up this meter; you can make this meter read differently with auditing. Practically everything we've ever found out is now valuable to us, one way or the other. I'm not saying you have this enormous span of things, but if you know something that's made cases well for you – you know, it – just this: If you know something that has made cases well for you – something like 8-C or something like this; you've made cases well with this sort of thing, you know; you've changed meter reads on them and so forth – why, that's a better reality, make them a Release with it. And you'll find the sensitivity is reading lower. If you've done something that makes the case better, you've produced a Release. Now go ahead with SOP Goals.

Now, that fits into your reality, doesn't it? I'm not giving you a whole new package and saying all of Scientology is discarded, but I'm telling you where it stops. It stops at SOP Goals. SOP Goals is itself, and it is very precise.

How you produce this Release: that's a matter that is pretty well up to you. I can give you numerous ways that will be highly functional on numerous cases. But by doing four or five of them, you will always have a case in shape to be run on SOP Goals.

All right. Let's look at the next factor on this. This has to do with the tone arm. This tone arm – this thing over here on the upper – upper-left side of the meter. All right. Now, this thing reads at 5,000 ohms female; 12,500 ohms male for the body. And its read is monitored for the body. It reads the body.

When a person is Clear you're not reading him; the E-Meter ceases to read. It's hit its zenith. When he's a total stable MEST Clear, it has hit its zenith. The meter is no good from there on up. It will always have to be used lower than that, however.

So what do you – what have you got left here? You've got his body. And apparently a female body is 5,000 ohms and a male body is 12,500 ohms, and that's represented by F with a circle around it and 2 for a female, and the M with a circle around it and the 3 for a male.

Now, that tells you at once why the lower-harmonic case – the dead thetan – why he reads at 2 and 3. See, that tells you why he reads at 2 and 3, because he's a dead body. You go down to the morgue and put the meter on a corpse down there, and you'll get these same reads. It's very fascinating, isn't it?
So you've either got the thetan not mauling the body around and changing its density every three seconds, or a dead thetan which couldn't, and you have these two extremes. And the worst-off case that you will run into is, of course, the lower, mockery harmonic of the Clear. Only he's really dead in his head. He's so dead in his head he thinks he's elsewhere while he's there.

You ask this person where he is – you just ask this person where he is; he's always someplace else.

In between that band, you have innumerable variations of this tone arm – innumerable variations of the tone arm. But most important – and this is the most recent discovery – did you know there were – you know these are divisions, and when you hear divisions of the tone arm dial it's 1 to 2. Look on your dial there. Look on your dial and just move it now from 1 to 2, 1 to 2. That is called one division of the tone arm dial. One tone arm division – 1 to 2.

Similarly, 2 to 3. Move it from 2 to 3. From 2 to 3 – that is one division of the tone arm dial.

Now, back it down from 3 to 2. All right. Back it down now from 3 to 2. That again is the movement of one division of the tone arm dial. Doesn't matter which way it moves; that is a movement of one division.

Now, move it from 3 to 3.5 and then back to 3. Do that again. Move it from 3 to 3.5 and back to 3. That is not one division of movement – not one division of movement. That is a half a division of movement, even though it moved up a half and back a half.

The way we're running this thing now, our movements are so explicit that when we say it has to have one division of movement for the tone arm dial, or an eighth of the division of movement of the tone arm dial, we mean in one direction up or one direction down, not four times with a quarter.

Now let's look at four times with a quarter. Move it from 3 to 3.25 to 3, to 3.25, to 3, to 3.25. That is not one motion – one division of the tone arm dial. Have you got that? That's not one division of the tone arm dial.

No, one division motion of the tone arm dial – the way we're – this is a refined look at the situation – is from 3 to 4, or 4 to 3. Now, this may contradict some of your earlier data. But we've had to codify this thing, so we're expressing exactly what we're expressing. A quarter of a division of movement could be this: In five minutes – now move it from 3 to 3.25, to 3, to 3.25, to 3, to 3.25, to 3 to 3.25. Got that? That all took place in five minutes of auditing. That's a quarter of a division of motion of the tone arm dial. Didn't matter how many times it happened; that's a quarter of a division of the tone arm dial. Got that subtle difference? That's just so we don't make any mistakes about this.

All right. Now, this tone arm is what we audit with, and you are being technically incorrect if you make a report like this: "The tone arm dial was pretty motionless while I was running the process, but the needle was moving." Any mention of a needle during the running of a process is a faux pas. It has nothing to do with the running of the process.
Now, curiosa – that it occasionally rock slams on you is just curiosa. It's not factual. It doesn't immediately lead you into making any new decision or solution. It's interesting that there is something flying around. But let me give you a caution: Because this needle flies around ... it is moving, isn't it? And your attention – it's moving rapidly, let us say – your attention is liable to be drawn to the needle and you're liable to start trying to interpret the needle as you audit a process. And it has nothing to do with the auditing of a process. We couldn't care less what the needle is doing.

While we're running the process, we might as well take the needle and snap it off and throw it away. The only thing we're going to pay any attention to at all is this tone arm dial. If that is moving, the process is biting, and if that isn't moving, the process is not biting.

And here we get a black-and-white Aristotelian fact: No motion on the tone arm dial, no action in the bank.

I'm not going to bother to go into the details here today of why this bank action occurs and so forth, but the bank is moving, and the movement of the bank is registered over here on a broad, wide basis on the tone arm dial.

Now, we're running processes today which do move the tone arm dial, and which are sufficiently good that they cannot help but move the tone arm dial. If you're running the right process, the tone arm dial is moving; if you're running the wrong process, it is not.

If the process is flat – regardless of what this needle is doing over here – if the process is flat, the tone arm dial is not moving. If the case is progressing, the tone arm dial is moving; if the case is not progressing, the tone arm dial is not moving. Simple, very straightforward. In other words, process on the tone arm.

Now, we take a look at this needle. What is the needle for then? That is for assessment. That is what you use that needle for, it is for assessment. There are several things the needle can do, and only one of those things has any real significance to you. What you are looking for is falls. They are called falls, drops, dips – there are numerous words used, but fall is actually the proper word only because it says "fall" on the needle – on the needle dial. It says "fall". And that means the fall is in the direction from set to where it is marked "fall." In other words, a fall inevitably drops to the right and recovers.

But it can go this way: It can fall, recover slightly, fall, recover slightly, fall, recover – it's still a fall. All right, we'll take a fall here, and it fell and then it recovered slightly and fell and recovered slightly and fell and recovered slightly and fell ... By the way, I don't pay any attention to this – tone arm numbers here – these numbers don't mean anything over here on the needle dial. They mean something on the tone arm dial, but they don't mean anything here.

I just noticed the other day somebody has marked this thing up for two divisions as one number. That will be changed. A division is simply the distance between two black marks on this thing.

All right, with that repetitive and continual fall, the actual fall was one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. In what space of time? Well, I would say in the matter of two or three seconds. You know, it kind of pumps itself down. Well, that is the number of divisions
of fall. Now, this thing is marked off with little black marks and you have these and you call them divisions. Don't pay any attention to the numbers on the thing. And that is divisions of fall.

Now, diagnostically, the fall is the primary needle manifestation. Now let's talk in these needle manifestations. Fall – that's primary. A stronger manifestation than fall is the rock slam. That's just all over the… I don't know whether I – yeah, yeah, I can. I can make one of these things rock slam. There – there – there's a rock slam. Just agitate – go ahead, do it – agitate your tone arm here and watch that needle. Just move that back and forth rapidly; that's a rock slam. See that? Crazy. That's a crazy thing! That means you're right on the rock chain to the first time the – ever guy – the guy ever decided to be another valence. That's right straight on the line. You get that thing, take it. That's your strongest read.

Theta bop is a diagnostic read, but when you're really on the button your theta bop turns into a fall. But if you're reading a bunch of questions and you get a theta bop and you keep getting a theta bop every third question – theta bop – there's one of those questions someplace in the assessment list that is a theta bop question, and it has to do with leaving and death. And it's really kind of the yo-yo. The thetan is backing out of his head and coming back in slightly. Whether he's doing it inside his head, or on the next planet, it doesn't matter, but he's going in and out. And he actually is moving in and out. He's moving – tck-tck-tck-tck-tck-tck-tck-tck-tck-tck-tck-tck – he's going. Call it – like a yo-yo – the old child's toy that bounced down and came back up and bounced down and came back up. And that's represented by a little tick-tick-tick, that is almost exactly the same path.

That's too fast a one. Now, if you just move this thing about an eighth of a division move your tone arm back and forth smoothly about an eighth of a division – move it back and forth smoothly an eighth of a division – you'll notice that needle rocking back and forth there over the same pattern. That is a theta bop. It does not matter a continental how wide the theta bop is. It can be a whole dial wide – .

Now, basically, I've always referred to a theta bop as something that did it repetitively, and most theta bops which are going to be anything at all do it repetitively. Now, if you refined this down to the ne plus ultra, you'd find out that one dip and one recovery at the exact same speed over the exact same area would be a one-motion theta bop. You're now sort of nagging at the facts. It's true. That's perfectly true, but it's not very useful. That's perfectly true, but it's not very useful. You get what I'm talking about now?

Now, a theta bop has the equal halt at both ends. You see, you might as well call it a fall as far as diagnostics are concerned, if it fell once and recovered, you might as well call it a fall. But technically speaking you could say well, that was a one – a one-jump theta bop, but of course it's diagnostic the way a fall is. See? You could differentiate between these two things. It would mean that the speed of recovery was the same exactly as the speed of drop.

But it's still diagnostic and it means the same thing ordinarily that a fall would get.

If you saw that manifestation, sooner or later you're going to turn on what caused it. And then it's going to go rock-rock-rock-rock-rock. It'll do the same thing many times now. It'd mean that you just ticked the edge of a theta bop.
So fall, rock slam, theta bop – all right? All of them are useful diagnostically. All of them. The fall is ordinarily what you use – you ordinarily use the fall. That's the usual action. The theta bop can be used as an indicator. But never put it down as "the needle reacted." Put it down as a theta bop. Make the Greek letter \( \theta \) and write "bop" after it.

That simply means the guy wants to get out of there. He wants to die. He is stuck in a past death. And oddly enough, he wants to leave the assessment, or he's got leavingness on his mind. It doesn't matter which of these things is true, you would merely know that some of them are true if he's consistently theta bopping. Theta bop and death are synonymous. Theta bop and leaving are synonymous because death is leaving. A guy blows out of his head when he dies so when he gets the idea of leaving, he also theta bops. It's very simple. Returning will also give you a theta bop.

Now, what do you use for assessment, then? Actually it's broadly covered by a change of needle pattern. The needle is sitting there quietly; you read question, question, question, question, and nothing is happening at all. And then you read a question and it goes jiggle-jaggle. Well, we don't care what it did. Read the question again; it goes jiggle-jaggle. We really don't care what it did, you understand? It did something. The needle responded because we read the question, and that is the fundamental; whatever the significance of the response are, that is the fundamental. And there's only one exception to this: It rose.

I can hear far too much about needles rising. I can hear too much about this; I can easily be bored with the subject of rising needles. In fact, you hardly have to do anything to bore me with it, because it means just one thing. It means the pc isn't confronting. And, of course, that's why he's being audited.

So, I'll show you what a rising needle looks like. Now, take this thing and set it at 2.5 – set your meter at 2.5 – and now move it slowly and evenly to 2. You got that? If your meter is turned on here – it's turned on and balanced and is in the vicinity of 2, you ought to have a read on the needle – the needle ought to be up in the middle of the dial. All right, take it from – again, take it from 2.25. Now, very slowly, over this period of time, inch it, inch it, inch it smoothly, smoothly – sometimes even with little jerks – inch it smoothly up to 2 and you will get it. That is a rising needle.

Now, naturally needles have to rise for tone arms to recover, don't they? Just the mechanics of the meter tell you that. They have to rise. It's absolutely vital. Otherwise you would never get another read anywhere on the tone arm, would you?

And if you become too fascinated with a rising needle, you're becoming too fascinated with something which doesn't mean anything. It just doesn't, that's all. Beyond this just one thing: The pc has struck something he isn't confronting.

Now, we used to use this rising needle this way: Anything that will stop a needle from rising is something the pc can confront, or is usually why the needle is rising. You can find out why the needle is rising by finding out what stops it from rising. Whatever stops a needle from rising is why it's rising.

I studied ASW under a British instructor. I was running British corvettes during the war and I was studying ASW and they have to do with meters too, you know? They have
chemical recorders and pings and bops and dials and Lord knows what. And I sat down in the classroom, and he gave me a lecture on the speed of sound, which went down to the particle motion of particles influenced by sound. We were about a hundred fathoms under any information we had to have to run a chemical recorder, you understand? I was struck by the tremendous thoroughness of this and that this particular instructor got through – after a long course of this and that on these things – I was very indebted to him for having given me all this stuff. I really knew about it, you understand? But I'll be a son of a monkey if it – if it had much application to hunting submarines, you know – the physics of speed of sound and that sort of thing. And I got the idea of the thoroughness of this thing. And the thoroughness of this thing was fabulous.

Well, I'm only mentioning this particular incident for this reason: Yeah, it'd be a good thing to teach you all about this E-Meter on the standpoint of making you learn the circuit. You know, the resistors and capacitors and everything in the circuit and exactly how the balance wheels go on in back of this thing and so forth. That would be a good idea. And probably you couldn't be called a total expert on E-Meters unless you could build one out of some old baling wire, you understand? But there is a point – there is a point where that information ceases to be of any value to you, because you are not building E-Meters.

Now, there was some sense in his teaching me all about the speed of sound, and so forth, because I could do a calculation. But how sound existed as sound: I didn't need to know this, you understand? I remember that course because on the one hand I resented the living daylights out of it – I had already been using these things in action, and on the other hand I appreciated it because it seemed so thorough.

I'm only bringing this up to tell you, don't think that there aren't things about this meter you could study. You could study its circuit; you could study its manufacture; you could under-study its costing; you could study methods of improvement of it. Well, needle manifestations become an esoteric subject like the construction of the meter. Am I making my point?

Now – now, you can really start getting esoteric. I'll give you an example. There's a stage four needle. And that stage four needle can't be duplicated over here by this tone arm, but if you'll take it up to 2.25, now swing it fairly rapidly in a rise by bringing the tone arm to 2, and then pretend the needle stuck, and then drop it back rapidly to 2.25, and then bring it up to 2, and then to 2.25, and then bring it up to 2 and pretend it stuck, and then bring it back to 2.25. Got that? You see that motion? Well, you can't get the exact motion by moving the tone arm because it's a distinct stick at the top. Up it goes, up, up, and sticks, and then it falls; and then it goes up, up, and sticks, and then it falls. There is a stage four case. You could hit the guy with a belaying pin, you could put him in boiling oil, and I think you'd still get a stage four needle. It is just a total no-effect sort of needle.

Now, a stage four can be very tiny. I've seen them a half a division wide. It's not a theta bop because a theta bop is back and forth, equal speed. Actually there's kind of a little flip on the end of it. If your needle was very sensitive, you'd see your flip on both ends of the theta bop. It goes over and flips and goes back and flips and goes back – and by a flip I mean it kind of goes tzit, tzit, tzit, back and forth, tick-tick-tick-tick-tick-tick-tick. On these meters it simply looks like a little swing.
But a stage four now: that's up, *tsk* stick, fall. Now, it's very relaxed at the bottom of it – up, stick, fall. It simply means a lousy case. You're going to have it already adjudicated down here with the sensitivity knob. You see? Nothing is having any effect on the case at all – nothing – as long as you've got a stage four needle. To that degree it's useful to know. You won't see them often. So when you do see them, nothing is having any effect on the case. But it's almost impossible for modern auditing not to have any effect on a case, so it would be very brief that you would see one. We can blow up stage four needles now very nicely.

I remember two famous cases that had stage four needles, though, that lasted through all of the early processes of Dianetics and Scientology, still with stage four needles. It's a no-effect sort of a manifestation. All right, the Prehav Scale will blow up that needle in no time at all, so why should we go into the particulars of it?

All right, there's another one; there's a *jiggle-jiggle*. A vibration – the needle simply vibrates like mad. Well, you've got somebody with an alternating current ridge. Very important. So he's got an alternating current ridge!

There's other stuff about meters – 4.5 means a crowd. If the guy is stuck at 4.5 on the tone arm he's afraid of people, or he's stuck in people.

You ever see travel pictures of the famous monastery in Greece where they haul people up in a basket that's their elevator? And it survived down through the centuries because no invader can even get near it – he can't climb it. Have you ever heard of this one? Well, I actually did an E-Meter assessment on its – on the head of that monastery, a few months ago. And where was he? He was at 4.5. Naturally, in – living in a protected area up in the sky – you almost might say – that nobody could get near or something, he had done such a tremendous avoidance of people that he finally got himself stuck there.

Incidentally, the only goal you could get out of this old man is he wanted to go to heaven. He believed his own propaganda. He said he wanted to have something happen with his eyes. He was going blind. That's what he said, but that meter didn't say so. He just wanted to die. He wanted to go to heaven. I tried to find a terminal to heaven. And I'm afraid there were too many people around for me to do a very good job of the assessment, because I could only spend about a half an hour on it, or something like this.

I got him straightened out enough so something could be done about his eyes. And after that I turned it over to a local auditor, and it would do something for his eyes.

Trying to find a terminal for somebody who wants to go to heaven, who answers you nothing but in total doctrine, you see – total doctrine. I mean, all your answers are doctrine answers, have nothing to do with anything. He had no – he had not – he didn't even have a goal to be a priest. I gave a Presession 38 to run the engram of his heartbreak when he was a young man at the age of eighteen in the United States when he decided to become a priest. That was the point where his whole life had broken down and he decided to become a priest, and actually, he'd been trying to go to heaven since he was eighteen, in other words. But going to heaven – what is this? It's just a manifestation of a fellow trying to die. So of course he was going blind. He was making nothing out of his own mock-up so fast that – what could you do?
Well, what could you do? Well, you could find the incident where he decided to become a priest – that's what you could do – and run it. The old man wasn't in bad shape, by the way, and I mentioned people enough to him in the assessment that I kicked him off his 4.5 read on the tone arm.

An obsessively stuck at 2.5 means a machine, a robot, a doll – that sort of thing.

Now, these are just samples of bric-a-brac. Oh yes, as time goes on, these things are very nice to know, and they're – they mark you as "the expert." Now, after I'd taken a course on ASDIC from a British instructor I was after that certified as a total, total expert, don't you see? I could probably build the machines. Now, I can't even buy one out of war surplus. I've been trying to get one for a yacht, and they won't even sell me one. Probably an expert like that – he's at least entitled to his machinery, isn't he?

Now, these you might assign to esoterics, so get your levels of importance up here – levels of importance. Terribly important that a read on the needle produces – most ordinarily and usually and significantly and which you always make record of – a fall; next to that, a theta bop; more rarely, a rock slam. Most positive read is a rock slam.

Somebody starts rock slamming, and then you get him so he does nothing but rock slam on that question, that is the question that is producing the rock slam. And man you'd better run it because that is right on the rock chain. That is hotter than a pistol.

Every time you come by "boy scout" – he used to have an ambition to be a boy scout. Ambition to be a boy scout – rock slam. And then later on he wanted to be a minister – no rock slam. And then later on, why, he wanted to become a choir boy – no rock slam; no action at all, and so on. You go over this list of assessment again, you get it up to "boy scout" – rock slam. And all of a sudden, no rock slam on "boy scout." That has dropped out.

But later on in the questions he wanted to be a frontiersman. That rock slams, see? In other words, "boy scout" was borrowing its rock slam from "frontiersman." And we keep on asking him about "frontiersman," and the more we ask him about "frontiersman," the more rock slam we get – that's only valid if this other phenomenon takes place: no other goal on the list produces any fall, any theta bop, or any action on the needle. But "frontiersman" produces rock slam.

Well, then, you're saying the same thing as frontiersman produces fall, aren't you? So a rock slam you can classify for diagnosis as a very positive fall, that's all.

Fall is what you look for. And don't go talking to me about rises and don't start worrying me about how this pc consistently read at 3 7/8, and what did that mean? I don't know what it means. Who's kidding who? Got it? So what? That's interesting, and those of us that are fooling around with meters will eventually get this thing read down to a point of where you could put any man or beast on the face of Earth on an E-Meter and we can probably tell what his name, rank and serial number is for each life back – you know? That's way beyond what is needed to make SOP Goals work or make auditing work.

You produce a reaction on this needle that is different than the reaction you had on this needle, and you've got a reaction. But that's not true of fall, because you might have
leered at the moment you asked the question, and he couldn't confront a leer so now he's rising. Rise means nothing.

Now there's another read I'll have to tell you about on this meter. And that is 7 on the tone arm dial. The limitations of manufacture of the meter prevent us from having a 7 on the tone arm dial.

I was very bright a few months ago in South Africa and made this horrendous discovery that there is a 7 on the tone arm dial but it can't be reached by the tone arm.

Put this thing at 2. Got your meter set there at 2. All right. Now, let's say he's a dead-body 2; he's a dead-thetan 2, see? Sticky needle, this, that, the other thing; high sensitivity down here, and so on. It doesn't read in these gradients, by the way, because the bank goes *click* and *thud* and shifts here and there. But an actual, totally slow read of this thing, of his recovery, will bring him down – this is the dead-thetan case – bring him down to 1.5. Now, if you keep him hanging at 1.5, of course you're not making any progress with the case.

This is not a suppression of the case because it's gone down. Actually, the way it reads is: Move it down now to 1.5. Now move it down to where it won't go any further. Now twist it all the way up around here to above 6. Now, you see, between that 1 and between that 6 on the bottom of the dial there should be a 7 through which this tone arm should move. This is a limitation of the meter.

You see, 1.5 is more responsibility than he had at 2. You got that? So to have more responsibility than he had at 1.5, it'd have to go down to 1, right? To take more responsibility for life than he had at 1, he's got to go over here to 6. And that's more responsibility than 1. And then there's more responsibility at 5, you see? And then there's more responsibility at 4, and then when he consistently again is reading here at his 3, for Clear, why he, when he is cleared he will just hang there. And it means he's totally responsible. Now, there's the cycle of responsibility on that action. And as you audit, that is the one factor that you can check a pc back against. Is he more responsible?

Well, the dead thetan is more responsible at 1.5 than he was at 2. See, but there is no 7 on your tone arm dial. The limitations of manufacture of the meter prevent this thing from just twisting all the way through and coming back again. Otherwise, actually, it's a full circle.

So don't think that the case that goes down to 1.5 is a special case. It is not. He's not a special case. He's more responsible than he just was. Only start worrying about this case if he sooner or later doesn't become 6.5. Got it? That means he's hung up. He's not making progress. But that's the way the case goes.

Now, on ACCs we've had this oddity of an auditor trying to read ... Ordinarily he would run one tone-arm-dial division, you see, between 1 and 6 – or he'd – he's really running two, see?

But here's the way he goes. He goes from 1, 6, 1, 6, 1, 6, 1, 6, 1, 6, 1 – got the idea? And actually the auditor is having to twist his tone arm dial. Now, there's a point there, because 7 exists, where the meter doesn't read. There's a point where the meter doesn't read. And at some time or another, very, very rarely, you – very rarely – while processing somebody ordi-
narily, you will find somebody who is sitting at 7. And you can't get him on the top of the meter, and you can't get him on the bottom of the meter.

And no meter ever manufactured will be able to compensate this because of the tone arm limitations of just having the tone arm on a pot. You got the idea? This is modern electronics. They'll have to change modern electronics before we can get a 7. You got it?

You probably could design one that would run this way, but don't be too amazed if you go for instance from 6 to 1, 6 to 1, or if all of a sudden the pc doesn't read anywhere. You start going this way. He doesn't read anywhere on the dial; he's not up, he's not down, sensitivity doesn't do anything. Well, two things could happen: Either your meter's out, at which time it is just necessary for you to reach over and take the cans and put yourself on the meter, see, and pull the tone arm down – "Oh, the meter is reading" – give them back to the pc. Ah, that tells you it all. Ha-ha! He's at 7. The pc is at 7. Just go on and process him on something you figure will work, or go on processing whatever you were processing that got him onto 7.

If you picked him up originally off the street and he was on 7 – very rare this is; this is extremely rare, but it could happen to you, what's your final answer? Well, you'll just have to run him on something that will improve the case, and he will read on the E-Meter. This is a bug in the construction of the meter. Okay?

All right. Now, change of characteristic means that the meter, on a certain question, has its needle shift into a different action than it was in. It resumes its old action when you no longer ask the question – when you ask the question, it takes on any different reaction. You got the idea? A change of characteristic – that's all that means. For instance, it was theta-bopping and you asked him about donuts and you started to get a fall. But you ask him about anything else and he theta-bops again. That's a change of characteristic.

Now reversewise, you were getting a fall, a fall, a fall, everything you say to the pc, you see? You say, "Well, did you eat breakfast this morning? Do you like Egyptian cotton? What color is a piece of tin?" You ask him anything and you get a fall. Well, that is the needle pattern of that pc. It's a fall, it's a fall, it's a fall, it's a fall, it's a fall. It'd be maybe a one-two division fall every time you say anything. Ordinarily you'd get this if your sensitivity was just a little high. One of the ways to do it is just back your sensitivity off a little bit. But nevertheless you can read through that. That is the pattern of the meter.

You usually read from a still needle. Try to read from a still needle. But the pattern of the meter for this pc is a fall – "Do you like Egyptian cotton?" "Have you seen a jeweler recently?" "Have you ever shot grapes?" And it's just a fall, it's a fall, it's a fall, it's a fall. The fall is always the same fall. And then you say, "Well, are you pleased with your marriage now?" – you get a theta bop. Ah-ha! Ah-ha! And you say, "Do you like the Union Jack?" and you get a fall and you get a fall. And you say, "Are you pleased with your marriage?" and you get a theta bop. That means that that question is charged. But which question is charged? It's the one that produces the change of pattern. You got the idea?

Now, more loosely, more loosely, you can say that any time the pc has a charged question within his level of reality, you get a change of pattern. You could say a fall is a change of pattern, a theta bop is a change of pattern, a rock slam is a change of pattern, don't you see? So basically you're trying to change the pattern of this meter.
Now let's get back to tension. This meter has to be set up higher and higher, and its reads are tighter and tighter, the more tension there is on a case, and your goal of processing is to take that tension off, and the meter, of course, registers this – you get a low sensitivity knob. This starts to come in toward Clear, and eventually tension isn't even registered on the needle.

Sort of falls out in this order: The tension, as the case gets better, will fall out of the sensitivity knob. Then the tension starts – you see, at 6.5 on the tone arm dial, that's not untense. Actually, you go ding like this and the fellow hits high C, you know?

All right, there it comes out of the tone arm dial, down, and he gets down toward Clear read. And it pumps down over the hours and hours of processing, you see, gradually pumps down closer and closer in, and eventually the tension totally disappears out of the needle. And the needle then is a free needle.

We have been careless in use of terms. A free needle means the needle is free. A null needle means it doesn't get a change of pattern or react on the question. But a free needle just floats. When you've seen a free needle – it'd become unmistakable. It just floats around. Actually it looks like your sensitivity knob – you can actually approximate a free needle by turning your sensitivity up maybe to about 16 on an average case, and then not let him breathe. And you'll get a float. And this needle just floats around. And of course, that's no tension, isn't it?

Now, when you've cleaned up everything in life that he could possibly have any tension on, which is called stabilizing a Clear, you just go over more goals and more Prehav Scale – just – and do all the steps of SOP Goals on and on and on. He starts blowing them by inspection, and it gets easier and easier for him to blow them, there's less and less tension on this needle, and eventually you can't get any reaction on the needle, and that's it. You've got a Clear. You got that?

So just – I've taken you now from total tension, which is dead-thetan reading at Clear, then you get a read on up the line – more and different positions of the tone arm, different characteristics of the needle – eventually up to... At no particular stage of the game does it read a certain combo, beyond saying, well, the fellow does not now have to have his sensitivity jacked up. All right, he used to have! So therefore he's getting better. The fellow is not now reading at 6 on the tone arm, he reads down around 3.5, 4. Well, he's getting better. Don't you see? And his needle doesn't get sticky and unstick and do jerky things, and so forth, and – he's getting better, don't you see? And eventually when the needle, the tone arm and the sensitivity knob no longer produce – no matter what you do with them – any reaction on the thetan that you're auditing...

Oh, of course, you can still – on a floating needle you can pinch the guy madly and so forth, and rough him up enough and go like this in front of his face and kick him around. And if he did get annoyed with you, which is not probable, but if you did, you could probably get another reaction on the thing. If you hit him with a truck – something.

But now we're getting up to Theta Clear. Now, this requires an entirely different meter. I'll talk to you in just a moment about the future of meters. This meter will always be nec-
ecessary just as it is, because it tells us everything we need to know in order to clear a person. Okay? We needn't know any more than this.

We could know all about its design, and how many pounds of weight the thing has. You could probably be flunked on an E-Meter examination. "What is the exact weight in grams of a..." We could get pedantic, you know "... of a Mark IV British meter? Oh, you don't know? Well, you don't know how to run an E-Meter?" You get the idea? We could go goofy like this.

As a matter of fact, they do in the army. The private trying to make a lance corporal: Why, they ask him how many pounds does whatever the current-issue rifle weigh and all of this kind of thing. And what is the exact muzzle velocity of a Stokes mortar and ah... He isn't supposed to know the exact muzzle velocity; he's supposed to be able to fire them accurately.

The next meter above this is not a meter you would care to use on a person up to clearing, because it's an oscilloscope meter. And for you to stand there with a green line dancing madly in front of your face during all of the auditing where this needle is, you wouldn't like it. You wouldn't like it.

It's interesting, and if a case was real sticky, you might take one of these O-Meters, or theta meters, and you might put a low-tone case on it and you might be able to get him unstuck on his flows because it registers flows, but you wouldn't like to audit him on it.

I've already discovered this. I've been researching, by the way, for this next level meter for several years, and I finally got it boxed into, I know exactly what we're looking for and exactly what we've got to have. Now, that's as far as it's gone. Well, I've got some people building one, as far as that goes. But for you to audit with a bzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzz going on here... Furthermore, they're about two feet deep, minimum, and they're about a foot and a half high, and about a foot and a half wide, and you'd have to have the janitor come up and move it in your auditing room, because they're heavy. Now, a big one (which it may eventually have to be) is so big that it took Peter and myself – and we were very happy when we set it down– to carry in the last experimental model into this office. It took the two of us, staggering. So it's not practical from that standpoint.

But it is practical from the point that if you're going to audit somebody up from Clear, you have to have something that reads in micro-microvolts. You have to have something which is so sensitive that... There's the body and there's the thetan. Now, if the thetan is still in connection with his body in any way, shape or form, it'll read on the meter. You see? So you'd be able to tell what he's thinking and what he can't confront – electrically, you see? And you'd be able to sort him out, even though he was off the top of this meter, with this new theta meter, you see? He'd think, "I hate cops," you know? He's Clear as far as Earth body is concerned and that sort of thing but he's still got bugs.

Because look, I'll point something out to you. He cannot... Well, he builds houses. That's kind of remarkable when you come to think about it. He builds houses. He builds them. You know, he puts planks together, and puts up windows, and... Why doesn't he say "House" – pshew! There's a house. So there must be something wrong with him. Obvious, isn't it?
This actually doesn't read any higher than about 20 on the Tone Scale. This goes up to about 20 on the Tone Scale. From 20 to 40 on the Tone Scale you need another piece of equipment. Why? Because this measures games conditions called physical universe, and you need something that shades the tiniest, tiniest things to read the next level up. But this will take you to Clear.

Well the funny part of it is that everything you need to know about this meter I have given you in this talk. Isn't anything else you need to know about this meter.

Assess on the needle, process on the tone arm, diagnose on the sensitivity knob. The thing represents tensions. The higher these things have to be set up, the more tension is in the pc, and as you run it, you are simply taking the tension out of the pc, and the needle and the tone arm and the sensitivity knob read more and more comfortably.

And eventually when they don't read at all, you've got a stable MEST Clear. When I say they don't read at all, it's just frankly that.

I have a piece of news for you – just – I might as well put onto this last few inches of tape here that's running, that you will be interested in. We have theoretically transcended MEST universe weapons. It may not mean much to you as a sudden statement. But as you go off the top of this meter – in other words, the meter is no longer active on the individual – it means his tolerance of motion, his tolerance of change, is so great that if you hit him with a bullet you wouldn't hurt him. You probably wouldn't even be able to hit him with a bullet. And the big boys walking up and down and mocking up space flights with their – from their arsenals of atom bombs… Here they are, with their nice, polished atom bombs that can wipe out the world, and so forth. Well, nobody developed a defense against the atom bomb, and for a number of years I actually worked on MEST defenses against an atom bomb and I know they could be developed, but it would cost billions.

And we all of a sudden have a defense against the atom bomb. A person who is super-cleared, probably up around the level of Theta Clear, is not affected by them. He could probably stand right in the middle of an atom bomb blast, but his tolerance of change would be so great…
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Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

Don't get the idea that what you're doing is experimental. It is not experimental. But I'll tell you that trying to find out what you do wrong with it and how to communicate how to do it right is a complex drill all of itself. And if there's anything that's being worked with, it is that. But that is always worked with. That always has to be worked with. How do you communicate this information so that people can do it without additives or alter-is?

I'll give you some simple rundown: I say, "Well, you look at the pc fixedly and sneeze and that fixes it all up, you see?" That's all dandy. And then what do I hear? "Well, do you sneeze in E-flat minor?" [laughter] "What is the violence and duration of the sneeze?" [laughter] "Is this done in an auditing session? Do you use Model Session form to put this sneeze in? Or is it a special form?" "Now, this, of course, isn't bounded by the Auditor's Code is it?" [laughter] And particularly, "This changes, of course, everything we have been doing before."

Those things are pretty inevitable. Now, I don't mean to be sarcastic. I'm just showing you what happens – I'm not being sarcastic because this is too true; it is too painfully true.
And it works like this: You, in trying to equate a relatively simple fundamental in Scientology at this time, are, of course, picking up a fundamental which sits right in the middle of anybody's case. And you tend to blow off a little bit of a confusion, you know, in trying to grab hold of it. And it isn't as if I were teaching you how to run a diesel engine. What little oddball ideas you had about diesel engines would blow off in a hurry. I could teach you how to run a diesel engine – very complicated – to even you girls, you see? Just bang. It'd be hardly anything to it. I'd show you: Well, there's this and there's that and there's the other thing. I'd have to read a book and find out how myself first. But that would be very easy. But that isn't what we're teaching. And the data that we're teaching goes straight into the middle of a reactive computation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, it is very strange and very peculiar that there could be such a thing as a perfect assessment, because there isn't any such thing as a perfect mind. Here's an artificial perfection
which you are trying to attain on a case. And it is highly artificial – extremely so. And it has to be done exactly right. And we're learning more and more how to do it exactly right by finding out the things you're doing wrong. That's a good way to learn though, isn't it? Don't make blunders, though, to teach other people. We don't need those; we got enough blunders at the present time. I have no insufficiency of havingness of blunders.

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is one assessment for one case and that is it. Now, what's odd is, in the first few days of running of a case – I'd say in the first few hours of run; anything up to thirty, forty hours of run – do you know that you can reassess at any time and get the same assessment? You know that you can always reassess. The auditing of an incorrect assessment does not wipe out the correct assessment. That's another lead-pipe fact. You can just wrap around that and hug it to your bosom because it's a very fortunate fact for you. It is extremely fortunate.
It means that you can make a mistake with a case and audit it for some little time – 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 180 hours, and still do a right assessment on the case afterwards. Isn't that fascination?

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

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

Now, let's take a good look at this. If you can always do a right assessment, even if a wrong one has been done, then the answer to vast difficulties which you're having with a case (or auditing a case for 30, 40, 50 hours without marked and distinct improvement) has as its answer – Those are the difficulties: auditing a case, and the case is just having one awful, horrible time, and you just practically can't hold the case in session, and the case is all ARC broke, and all of this stuff is going on. Answer? Reassess, perfectly.

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

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

Difficulties with SOP Goals would come about through your inability to apply things right technically. Let's say your TRs are all out. And you sit there, and you look at your E-Meter, and it's all sort of cross-eyed. And this thing keeps falling madly. The E-Meter keeps falling, and it keeps falling. And you say, "Peanuts?" You see? It's – you say, "Peanuts?" And there it goes. You say "Peanuts?" There it goes. And you say, "Well, peanuts are sure null." [laughter] You can make a technical blunder of this character, you see, and get all wound up in a ball if your confront is bad. Your pc may ARC break consistently and continually through just horribly bad technology, I mean a terribly poor administration of the TRs, Model Session and E-Metering. You're missing the living daylights out of the rudiments. You know, the man drops off the pin on a PT problem, and you say, "Well, that's flat." "Do you have a PT problem?" bang! "Well, that's flat. I'm glad we haven't got to handle a PT problem today." And
then your pc starts blowing out of session and getting snarly, and so forth. Oh, you can make those blunders.

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

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

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

Doing assessment saves time, because the accuracy of the assessment, if perfect, prevents an infinity of auditing hours without clearing. So you have – well look, you'd have a thousand hours of an assessment would at least be a finite number of hours of processing. And if an assessment took a thousand hours to do a perfect assessment – that's utterly ridiculous, but if it did, it would still be better than doing a sloppy, fast one. A thousand-hour assessment would probably clear the fellow in a hundred or two, you see? So you'd have the totality of time in auditing: a finite period of twelve hundred hours. But an imperfect assessment would give you an infinity of auditing hours, and that would be that. And this is the arithmetic that has to do with an assessment. He just never would get Clear. So there's no finite auditing period to an imperfect assessment. It will go on forever. And that is that! And it'll be very rough auditing too. And it'll just go on forever. Now, there is the advantage, then, of a perfect assessment.

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

But if you took 25 hours to assess somebody and then got the improper assessment, and it was way off the gun and off the beam, and then you say, "Well, I want to get on with auditing him so..." I would not be critical; I would again write the postmaster, and I would say "Please deliver one..." [laughter]
There's your situation. Do you see the order of magnitude and how this thing sets up? Do you see how this is? Hm? Well please, if you don't learn anything else, learn that, because it's your foremost datum – the foremost datum which you have, and which I know now is absolutely true. This is one of those weird, big truths. It's only true as far as auditing is concerned; it's only true as far as clearing is concerned; but, within that framework, it is one gargantuan truth!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I'll give you an idea. I had – used to have grave qualms about docking ships. I can handle practically anything in the way of ships, but I started getting them around docks or around shallow ground ... It's quite visible what this is: A ship isn't supposed to touch anything; it is not supposed to run aground, you know? It's not supposed to ram things. It's not supposed to go into cliffs, you see? So most of the time you're skippering a ship, you're preventing it from running into things. In other words, you're preventing a ship from communicating. That's about all it amounts to, you see?
And I thought, "Well, this is a very necessary thing, obviously." And I was thinking about ships and monkeying around with yachts, and so forth, and I was thinking about ships. I got a little – a few cognitions on this thing. It became very obvious to me, and I started to laugh at myself, you see, because "Well, you have to be very worried about ships in order to run ships." And I'd actually stopped running ships because I was worried about them – because I liked ships, because I wanted to run ships. You get the idea? [laughter]

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

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

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

And there's this whole parade of these things: Here's a game, the fellow is fairly happy with the game, and something invalidated it. So he now goes into this new valence and plays this new game in order to keep the old game, which now he can't have. And now he's got this new game and he's got all the beingness, doingness and havingness of this new game, but something invalidates that. So he takes over on the winning valence of a new game, and he goes into this new game and the beingness, doingness and havingness of this new game and then – so forth. And he's becoming unhappy in life by this time, you see? But that invalidates the old game. Now something comes along and invalidates this new game and now he's – for some reason or other, he isn't himself anymore. You see, he's just departed from it. His communication with the world has become very poor.

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

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

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

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

So you're restoring the power of choice of the pc over games. And as the pc gets out of these fixed games, he can now look around the environment and find out that he can not only play that game but that he can play other games. Now he's got more games. And if he's got more games, he'll stay Clear. And if he's got less games, that he really can play, he will go aberrated on you again. So the total stability of clearing works out to be "how much horizon you lift for the pc in these given zones of beingness, doingsness and havingsness." And if you lift them all so that he's no longer aberrated along these lines, you have a stable MEST Clear. And he'll stay that way.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, for your new goal: add goals, find all of the goals. In other words, it is quantitative. Find all of the goals. Every opportunity you get, find more goals. On terminals: every opportunity you get, find more terminals. Quantity, quantity, quantity. I don't care if you have
a list of 1295 goals and 15,000 terminals. I just couldn't care less. You won't achieve that. You'll probably cool off at the absolute top of about 350. That's probably the extreme.

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

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

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

Actually, the assessment has to be as perfect as it mechanically works out to be. It's quite mysterious that it works out so wonderfully and so mechanically to be just that. It'll turn out to be "one goal that won't go flat unless you audit it." And, of course, if you've got this one goal and then you go over the list again and *it* disappears, you didn't have all the goals. That's all that means. And if you had your list of terminals, and you finally had one terminal, and there it was, and that's that one terminal, and you've really got it all done, and you say, "Well" – just as an afterthought – "Well, how do you feel about janitors?" and it goes null – what did that mean? It means you didn't have all the terminals, that's all. You've got to now make a new, additional terminals list and find the terminal. You have – all you – all you've got are null. Well, then you haven't got the right one, that's all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And you say, "Cats would shoot sparrows?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, if you get anything like three falls, the same or increasing, while reading the thing the first three times – the goal or the terminal – if you get three falls, or if it looks like it's going to go on falling, or if it looks like it is going to increase its fall, leave it in and go on to the next read. Do not try to flatten it. Got it?
But if in the first three reads of the goal or on a terminals list – this does not apply to the Prehav Scale – I want to get that note in there often – assessing on the Prehav Scale is done at one announcement of the level only. You don't announce a level twice; you just announce it once and take what it said.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, what happens if you get down to the end on the sixteenth read of the list, and there were only... See, when you go over it the next time, you only read those goals that have a slant in front of them which said they still read. You use the same principles in going over this. He had 120, they have now boiled down to 40, on maybe three reads. He's got 40 left. Go over these 40, and they all go null, null, null, null. "Oh, there's one. Okay, that one stayed." Null, null, stayed, stayed, stayed. Oh, they say, "That's fine. That's dandy." And you get down to the end of this thing, you ask him, "Do you have any more goals," see, "that you haven't mentioned before?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why? Because there's always the thing you can do when all else fails, and that's usually the arts. Now, isn't that a hell of a thing? That's an awful commentary on the arts, but I don't intend it to be a commentary on the arts. The Renaissance in Italy takes place after it's beaten by France. Nobody can now make machinery or masses or really put up this or get a society on the road but they could paint pictures. Got the idea? So they're going to start to overwhelm with aesthetic masses. Actual masses didn't work so they're going to go into aesthetic masses. And those are closer to the thought band.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Audience: Yes. Hmm.*

I think Khruschev himself could be put into session with this one. [laughter]

Okay?

*Audience: Yeah.*

Thank you.
E-METER

A lecture given on
19 May 1961

Thank you.

Well now, we've gotten ourselves a few cases moving along, and every time I see you, why, you're less plowed in. This is "Operation Reverse the Furrowing."

Okay, let's see, what is this? This is the 19th of May 1961. This is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, once upon a time there was a knucklehead – once upon a time. And he kept doing things to people – kept doing things to people. And then a few trillion years later, he said they'd all been done to him. I'll give you an example of this – in a moment. But right now I want to talk to you something about E-Meters and assessments. This is very, very important. Then I'll tell you more about this knucklehead.

The E-Meter is a very peculiar instrument. It is absolutely accurate. But when somebody is so knuckleheaded as not to ask the right questions, of course, it apparently gives wrong answers. An E-Meter is as accurate as the auditor asks the right questions. It itself is totally accurate. But you have to find out what it is talking about. And it is not necessarily talking about what you are talking about as the auditor. But it is talking about something, and the probability is that it is very close to what you're talking about, when it's talking sporadically, but not quite it.

And when you ask the right question, the E-Meter then reads, hard and consistently. But the near-right question reads inconsistently. So when you get inconsistent reads, your question is not quite right. That is a general rule – not quite right. But when you ask the right question, the E-Meter will then tell you it's the right question by reading consistently.

You can ask for a withhold – something on this order: You can say, "Well, are you withholding anything about your house?" And the E-Meter will go flick.

And now this fellow, who comes down the track all these trillennia – having burned houses, massacred the inhabitants of houses, having chewed up the landscape of houses in general, in many wars, in many lives – knows very well that it's a house. And he becomes completely fixated on the idea that he must ask the question about the house, the house, the house. And the E-Meter goes flick-flew, flick-flew, no read, read, no read.

"All right, what about this house are you withholding?" And the E-Meter goes flick, and then no flick, and then it theta bops, and then it goes no answer at all, and then it goes totally null. And this fellow who knows very well that it is about a house – he says, "Is it a
big house or a little house?" And the E-Meter goes flick, and it goes flew and it goes null, and it goes this and that. Just nothing seems to happen, that's all. Nothing seems to happen.

And then the D of P or somebody (whose specialty was burning down barns!) [laughter] gets the pc in and says, "Well, now you seem to have a withhold here, and we don't seem to find out what it is. Is it about barns?" And there's a flick and a flew, and a null. And the D of P says, "You see now, you knuckleheaded auditor? You -- you -- you -- you missed it. It's about barns." [laughter] And there it goes. But the thing doesn't clear.

And the pc says, "No, I've never done anything to barns."

"Oh, it's -- must be barns, must be barns. It's just -- come on, confess. What is it? Barns. Barns. It must be barns. Has to be barns. Everybody knows what you do with barns: You burn them down when they're full of stock! Always produces a hell of an ARC break in the vicinity when you do that sort of thing. Leave the house alone but burn the stock up. Ugh-hu! That's best."

And nothing is going to happen either way because they haven't learned this rule: The E-Meter reacts and clears on the exact right question. That's what it reacts and clears on. But it will give you an indicator. It is nice enough to tell you "you're getting warm." But when you don't get a consistent read on an E-Meter, you are just warm; you're not red hot. When you're right on it, it will read consistently and it will clear at once that the pc comes up with what it is. That is, on a Security Check.

And if it is the chain on which the pc is totally plowed in on from one end of the track to the other, it will just go on reading and reading and reading until it's audited. The rule is, you have to audit the things that don't clear on a question. That is the rule -- a general rule -- where it comes to auditing, or where it comes to clearing rudiments.

You say to the pc, "Something or other, something or other," and you get a fall on the rudiments. And you say, "Well, do you have a withhold? Is this what that's falling on? You withholding anything?"

And the pc says, "No." The E-Meter goes clink-clank. It'll go falling on just about what it's falling on -- on just exactly what it's falling on.

And you start probing for this thing and all of a sudden you say, "Well, is it something about me?" Your fall becomes steadier and more consistent.

And then the pc says, "Well, yes, last night I told somebody you were a bad auditor." The fall disappears.

But the knucklehead then audits it. Having cleared the meter, he now goes into "What have you done? What have you withheld?" You got the meter clear on rudiments; why are you trying to do anything else?

The rule about rudiments is simply this: Rudiments are there not to run the case, but they are there solely and only to set up the pc so that he can be audited and will stay in-session -- definition of which is "willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case." And that is what you're trying to get him to do, and if the rudiments are too flagrantly out, it won't happen.
But setting the meter on a third-of-a-dial drop and going over the rudiments – if you do not get a wild or significant fall, you just leave them alone. You know, with a third-of-a-dial drop you can't see some of the meter reactions, so you just blind yourself to that much meter reaction. That is, that meter reaction which you cannot see at a third-of-a-dial drop will not get the pc out of session. Have you got that? It will not take the pc out of session.

So advancing the sensitivity knob to a point where you get a sixteen-dial drop on a can squeeze, and then clearing the rudiments of every flick on that enormously expanded scale: You're just wasting auditing, because clearing them all up, you're running the case with rudiments.

But if you clear rudiments on a third-of-a-dial drop – and mind you, do that carefully. When you set the meter with a third-of-a-dial drop, why, you don't see any fall, any theta bop or anything. Mind you, there'll be falls and theta bops – are there but they're obscured by the fact that you're reading from the still needle. You follow me?

You told the guy to squeeze the cans. Cans squeezed – you got a third-of-a-dial drop. You just leave the sensitivity knob right there. Ask for the rudiments; it doesn't move. Now, a little flick while you got it set at a third-of-a-dial drop, you'd investigate. If it did move it, you would investigate it. But usually a little flick like this just blows up.

I mean, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes, I have a present time problem. I'm worried about going out and putting in a pound note into the parking meter." (Or whatever the police are demanding these days.)

"Well, do you have to do that now?"

"Well, no. I don't have to do it for half an hour."

"Well, would it be all right if at a half an hour, I remember it and send you down there?"

"Yes, that'll be fine." Drop disappears.

"Do you have a withhold?"

"Yeah – no, no, no, no-o-o-o, no, no." You get a fall, get a flick, get a theta bop. Ah, you better find out what it is. But that's on the sensitivity knob set at a third-of-a-dial drop.

Now, if your sensitivity knob was set at 16 and you got the equivalent of – you know, this can squeeze drives the needle across and it bounces off the pin, you know? Well, that's actually probably set for about five or ten dials of drop on one can squeeze, see? Now you ask him "Do you have a withhold?" – why, hell, you can even read his heart beating! See?

It'll register this closely: "Are you withholding anything?" And 42 trillion years ago he shot down a pilot in flames and was very careful not to let his own body drop or get burned up. So he was withholding his own body, you see? So, "Are you withholding anything?" Yes, you'd get a reaction on the needle.

But, look, that reaction is his case, and it is not adequate to stop a pc from going into session. You got it? The purpose of the rudiments – 100 percent, the purpose of the rudiments...
are only these: to set up the case so that it can be audited. The purpose of the rudiment is not this: to run the case. That's not the purpose of the rudiment.

There are numberless things I could tell you about rudiments. But ordinarily, in ordinary auditing, it totally suffices to make sure you get all of the falling or observable ARC breaks, problems, withholds off – and objections to the room. You see, that's totally adequate. They fall, get them off – with the sensitivity now set for a third of a dial.

Oh well, how about the E-Meter that can't be retreated on its sensitivity? I'm afraid you've got a rebuild coming. There isn't anything you can do to the meter apparently (I was experimenting with it last night) but put a new sensitivity rheostat in it. That can be done rather cheaply. HCO will do it for you.

But after a person gets about halfway Clear, a can squeeze on old meters at zero – old British meters is what it mainly is – when the sensitivity knob is set way down, all – as low as it can be set, you get a dial drop. And you're running somebody like that? Now what are you going to do? Now what are you going to do? This rule no longer is observable. Well, what you're going to do is get a new rheostat put in the E-Meter that can be turned down to a third-of-a-dial drop, okay? Simple, huh?

And meanwhile, before you do that, if it falls on a rudiment, sigh and clean it up. Because you're not going to be sure whether it needs cleaning up or not. So you have to use judgment as to whether or not it needs much cleaning up.

In the first place, people who fall well on a can squeeze – they aren't bothered as much as some other people by ARC breaks, unless they're being audited by some auditor on whom they have a lot of charge. Then they'll ARC break.

But the usual cotton-picking ARC breaks that don't amount to anything – ah, they don't really, terribly disturb them. The better off a case gets the less it's disturbed by the environment. Definition of a Clear is he can handle the environment and isn't disturbed by it. So of course, as you start progressing toward Clear, the can squeeze gives you a greater and greater fall for the test. And the nearer a person gets to Clear, why, the more drop you will see on a can squeeze with the sensitivity knob set as it used to be.

Originally, the fellow comes in and you turn the sensitivity knob up to 16, you put the cans in his hands and he gives a can squeeze, and it falls a thirty-second of a dial. Well, this fellow is going to endure; he's obviously built out of solid oak.

The same setting, if you care to observe a meter, running SOP Goals – supposing you did a long and thorough assessment. You wouldn't do a thorough assessment on this guy. You wouldn't do an assessment at all. You would do a Joburg Security Check and then you would give him a general run on the Prehav Scale, and you'd clear up some levels on the Prehav Scale – just in general, you see? And then when you got it so it was looking much better, and the tone arm was reading much better, and you knew you weren't reading a dead thetan, and you did get a little bit of a drop on the can squeeze, and so forth; you could go ahead and assess him.
So you go ahead and you complete your assessment, and you'll notice suddenly that it's sitting at a fairly low sensitivity setting and the third-of-a-dial drop occurs very easily. The case is much looser. The needle is much looser. You follow this?

*Female voice:* Yes.

All right.

That's the way you handle rudiments and handle an E-Meter. But Mr. E-Meter will tell you that you are close, if it's answering sporadically. But if you're answering dead on you'll have this interesting experience: You are running a Joburg Security Check, and you ask the level – you ask the precise level – "Have you ever raped anyone?" And the needle falls in response to that question – that Joburg Security question falls – something on the order of about quarter of a dial, and the pc says, "No," and it falls a quarter of a dial. And you say to him, "Well, have you ever really raped anyone?" and it falls a quarter of a dial.

Now listen, you can go down the list of all the things he might possibly have raped, or done sexually that might be considered rape or anything of the sort, and if it's not exactly on, the exact same fall will continue.

On a withhold you've got a reversal of the rule. The E-Meter falls in response to the question. In this case, it continues to fall if the question isn't asked.

So there are two phenomena in which you're involved here: One is you have to ask the right question to get the fall – the exact, right question to produce the consistent fall – and the other one is to get rid of the fall, you understand. And that requires communication from the pc. And in failure to communicate, it won't go away.

Don't think your meter is busted because you were asking this question and hours later he just never seemed to get through a Joburg Security Check. He will always get the same fall. Always, always, always, forever, practically till the end of the world, would he get the same question, "Have you ever raped anyone?" You can ask him, "Is it this lifetime?" and you get the fall. "Did you rape somebody in this lifetime?" You get the fall. "Did you rape somebody in your family?" You get the fall. You understand? He has raped somebody. That is it. You have asked the right question.

Now, having asked the right question, you see, is one part of this comment. The only way you'll get rid of the fall is for the thing to be answered.

So first, there's the right question that produces the fall, and the second phase of it is the answer that eradicates the fall. And it must be – surprise, surprise – the exact answer.

The precision instrument called the E-Meter depends, then, upon the exact question to get the response and the exact answer to clear it. Now do you follow me?

Now, the individual who continues to fall on a certain terminal is so involved in electrical masses – exchanges, energies, and so forth – in the mind, that that terminal has to be audited. Only then do you get rid of it. So it is not, in that case, just the one right answer; it's enough thousand right answers to clear it.

Therefore, when the preclear does not give you the exact answer to the auditing command every time, you will continue to get it to read and auditing will continue to infinity.
You must get an answer for every auditing question, and it must be the answer to the question you asked. Otherwise, it continues to read on the meter. Well, you're not fighting the meter. The meter only indicates what's still banging in the fellow's mind.

In other words, a preclear could be audited for ten thousand hours without ever answering the auditor's question, and still be reading the same way on an E-Meter. How do you like that? You got that?

So that a case that hangs fire, falls into just these categories: A present time problem is there consistently and forever. This is what you call a hidden standard sort of a thing. The guy's got a long duration present time problem, and he knows when he will get better: It's when his hair stops standing up when he sees a horse. And he waits for this endlessly to start happening. He tests out his auditing results. He has an intensive, and he goes and he finds a horse. And he very carefully puts his hand back here, and he looks at the horse. [laughter] And if his hair doesn't stand up, he says, "I got some progress," and if his hair does stand up, he says, "Well, that auditor's a bum." [laughter]

You think I'm joking, but that is true of every case that walks the street that is having a rough time – it's by a hidden standard. So part of your Goals Assessment must always get out these hidden standards into view.

Hidden standard is our technical term. The pc will call them "problems of long duration" if they're fairly sane, but they also respond to things of "difficulties in life." A word I commend to you as very useful – "Are you having any difficulties in life?" "Now, what difficulty would have to change for you to know that the auditing was working?" Or more broadly, "What difficulty would you no longer have if Scientology worked on you?" "What difficulty would have to happen in order for you to know that auditing was working?" You got that? This is the hidden standard.

I'll show you what happens when you don't address the hidden standard. The individual very nicely goes through a whole auditing session, gets along just dandy through the auditing session, gets along splendidly, seems to be making progress; and at the end of session said, "I didn't make any part of my goals."

Well, maybe the goal that he gave you at the beginning of session was just to sit there throughout the session. And you look at this in utter amazement. He did sit there throughout the session. He must have made his goal for the session, but he tells you he didn't make any part of his goals. Well, you're an utter knucklehead if you don't consult your E-Meter and say, "Do you have any particular gains that you will have to make or establish in order to know that auditing is working? And if so, what would they be?"

"Oh!", the fellow would say, "Oh, well, yeah, if you ask me that. Yes, as a matter of fact. Yes, yes I do have. You see, every time I look at a horse my hair stands up on end, and I feel right now, actually, that if I did look at a horse, my hair would still be standing up on end when I looked at the horse."

He's got every single auditing command you have given him circuited this way. He audits "women" so that he will correct his relationship with horses. He puts a via on every command answer.
One man we found had actually— for something on the order of five or six hundred hours, at least, of auditing he addressed every auditing command through this electronic engram, in the firm and utter and complete belief that it would change him from being a man to a woman. And what was the answer to this question: "What would have to happen in order for auditing to work?" This fellow's answer was "I would have to become a woman."

Now, that's what you're going up against when you ask the pc, "Are you making any progress?" And don't let me catch any of you going out of here and auditing anybody after this, up against a bunch of hidden standards that are utterly unknown to you. Just don't let that happen because that is silly! It means that the pc violates this E-Meter thing. He is not giving an answer to the auditing command. He is taking the auditing command, fitting it to something else and then answering his impressions.

Of course, your needle doesn't clear. Not only does your needle— doesn't clear, your tone arm doesn't move. The case does not progress. The dead thetan reading at 2 never reads any place else than 2. Your E-Meter characteristics don't change. Your needle does not get looser. Your sensitivity knob does not have to be set lower.

If your E-Meter isn't shifting during the course of auditing, the first thing to suspect is that you yourself have got the wrong curve on this. See? There's something wrong; you've goofed somehow. You did a Prehav Assessment, said "Well, the fellow is obviously resisting everything so the obvious level is 'resist,' " and you just went on by— knew it was barns—and you went right on by and ran "resist" and the tone arm didn't change, and nothing changed and— wrong level. Bum assessment. You get the idea? Bum assessment will give you that. You aren't asking the right questions. Or the individual has one of these hidden standards of long duration, and so forth, and he addresses everything around to it.

A pc will not improve if he has a present time problem of long or short duration which is absorbing all of his attention. He will not improve in auditing. So you might as well take care of it and get it out of the way right now. He will not improve if he has withholds. Poetically, God 'elp him, he will not, not, not, not, not, not, exclamation point, improve if he has overts on his auditor he is not disclosing, if he has overts on Scientology he's not disclosing, if he has overts on the principals of Scientology.

For some reason— not because we dreamed it up, because it happens to be true. I scouted this out the first time, many, many years ago, about 1954. Most of the returns were in for the people who had attacked Dianetics. There were about twenty-one of them in the United States who had— well, a lot of them had actually taken money to do us in and were still with us. With the exception of seventeen who were either in jail or dead. And as they made up a primary death list for that particular time, and a primary difficulty list, I looked for some common denominator amongst them to find out what this was all about. And it was only one common denominator: Some of them had literally had, in the period of four years, hundreds and hundreds of hours of auditing. In the case of Joe Winter, over a thousand hours I'm sure— maybe even two thousand hours of auditing. And the common denominator of all those people is they'd never made a single case gain in all their auditing.

That was the first time this one showed up. It's a grim and ghastly thing. It's a built-in, automatic protective mechanism in Dianetics and Scientology. The fellow who accepts money
or goes out of his way to injure auditors, organizations, the subject, principals in it, has just
plain condemned himself to eternity. That's all. He's just condemned himself to an eternity of
there he is, going on down. Honest, sometimes it makes me gasp because I've gotten so much
data on this by this time, at the actual adventurousness of how some of these characters will
swap a couple of quick sixpences for the next two hundred trillion. Doesn't look to me like a
good bargain. [laughter]

Now, oddly enough – strangely enough, a primary fault I have is honesty. I will tell
you what I know, or what I think I know, when I know it. And if I find out it isn't true, I will
tell you it isn't true. And if it happens to be discreditable along the line, I'm afraid I will tell
you.

Along with that goes the necessity – I would say better "has gone the necessity" – to
keep enough hope going to get the job rounded up. That has been part of the responsibility.
To have not done so would have been an overt act.

Now, I frankly tell you, I would not tell you that there was a self-protective mecha-
nism in Dianetics and Scientology out of an anxiety to protect Scientologists, organizations
and the principles of Scientology and the people at the top of it. I just wouldn't tell you that,
that's all. In the first place, I don't believe I'm so weak that I would need such a mechanism to
protect it or to protect you, you see? And for this other thing to be built up as an inside, built-
up, completely arranged, booby-trapped mechanism is always filling me with a little surprise.
I think if you listen to a lot of tapes, you'll hear me being surprised about this in other lec-
tures. It's the darnedest thing I ever saw. It's just horrible. It's utterly horrible.

Gracey Zilch goes out and does in an auditor – busts up his marriage and spoils his re-
pute – and for the next thousand hours of audit ing, Gracey Zilch is right where she is or
worse. And nobody seems to be able to do a single thing for Gracey Zilch. Isn't that remark-
able? It is just fantastic.

Now, religious organizations have tried desperately to protect themselves with things
like blasphemy, and protect themselves with other you-must-nots and thou-shalt-nots. You
know, everybody talks about the Ten Commandments. Have you ever counted them? In an
actual, original Old Testament there aren't ten commandments – columns of them: Thou shalt
not eat pork that has been uncleanly raised, or something of the sort. Thou shalt sell it to a
traveler instead. [laughter]

What it amounts to is you can't look for help from a quarter on which you have tre-
medous overts. Even though the help were given you, no matter how gratuitously, it would-
't be accepted by you because it's always looked on as a betrayal. Why is it looked on as a
betrayal? Because one has betrayed that help. So of course, when one is audited under these
conditions, he has this remarkable frame of mind: that everything anybody is saying or doing
to him is calculated to betray and destroy him. So the more he is treated the worse he gets.
Now, that happens to be our little, built-in self-protective mechanism.

Now, because we are the only science of mind that has ever come up the line and sat
back on its haunches and proved itself across the board, we can also undo that. If we want to
take enough trouble we can also save Gracey Zilch.
One auditor sits on her head and the other straps the cans to her feet and a third, as she's being held down, locates what she has been doing on an E-Meter, you see – something like a Joburg or something like this, you see – and actually gets the thing taped out and then finally says, "Well, Gracey, we've got the goods on you. And now why don't you go off someplace and realize that if you don't do something decent about this, you're sunk." And I don't care it might take two hours, two years or two lifetimes; sooner or later she's going to come in and tell all. Fascinating, huh?

We can undo it. So, in a little, tiny, microscopic way, not accepting a half a million dollars from the Communist Party of America to do in a Central Organization; that of course killed a man. I bet you right now he's tagging around in a schoolroom someplace or another, wondering what is wrong with him and why he feels so spiny. Fellow by the name of Don Purcell. He died. He did this, and for three years he just went on a toboggan and died. One of the reasons was is nobody was interested enough to even try to do anything for him. And the other thing was he had made it impossible to arrive at that data earlier by causing such a tremendous disturbance that he slowed up research.

I felt like telling him once or twice, "Look, maybe someday your wife is going to get sick or your kids are going to get sick or something is going to go really wrong in your existence and you're going to need us like mad, you see? And here you are, doing nothing but getting us so upset and disturbed that we actually can't do very much in the way of research, and you're slowing us down. Maybe someday we will know something that you really need to know desperately."

And sure enough, it happened to work out. Of course, there is this – there is this: I would say that it wasn't totally, probably, the overt-withhold mechanism, I think Suzie's postulates had something to do with it. [laughter] Because if she ever wanted to see a man dead, it was that man.

Anyway, let's get over to – let's get over to some more about this E-Meter now. Do you see that if this on a much more dramatic basis can exist, your failure to find out your auditor has – pardon me, your pc has been nattering about his auditor between sessions – your failure to find this out while running rudiments – is to throw away a session. Do you see that? Because just as it isn't very terribly important, so it isn't very hard to pick up, but it is important enough to knock a whole session out or maybe a whole intensive out.

So when they've got withholds in life in general which separates them from the human race and all livingness, or in particular when they have withholds on the auditor, auditors, Central Organizations, people in the Central Organizations, you see, there goes the case, there goes the intensive, there goes the session. You want to do something for this guy; this guy will give you a failure. Why? Not because of anything that you did to him particularly, but because he just goes around nattering about it.

When people are not Clear, if they know this perfectly, they actually go around sort of holding themselves in a frozen "don't think anything bad," "don't think any bad thoughts," you know? [laughter] And then when they get a little bit better they relax, and they think real vicious thoughts. [laughter] And then they give them up as withholds; that's a sort of a revenge in itself. And then later on, if they happen to have done something that they found out the
auditor – you know, and realized suddenly that the auditor wouldn't like it or something like
this, why, you ask him for it and they give it to you.

So overts are more difficult to clean up – that is, withholds; overts which are with-
hold – are more difficult to clean up the worse off a case is. It's proportional. They go down
into not realizing what an overt is and they will go out and do some of the wildest things. The
psycho band will go out and do some of the most incredible things and not consider them
overts at all. They won't fall on a meter.

So here's a modification on your third-of-a-dial drop. You set it for a third-of-a-dial
drop and run the rudiments but your third-of-a-dial drop only goes for those rudiments and the
assessment, which don't consist of getting off withholds. So when you get that withhold, reach
over here, crank up your sensitivity, ask for the withhold and strip it good, you see?

But if it is too active on withholds and it's going bang, bang, bang, bang and you don't
clear it right away by asking what it is: Joburg Security Check. You don't run anything further
than the rudiments and that. In other words, run the rudiments and then enter into Joburg Se-
curity Check.

By the way, a Joburg Security Check is done in Model Session form. It's not done out-
side of Model Session form; nothing is these days. There isn't anything done outside of Model
Session these days – nothing. So your rule about the sensitivity knob is that the only excep-
tion to a third-of-a-dial drop – and I tell you this very advisedly – the only exception in run-
ning SOP Goals and its preparatory steps to the third-of-a-dial-drop setting is when you are
after withholds. And of course, that includes at once the Joburg Security Check and it in-
cludes the withholds in the rudiments. You got it? Hm? That makes it very easy, doesn't it?
Magnify your read when you're after withholds and it's going bang, bang, bang, bang and you don't
clear it right away by asking what it is: Joburg Security Check. You don't run anything further
than the rudiments and that. In other words, run the rudiments and then enter into Joburg Se-
curity Check.

Now, in assessing for goals, Assessment by Elimination, you of course, then, set the
meter for a third-of-a-dial drop. Why is this? If it is set for more than a third-of-a-dial drop
you are auditing the case, not assessing him. You see that? It'd be erasing goals by repeater technique. You see that? It's not a very good process. Isn't necessarily harmless. As a matter of fact it'll benefit a case, but
it's very lengthy and it can go on for a very long time.
Now, what you're trying to do in Assessment by Elimination is get them so they don't read with the meter set for a third-of-a-dial fall. Once more, if your meter can't be retarded far enough on the sensitivity knob, why, you'll just have to get your meter fixed so it will. Because an Assessment by Elimination is not a process by which you seek to reduce the goal to no electronic reaction in the mind. It is only this: It seeks to null the goal so that it only does not act on an E-Meter which is set for a third-of-a-dial drop. You got it? And it permits you then to get the goal which will fall and fall and continue to fall and go on and fall, that has to be addressed by auditing. The only thing you're trying to do is that.

Now, we have proved out this fact: That if you erase all of a person's goals, the person still has a goal which falls – still one goal that falls – if it's erased! You see, that's a valuable datum. Let's not lose it. If you erased by repeater technique every goal the person came up with the person would still have one goal. That's interesting, isn't it?

All right, you don't have to erase them all to have just one goal. You have to null them on a meter set with a third-of-a-dial drop and if you do you will still have the goal – the one goal. You understand? See, it's different. It isn't actually erasing them. It is actually erasing them as far as the meter is concerned. You see, you just take the edge off so they don't fall. Well, that's it. And it gives you a fast assessment – rapid assessment. This is mainly in the interest of speed. That's all it's in the interest of.

I imagine if this were 1325 when people had a great deal more time, or something like this, or on some planets like Jupiter, we'd probably be trying to find out how could assessment take more time? [laughter]

If the psycho-analysts were doing this, of course, at sixty pounds the hour, or something like that, they'd try to figure out how to stretch the assessment.

Well, the way you stretch the assessment is very simple. All you have to do is turn up your sensitivity knob to about 16, and every time the person comes up with a goal or every time you ask for any more goals, you of course get a read, see? You go over the goal, and with the thing set up very high, why, you say, "All right, you wanted a set of paper dolls," and the thing falls quite well.

But if you turn the sensitivity knob down for a third-of-a-dial drop, you're reading from a still needle. And the impact in the mind on the subject of acquiring paper dolls is inadequate to move that from a still needle. So for your assessment purposes it is null. You got it?

So you can go over – in that wise, you can go over literally dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens of goals. Now, part of the – I mean, in one session. You get lots of them. And you get down to the end, and because your sensitivity set is low, you say, "Do you have any more goals?" Well obviously, for God's sakes, if the person has any more goals, realize that it's a limited question. It's limited in its application. It's not a true question. "Do you have any more goals." Well now, look! This person has been around for the trillennia. Every life they had several hundred goals. Well, all right. What are you going to do? Multiply five hundred times two hundred trillion and what is that? That's your goals list. All you're after is a no-fall at the end of the list with the sensitivity knob set for a third-of-a-dial drop. That's the only thing you're after.
You can go over the various kinds of goals. You say, "Got any childhood goals? Are there any more childhood goals? Are there any more withheld goals? Secret goals? Are there any more antisocial goals? Have you thought of anything that would have to happen for you to know that Scientology worked? Are there any difficulties you haven't mentioned to me?" And look, by the time you got all of those that I just gave you, practically in order, listed, and you get down to the end of the list and you ask all those categories again and you get no fall to your naked eye – you see no twitch.

And don't tell me that if the needle rises you go on because that's getting to be a very sore point. Keeps coming in over the lines and so forth, "The needle was rising so I had to continue to run the rudiments." And somebody just today spotted that. It's because it's in the TRs. The E-Meter TR has in it "rise" as a reaction. "How many reactions there are to a needle?" and rise is one of them. And then you say, "If you run the rudiments and you get a needle reaction, you must flatten the rudiments," and the auditor applies these two things just bing, bing. When we say a reaction for the rudiments or a reaction for an assessment, we mean a rock slam, a theta bop or a fall. In order of importance it is a rock slam, a fall or a theta bop. A theta bop is the least important, a fall is the most ordinary and if you're getting rock slams, watch out because the whole bank is grouped.

Remember the old Dianetic grouper? Well, the old Dianetic grouper, if we'd had people on E-Meters in those days, would always have registered as rock slam. It's just a grouper in time and a grouper in place and a grouper in mass and a grouper in this and that, and so you get a rock slam.

In passing, just while I'm thinking about it, I better tell you something about running a rock slam.

If you're assessing and getting rock slams on the Prehav Scale for a terminal – let's say the goal rock slammed ... You know what a rock slam is, now: it's an irregular, wobbly, large or small shiver and shake across the thing. A theta bop is a very regular one, of any width. But a rock slam is a shiver and shake and it dances around and it's very jerky and it's quite unmistakable. Once you've seen a rock slam – they are – they're quite weird when you see these things turn on. You say, "What in the name of God is that?"

These little, tiny needle shivers that you see are probably microscopic rock slams. I don't really think they are a different read.

There's a point of adjudication here: Do you just run the rock slams off? Do you assess it as long as you don't have a rock slam? And run it as long as you don't have a rock slam? Assess it for the rock slam? Run it until you don't have the rock slam? You could do that, you know? This is not a hard and fast point because the rock slam is going to turn into a fall; it's going to turn into a theta bop; it's probably going to go null. The liabilities of doing that is you've got a rock slam left someplace else on your Prehav Scale.

There's a matter of adjudication; we'll have more data on this someday – in the very near future. But I would say, knowing the nature of a rock slam, that if you just followed rock slam and ran the rock slam off so that you didn't get a rock slam in twenty minutes, or something like that, the case might make better progress. But we'll find out more about that. That's not a hard and fast rule at this time.
It's just this: When you're running a rock slam, remember you're running, probably, a very short duration. If you could hold a rock slam with your tone arm so that the needle continued to sit solidly at set, what would the tone arm be doing? Yeah, it'd be quite a wild tone arm, wouldn't it? Huh? Well, that would be the one thing you can't read on a tone arm. You have to read it over on the needle because – just because you can't do that with a tone arm.

You see, theoretically, when I say process by the tone arm, I mean keeping the needle somewhere in the vicinity of set, and that gives you your tone arm motion. Well, a rock slam, you can't keep the needle in the vicinity of set, you see? The tone arm would be slamming.

Well, certainly you're going to run a tone-arm slam. You can't set a meter for a tone-arm slam. So that's what you'd run flat. You got the idea? You could run the tone-arm slam flat, and if you assessed again you'd find the rock slam has now gone elsewhere. It's a matter of adjudication, it's a matter to be proved out, it's a matter to be settled, but that is a point. And I'd better tell you what points really don't exist in clear-cut silhouette relief.

Now, what do we get into here when we ask the wrong question on an E-Meter? We're asking the fellow for goals and it's the wrong goal. Well, therefore, it's the wrong question and you get a sporadic read, and the goal seems to peel off and disappear. A meter, actually, will react only as long as things are bunched up. And as you're assessing for goals, when you first grab ahold of the pc, the goals are all in one terrific, mauled-up ball, you see? And so any goal is doing a dance.

But, as you repeat these goals, with the thing set for a third-of-a-dial fall, the goal peels off the main mess. It comes free and becomes itself.

And as you go over a goals list over and over – and later, same way with terminals; a terminals list over and over – you're going to find this is a persistent and continuing manifestation: That the wrong questions peel off and the right question remains. So that is true of an E-Meter.

If you always knew the right question to ask, you would always get the same fall. But, at the same time, the assessment has therapeutic value. Something for you to remember.

If you just assess somebody – maybe he's in lousy condition and really isn't ready for assessment and so forth – if you just assess him and you do a good job of assessment on him, you're going to get an improved case and he's going to feel better about things.

An assessment cannot, then, be classified as something which must be done to set up an intensive. Similarly, a Joburg Security Check, if run well by the auditor, with a nice, gunned-up sensitivity knob, is terrifically therapeutic – terrific – and once more could not be considered something by which you set up a case to audit it. These things all fall within the perimeter of auditing because they are therapeutic, they are beneficial. They advance cases.

Let me tell you that just this one thing of a Joburg Security Check has advanced cases that have never before moved. Why did they never before move? They were sitting there holding on to their cotton-picking withholds! And their withholds were so heavy that they couldn't communicate to the auditor, so they were never in-session, so auditing never worked.
So you can't call a Joburg Security Check, then, something that occurs outside of intensives or outside of auditing unless it is being used for purposes of security. And then, of course, you don't do it in Model Session form. You're just finding out whether this guy is safe to have around, that's all. And if the questions all clear up, voilà! He's safe to have around, providing you know how to do a Joburg Security Check. That's the other little proviso that you must be awfully sure of. Some of you, or maybe all of you, will someday have the experience in Scientology of you got a new HGC Admin, or you've got a clerk or something like that, and you've taught them the this's and that-a's of things, and you're too busy to give this new applicant a Security Check yourself, or everybody else is too busy, and you can't turn him over to a good auditor to do this Security Check. And you say, "Well, you know the rudiments and you know how to do this, so you just go ahead and give him a Security Check."

And you're going to find out where my viewpoint sometimes is: in total bafflement of how anybody can invent as many ways of doing something wrong. And my viewpoint is very often on that total bafflement. I know why it happens, so that it doesn't continue to baffle me very long and it doesn't upset me, but it is still something to marvel about.

If you were to take somebody and give them an hour's instruction on the E-Meter, show them about the needle and then turn over some raw meat off the street and tell them to give this person a Security Check so you'd know whether the person could be hired or not, your usual response is not "The person is all right." The usual response is "He couldn't possibly be hired." If inept people were running E-Meters at all sides to do Security Checks for the purpose of employment, you could guarantee this: The whole world would at once be out of work. [laughter]

Various things happen but the category of them are utterly in the thousands. And there's no sense in going over the number of things they can do wrong, except those things which are rather common errors or which can be used to clarify the right way. Then you can go over things that are wrong. But otherwise, if you list all the things that are wrong or could be done wrong with an E-Meter, you'd probably be up around ten, fifteen thousand items. It's colossal.

For instance, simple error like this: The person they're checking breathes. This is rather strange and peculiar amongst the human race, particularly people in London; they know better. But they breathe, so every time they take a breath – the meter isn't set right probably – and every time they take a breath or a deep breath (or even if the meter is set right, every time they sigh), you're going to get a fall. And if the person were doing it, they wouldn't even realize they had to repeat the question again or anything like that, and they would be saying at that time, "Have you ever embezzled the funds of an employer?" you see, or some such thing. And the person says – he's getting kind of bored with this you know – and he says, "Ahew!", you know? It falls. And they'd write down "Embezzled funds of employer" [laughter] and go on to the next question.

Now, an idiocy of this character – let me tell you some more about this instrument – an idiocy of this character is going on in the United States at this moment. If it weren't so sad and tragic, one could laugh about it, and you will laugh, too. You probably won't laugh so well until you yourself conduct this experiment. And this is what is known as compartmenting.
questions and something you will have to know in doing Goals Assessments: the compartmentation of questions.

The fellow turns in a goal: "I would like to be a fireman and crawl up ladders and rescue beautiful women." That's the goal. So you come to it on the goals list – and by the way, these goals are always put down in the fellow's own words. He'll amend them, but when he wants to amend them, you amend them and add that amendment as a new goal.

So you are reading along his goals list to him and you come down to this one. You come down the list and you've covered now maybe seventy-five goals and twenty of them are still registering after a brief repetitive read. And you've gone on and the remainder, the fifty-five, have sort of dropped out and you're just feeling fine. You come to this one: "You want to be a fireman, and crawl up ladders, and rescue beautiful women." Only you read it this way: "You want to be a fireman, crawl up ladders and rescue beautiful women," and you get a fall. And you say it again: "You want to be a fireman, and crawl up ladders, and rescue beautiful women", fall!

You say, "Well, that one stays in.", Give it a slant mark. "That one's in." You read it a few more times, you see? But it looked like it was getting a stronger read. Let's say it – after you read it two or three times, it was getting pretty – it was getting tougher! More reaction, more fall, more theta bop, more rock slam, more something. So you just left it in, and you said that was it, and you went on to the next goal. And the next time you come by this thing you read it, and by George, it's still in!

And you go tell somebody. You say, "You know what his goal is, is to be a fireman." Nuh-uh. The way you handle these category goals is you pull them apart and you go over them like this: You've read the whole goal, you see? You do read that – the whole goal – a couple of times. Thing continues to read; now let's find out what's wrong with this thing.

You say, "You want to be a fireman. You want to be a fireman. You want to be a fi- ." That's the end of that. That's the end of that read it just disappeared. You say, "Good. To crawl up ladders. You want to crawl up ladders, crawl up ladders, crawl up ladders." That's the end of that one. That's the end of that one. "Rescue beautiful women, rescue beautiful women, rescue beautiful women. Ah, that's what we were falling on. You want to rescue beautiful women. Ah, that's good. That's good." Now, because it fell apart otherwise, let's be just a little cleverer and let's say, "To rescue, to rescue, to rescue." That disappears. And what was he falling on? "Beautiful women, beautiful women, beautiful women, beautiful women." [laughter] As what healthy male wouldn't!

So this whole goal disintegrated except beautiful women. Now, usually the pc will now volunteer, "Yes, I'd sure like to know some beautiful women." You put that down as a new goal. Got it? That's getting rid of them by compartmentation. Got it?

Now, some real – I wouldn't even dignify them by calling them knuckleheads – wogs, drifting around in various places, have been let loose with an E-Meter over in the United States, and they've got it all figured out now that everybody has been PDHed and that everybody has PDHed everybody and they're spreading it all over the place and telling everybody that everybody has been PDHed. And they prove it this way: They put the person on a meter and they say, "Have you ever been a victim of PDH?"
And the person says, "What's that?"

"Well, have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" And you had a nice fall "Wwahoo-haho-o-ahoo-wahoo-wahoo! Here we go!!"

"Well, who did it? Who did it? Who did it? Was it Ron? Was it Di Diego? Was it Dick Halpern? Peter Hemery do it?" All of a sudden they say, "Frank Sullivan do it?" – get a big fall! "Ah, we've got a PDH here by Frank Sullivan, ho-ho-ho-ho." Well, believe me, we might have! [laughter]

Teaching is not implanting, but teaching on the whole track often came to implanting. You never had time to teach somebody where all the leads were in a tube room of a spaceship. And there were eight hundred thousand different leads and connectors to all the electronic equipment. So you said zip! with the needle, and you turned on the super tape recorders, and it went off at a high whine. And you played it over to them hard. And after you'd done it a few times, what do you know, they'd be able to go up and hit lead this and lead that, and they'd be so on and so on, and fix up this and put it in that.

And actually there are people around who've gotten so used to being trained that way that we have today a thing called Dormaphone – which, by the way, doesn't work on anybody who didn't ever teach anybody this way. Doesn't work. "Learn the Spanish language overnight." Well now, if I know all about this, why don't I sock some sodium pentathol in my arm, or something of the sort, or take a couple of Nembutol sleeping tablets, and put a pair of earphones on, and turn on a record that repeats how to speak the Spanish language when I do this.

It happens right now – because there's a ship down at Las Palmas I'll have to repair using the Spanish language – that I picked up some linguaphone records, and I happened to be listening to them wide awake. I'm brushing up my Spanish. When I first listened to the records they were a terrible blur; I couldn't tell one word from another. Now it's getting so that I actually can differentiate the difference between the alumno and the professor. Trouble with me and Spanish is I have enough overts against the Spanish people that I have a hard time hearing them. That's true. Any young Roman officer back in the old days had a hard time this way. Anyhow, I don't mean to restimulate anybody. [laughter]

All right, well, why don't I use this type of education? Well, I just never got used to it. Why don't we use this type of education in Scientology? Well, nobody – it – Scientology is an education of reason, not an education of location. Auditing is a practice of understanding, judgment and application. It is not a practice of locating and repairing a bunch of leads. You understand? It isn't teaching some soldier the gun parts. It leaves him with the initiative to handle weapons. Big difference there, you see?

So all somnolent education is limited to the pat solutions or locations to the questions. Now, if they were all pat solutions and everything was all pat in all directions, it was mostly locational nomenclature and category and where found, you can do it. Thetans have been doing it on the whole track forever. I mean, as long as we've had time this process has been going on.
But some people have become very specialized in doing only this. And those people set up a machine that furnish an implant for any given situation and will answer with name, rank and serial number, exact date, time, location, situation and text.

Five or six times over the last nine years, there have been big fads going around with this and anybody who has used this as a consistent and continual means of education – nothing vicious about it; they've just used it as a means and method of education, that's all – can set up a machine that'll respond. It'll give an implant for any given situation. But that is much rarer.

Let's go back to how you use an E-Meter on this other thing and this will amuse you far more. If I've stepped on any toes while I've been saying this, I am very sorry. But it is simply usually used for educational purposes. You got a new crew aboard the spaceship and not a single, cotton-picking one of them knows anything about space flight. What is the best way to handle this crew? You shove them underneath the proper speakers, and you give them the proper drug, and it all runs off at a high roar, and all of a sudden you have a totally educated spacecraft crew.

Right now you could probably get a visio of lying in a nice bunk on a spaceship, and it's got a speaker over your head and it's playing violin music that is very soft and soothing and at the same time giving you the regulations and identity and so forth which you exactly were supposed to occupy, all of the duties, regulations pertaining to these duties, your relationship to other crew members – everything that has to do with your job. And finally, you get lazy enough and you say, "Well, that's a good thing," and you get up out of there and say, "I'm the first mate!" [laughter]

As a matter of fact, you have a society right here at the present moment which is going into this particular line. So don't feel abusive about it because every time you even captained a spaceship, you've had something to do with this.

But I'm talking about somebody who has made a good specialty out of it, who's figured them out, who has used it consistently and continually or who has practically never done anything else along whole and enormous stretches of track. Those people will develop an identity which gives implants. They'll implant themselves. They can come up with an implant for any given situation. That is rarer – that is rarer – but it is not rarer than 5 percent of the human race. Well, you wouldn't call that terribly rare, then; you'd just say it's a bit scarce. And almost anybody could be restimulated with auditing up to a point of where they'd produce some kind of a reaction on this thing – almost anybody.

But let's take compartmented questioning and look this thing over. "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" – fall. "Who did it to you?" "Frank Sullivan" – fall. That's our proof. That's all you'd have to do, isn't it?

Now actually, it'd clear up and get kind of mucky, and it's awfully hard to read. And if you really don't know an E-Meter very well you don't notice the sporadic falls that you get on this repeated question: "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis? Who gave it to you?" "Frank Sullivan."
"Did Frank Sullivan give you this?" If you're not used to an E-Meter, you don't notice that the thing reads kind of weirdly.

If you've got hold of an individual (seeing the meter or something of the sort) who's got a good machine on this particular basis, it'll date it. It'll make it all reasonable and logical and set the whole thing up.

Where do you get an engram bank from, huh? Actually, you yourself are making the engram bank, but you wouldn't have to erase it if it wasn't being made on a via. If it was being made directly and created directly by you it'd just blow, blow, blow, blow, blow; you'd never have to erase an engram, would you? Factually, it's produced by a machine. There are machines that produce pictures. The thetan has got them. They're invisible. He's got them stuffed away under his left armpit or something of the sort, and they produce these pictures. And it's a machine. All right, all you have to do is specialize that machine a little bit and it'll produce a PDH, at will. I could take one – such a person and actually get PDHs until it became foolish to the person. See? And one of the cures of it is to date other people and other PDHs until we find out that their mother and father both PDHed them, and everybody else has PDHed them, all the way up the line.

You could rework this machine until you made the machine practically go goofy giving you new PDHs. You got it? In other words, it dubs in a PDH. That's all. And that's dub-in, just as such. Whereas the person is actually giving you perfectly valid engrams, when it comes to this particular type of engram it's a dub. You got the idea?

Do you know that a lot of young girls walking around right now, you say, "Well, get a mental image picture of your father," and they get a hairy ape or they get something else, see? In other words, they got a machine that'll dub in fathers. Well, so there are machines that'll dub in PDHs.

But that isn't really what I'm talking to you about because that's more advanced curiosa. And that isn't really what I'm talking about at this particular time – the advanced curiosa. I'm talking about E-Meters and this single question: "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis? Who did it?" "Frank Sullivan."

Listen, if you're an auditor and you know your business, you know there's such a thing as O/W. And you know this: That an E-Meter reacts to the auditor's questions. And any question that is near the truth of anything will cause a reaction on the machine. And it is up to you to get a consistent read. You have to ask the smarter question. You have to ask the varied question to polish that read up. And all of a sudden, it's reading like mad and you know exactly what it's reading on and everything else that it might have been reading on disappears.

All right. Victim? How many people do you think will get a reaction on the word victim? [laughter] How many people do you think will get a reaction on the word pain? How many people will get a reaction on the word drugs? How many people will get a reaction on the word hypnosis or hypnotism or hypnotists? And if they've had a few overts or if they've read some of his literature, how many people do you think would get a reaction on Frank Sullivan?
No, all a question proves, when it reacts on an E-Meter, is that it or some part of it has charge on it, or the question is near some question which will have charge on it. Got the idea? Now, by varying your question you can smooth out the reads and as you become used to the instrument, you'll notice that it reacts sporadically and occasionally on something. Well, you just shape your questions around and change it around until you get it consistent, consistent, consistent, always the same read, always the same read.

You can only keep it reading the same, however, if you practically muzzle the pc. The second he starts imparting information the read blows up. Because if he answers the right auditing question, the read blows up. But of course, because he answered it and the read blew up entirely, you also know what you were asking. Don't you see? You know what was right.

So with the pc totally gagged, you could by questioning – pc not permitted to talk, actually with a gag on – and you have to gag pc if you want to carry this thing out to its extremity. It's a good drill and – they get too interested.

My favorite mechanism for newspaper reporters these days, by the way, is to find an automobile accident they've been in – they've evidently all been in automobile accidents – where the accident occurred, who was hurt in the accident, where they were hurt in the accident; and find out the whole lot, such as the make of the car, and all this sort of thing, without letting the reporter say a word to me. And man does it make citizens out of them. The somatics turn on and everything turns on and they say, "Well, how did you know?"

But actually you can't get much further than them being hurt, or someone in the car being hurt, than they all of a sudden start going off like small firecrackers, you know? And they say, "Well, yes! Well, how did you know that?" Well, you haven't actually had a chance to prove that you were a total wizard. They're now convinced of it, see? "How did you prove that? Well, what do you know. Yes, as a matter of fact, it was an old Rolls-Royce. And it went off the edge of a cliff down in Devonshire. And uh – uh – that's right. There were other people in the car all right. Girls they were, and uh – so forth. And I – I didn't ever realize this before, but I must have gotten jammed under the dashboard, you know? I've got a terrible pain here. Uh – yeah, and I must have been jammed under the dashboard. I never realized that before", you know, and they go limping out. [laughter]

Of course, such a thing dies out in the course of about three days, but they don't go back to the office and write that story that the editor told them to write to clobber Scientology, mostly because they can't now sit down comfortably. It restimulates them.

This is a very effective way of handling reporters, by the way. It's a – it's a real convincer. Similarly this other drill is a marvelous convincer to somebody who believes he has been PDHed.

"Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" Well now, just as you would in goals compartmentation, you say the word "victim" – "You ever been a victim? You ever been ...?"

"Well," he says, "Ah – ha-ha – yeah – ha-ha, I've been a victim."

Yeah, well, that's the end of that read. "How do you feel about pain?"
"Oh, no, I don't want anything to do with pain." Read, read, read, read, read. And they say, "I don't want anything to do with pain. I'm having an awful lot of trouble. And during my early youth I was in agony most of the time. They had my teeth in braces," and so forth, and that one drops out.

And then say, "Well, how do you feel about drugs?"

"Oh God! Eh-e-ptuh! Every time you see a medico they never treat anything; they just shoot you full of drugs and you stagger around. And if they'd only have gone away in the first place, or you never called them, why, you probably could have died peaceably or gotten well or something of the sort. Yeah, I don't care much for drugs." That's gone.

"All right, hypnotism. You ever been hypnotized?" There wasn't any charge on it in the first place and it's dead. Now say the question: "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" The needle is – needle is totally motionless.

Now you say, "Frank Sullivan", and it falls. You say, "Have you ever had any overts on Frank Sullivan? You ever thought any unkind thoughts?"

And they say, "Well, who wouldn't!" [laughter] "Yes, yes, yes, I have, because as a matter of fact Frank Sullivan has been talking about being PDHed from the 1st ACC. He was telling me all about PDHs. And he goes around and talks to people about PDHs. And upsets people. And they don't like to get their own PDHs terribly restimulated, only he's so convincing about it. But his message is 'You have been PDHed! You have been. The reason you are being self-determined right this minute is because you have been PDHed.'" So with this kind of a thing, of course a guy gets unkind thoughts. He says, "This guy is nuts!" you know, although he might continue to be pleasant.

And the person says, "Yes, I've got lots of overts in that line. I've thought a lot of unkind thoughts in that particular line."

And you say, "Well, how do you feel about Frank Sullivan?" You get no motion to amount to anything on the needle. You've kind of blown it. Now you say, "Well, has Frank Sullivan ever PDHed you?" Now you'll get another surge. "Well, have you ever thought anything bad about Sullivan going around telling everybody that you've been PDHed?"

"Well, yes I have."

"Well, has Frank Sullivan PDHed you?" and that's now null.

Now you say to the person – now you say to the person, "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnotism?" – null. "Have you ever been given a pain-drug-hypnotic implant by Frank Sullivan?" and it's null. What was it falling on? It was falling on connected restimators and as soon as you blew off, and the pc actually answered directly what you were talking about ... 

Now, supposing he had been PDHed, and he told you an awful lot of stuff – "Well, yes..." and he answered all these things: "Yes, I've been worried about those things," and that sort of thing – and the fall cancelled off on all of them. And you said, "Well, have you ever been PDHed by Frank Sullivan?" and you got a hell of a fall. You know you'd never be able to clear that fall – never be able to clear that fall at all – if the person had no recollection of
ever having been PDHed by Frank Sullivan, if he had been. It would continue to fall. That would be that.

Now, this becomes a case for auditing. How do you audit it? You put Frank Sullivan on the general Prehav Scale and you simply run him flat. You assess him for level, just as you would an SOP Goals terminal. You find out where that level – it falls. You put together an auditing command on Frank Sullivan, and you just run that out. And then when that tone arm stops moving, as it very well might after about four or five waggles – See, it might only be a few dozen commands, see? You find your new level and you flatten that. And you find your new level and flatten that. And all of a sudden you can't get any reaction of any kind either on being PDHed or anything else; it will have blown. That is the magic of the Prehav Scale.

Marital Scientology – just going from the ridiculous to the sublime ...

As I said before, this thing about PDH would be amusing if it weren't so kind of sad. It's kind of knuckleheaded, you know? It's kind of terrible thinking of some people running around madly trying to tell everybody and convince everybody that they have been PDHed because they're simply dramatizing their own o verts, whether now in this life or on the back-track. And they are worried about them, don't you see? And when they've got to sell a bill of goods of this particular character and make it their life work, they might as well be writing out a confession and putting it in the hands of every Scientologist they talk to.

The guy says, "I've been PDHed! I've been PDHed! I've been PDHed! And yap, yap, yap! And you've got to believe me," and all this sort of thing. If he's making this – he's not telling an auditor this; he's not going and getting auditing; he's just telling everybody this – he's all the same as writing out confessions and signing them and putting them in Scientologists' hands. "I have PDHed the living Christ out of people for ages. You see? I'm pro." That's what he's doing. That's what he's doing.

Well, that's all right. But people who have done PDHs, ordinarily on the whole track in the best of thought that was the best possible thing to do at the particular place and time. So as a result, if they've got a machine that will produce PDHs, so what? It'll all come out in running SOP Goals. Why worry about it?

Furthermore, if some guy did PDH somebody – . Let's say. Let's say that Sullivan did go ahead and hold down somebody and slap him and cuff him and put him under drugs and shock him and put in hypnotic commands and run some patched together tape to him that told him to go and take HCA Courses. That wouldn't be a bad implant by the way. [laughter] And if he did this ...

Ah, look, look, look. Nothing can happen to you in one lifetime – not even a PDH of – not even an electric shock from a psychiatrist and so forth – that you can't handle now. All you got to do is find out – locate the fellow who did it and run him on the Prehav Scale and flatten the various levels, and that's the end of the PDH. Interesting, huh? Or just in the course of running SOP Goals, clear the guy and it'll blow off It's nothing to worry about.

And I'm sure that no smart Scientologist – now that we've got clearing going and we've got cases running so well – would waste his time PDHing anybody. Look at all that hard effort that would just blow off in a short auditing session. We're actually getting faster
today than they can be laid in. Used to be that we took them out much more slowly than – you know, an engram in general was erased much more slowly than it was laid in. Well, you look at the number of engrams, just count the number of engrams, that must blow in the process of clearing a person, and it is some binary-digit factor. The factor – you could start at – up on this wall here and write 1 and then 0s, column after column after column, the whole length of that wall, and so forth, clear down to the bottom of it, and you would not have stated a number large enough to give the person the number of engrams that he'd have; that number would not be large enough. And when you can take and blow this up in the course of, ah, at the outside, a couple of hundred hours of auditing; holy cats, how many engrams is that per minute of auditing – of actual effective auditing? It's some fantastic number. It must be billions and billions of engrams in fact. So who would waste their time?

But once more, going from the ridiculous to the sublime, what I'm about to give you is the birth of marital Scientology. Not really its birth, but it's grown up and got some pants and skirts on it.

We had marital Scientology the day we had the husband and wife sit down across from each other with an auditor auditing both of them and getting off their overts and withholds against each other. That did an enormous amount to patch up marriages and actually could be considered its birth. Now you can put pants and skirts on marital Scientology and some auditor setting himself up this way could do absolute marvelous things. All you do is take the husband by name and run him on the Prehav Scale; take the wife by name and run her on the Prehav Scale; and that's the end of the difficulties of that marriage.

Of course, if the fellow doesn't want to be married, that's his idea and he doesn't have to be run this way. At the same time, if he wanted to get unmarried, this would also be the smoothest way to get him unmarried. Got the idea? Either way. Either way.

But it would certainly patch up the marriage. You got the idea? It'd take the difficulties off the lineup. Because in the course of running it would run the O/Ws off. And what do you know, it's such a tiny, tiny, short track. What is it, they've been married for ten years. Wow! Ten years against two hundred trillion. Doesn't sound like much. So it's no track. And what you're doing is, instead of getting these little tiny, two and a half horsepower outboard motors and attaching them to the Queen Mary – that used to be auditing, see – and these little, tiny outboard motors are running mad and heating their bearings and so forth, to push the Queen Mary. Instead of doing that now, we have a ten-thousand horse Mercedes Benz pushing a rowboat. One of the precautions we have to take is it doesn't crush the rowboat. The precaution we take is do a technically perfect job of auditing and keep your rudiments cleaned up the way I've been talking to you about.

All right. How long do you think it'd take to clear up that much track on a couple? Damn short period of time. With a little experience and knowing your business, you could absolutely guarantee to set up somebody as far as this is concerned. You could absolutely guarantee. You'd say, "Lead-pipe cinch." What would you do? You'd take the husband's name or the wife's name or something like that. Now you could assess this out one way or the other, but now you'd be getting into another project. No, all we're going to do is a non-assess on the
terminal, beyond just the identity of the terminal. You got the idea? See, this is the light brushoff.

Husband's name is Joe Thompson. All right. We just take Joe Thompson, and we assess Joe Thompson up on the Prehav Scale and down on the Prehav Scale. And going up and down the level "failed endure" knocked both times. We make up an auditing command about the failed endurance of Joe Thompson and our pc's relationship to him. It may flatten in ten commands. It may flatten in ten or twenty commands. But as soon as the motion goes out of the tone arm, reassess. And then take the motion out of that tone arm. And then reassess it on the Prehav Scale. We're not talking about very much auditing, are we?

Of course, the case has got to be in the kind of a shape where they will talk to the auditor and interested in their own case before you do that. You can do that, too. You can run them general Prehav Scale and make them do a Joburg Security Check, and they'll be talking to you.

You know, doing a Joburg Security Check is not an overt. Some people will look on it as such. It's about the nicest thing you can do to anybody. All you're giving him is his life.

Now, let's take a little, brief summary of this. Mr. E-Meter is a precision instrument. Mr. Auditor is sometimes imprecise. Mr. E-Meter registers on anything the pc hears. The auditor sometimes doesn't adjudicate what the pc has heard. The E-Meter clears on everything the pc answers absolutely right. And it remains muddled on everything the pc doesn't answer absolutely right. It's as clear as that; the E-Meter is a precision instrument, but auditors and preclears are prone to error.

Now you, in your study of cases and E-Meters and so forth, have certain drills which you must undertake even though they seem to be silly drills. They may seem to be silly, but I want you here to make sure that you do these.

All right.
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All right, this is the 26th of May, 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, you may believe that good publicity in the newspapers will take Scientology someplace. You may believe that good public opinion on the part of the kings and presidents and janitors of the world will get Scientology someplace. And you may believe that it'd be wonderful if the head of the BMA or the AMA or the QBCs or the Ku Klux Klan or some other fascist organization [laughter], would announce that he was in favor of Scientology. You may believe all these things have value.

Well, I want to tell you today that they have no value of any kind whatsoever. They are as sounding brass and the tinkle of the temple bell. They are nothing. If you get the idea that Scientology will rise or fall by public opinion, circa 1961 or 1950, you are very much mistaken. They will have absolutely no bearing on Scientology.

It isn't necessarily that Scientology belongs to the ages, but this is vividly true, vividly: If you don't get results, all the publicity, good opinion in the world will do nothing. Your standard is quality, not opinion. From quality, opinion stems. The advance of this world does not depend on a bunch of wogs who happen to be heading the BMA, the AMA, the Ku Klux Klan or the World's Betterment Association for Emaciated Cats; it depends exclusively on better people. And the more better people you turn out, the better this world will be and that is the end of it. It goes no further than this.

It is behind this that my press policy has long been: When the newspaper reporter knocks on the door, let him climb the stairs so that you can kick him down them. We care nothing for adverse publicity or publicity that is for us. I certainly would not go ask the opinion of a tinker on the quality of the atomic bomb.

"Now", you say, "well, people will beat a trail to your doorstep if everybody is talking about how wonderful you are." This is only seeking public approval. When your case level is well enough up, you couldn't care less about public approval. Now, I don't say that I'm in the most wonderful shape that anybody has ever been in, but I will tell you this: I just couldn't care less whether there has been bad publicity, good publicity, rumors, scumors – who cares? My job, consistently and continually, has been, over a period of years, to get the ammunition to the front; that is all.

Incidentally, I try to handle administrative affairs and other things to make things run smoothly while things are going on. But administrative affairs are always secondary to quality – always secondary to quality.
If you make a better mousetrap – a fellow by the name of Emerson who is very much overquoted – the whole world will beat a trap to your door. [laughter] But nevertheless, there is some item of truth in that. If you want lots of preclears, if you want lots of activity, if you want lots of students, you have to furnish the goods. First, last and always, furnish the goods. The world itself, in its status that it is in today, depends utterly upon whether or not you can produce better people. It doesn't depend on the freakish political pronunciamento of the Duke of Algiers. It doesn't depend on it for a moment. It doesn't depend on it whether the "Race Hate Society" of north Manchester or the "Race Hate Society" of south Cape Town have anything whatsoever to say.

Look, I'll call something to your attention: The BMA, the AMA, the Ku Klux Klan and all the rest of it have uniformly and routinely been expressing opinions for a great many centuries and the world is no better off. If you see this in its proper perspective you will stop trying to fit yourself into the framework of the environment of a society which is already going down the chute. This is sort of senseless. It's a rather senseless activity.

But what would happen if here and there in this society, an able man suddenly arose? What would happen? Well, the society would recover. As a matter of fact, Southern Rhodesia probably has yet to recover from the shock of a Clear appearing in its midst. Evidently this fellow had been one of the worst off fellows: he kept walking into walls and into women and down manholes. An auditor there cleared him and the two hundred employees that worked where this fellow worked couldn't get over it. His family couldn't get over it. Nobody's gotten over it yet. You see, they're all standing back in a fantastic marvel about all this.

But that isn't the direct result. What happens is that in his immediate vicinity it starts to get calm and things start to happen and he starts to get effective.

Well now, on this particular program of clearing, we have not made very many Clears – yet. But this program is only a few months old. It began, actually, at the end of January 1961 – this new research. For the better part of that period, I've been trying to find out what people can do. I've been trying to find out what auditors will do. You see, this is a big difference between what should be done and what would be done.

I'm afraid that I have been well disciplined in this direction. I have very often produced techniques which were rather resounding techniques, but nobody ever used them. So what good was the technique? It's something like building the better mousetrap and then somebody uses it to fill up the ballast of a ship without ever setting it. See, it has no bearing on the beautiful "what could be done." It's what will be done that is important. And since the end of January I've been trying to sort it out carefully on what will be done.

Well, you have the bulletin, May the 25th 1961, which says "Preparatory Steps for SOP Goals." And apparently, from the experience I have now had over telexes and at the other end of HGC lines, this bulletin will be done. People will do these two things if they know how to do them and they can learn how to do them rather easily. So let's look at this whole subject of clearing as an effective activity, which, if effectively put into practice, will bring about a considerable resurgence of this particular civilization. This is fairly obvious that this will happen and let's stop worrying about and dividing our time around amongst a great
many superficial activities that have no bearing on much of anything. Let's just go ahead and get the show on the road.

I'm always asking this question when somebody threatens to sue me or something like this. We get threatened with suits every once in a while: suits for breathing, suits for...[laughter] And it's very interesting because I've be – had to become an expert on the legal background of about five continents now. And this is quite interesting, because when they sue you in Australia, it's quite different than being sued in the United States. Being sued in the United States is a contest of trying to wait it out, because of course it'll almost never get to court.

As a matter of fact, as one of the most serious suits in the United States was a fellow who had fraudulently obtained a great deal of money from the organization and I think it's been going on now for about two and a half or three years or something like this. And everybody has been fighting this thing and having an awful time with this thing and it's operated along the administrative lines – I'm talking now about the nonsense, you see? How you can split up your attention and get nothing done. And it's gone on continually. There've been attorneys and there've been this and there've been papers and despatches and cables about this now for the better part of three years. And it was finally heard the other day and the plaintiff's lawyer failed to turn up in court and it was thrown out.

Now, we've heard of the plaintiff not turning up in court, but the plaintiff's lawyer – and that dismissed the suit. In other words, this thing that they've been worrying about for three – or the better part of three years... And then when it finally comes to court, why, the judge throws it out because there's nobody standing in front of the bar. [Laughs]

I think if any one of you had the amount of money that had been spent on cable traffic and attorneys' fees with regard to this suit, why, you could probably buy yourself a very nice little car. Anyway, look at the wasted time. Look at the tremendous wasted time of this activity.

So, long since, I have had a method of adjudicating these things, which I don't always apply but most of the time do and that is I try to find out what game is being played and if it's not our game then I don't play it. And this is the most disconcerting type of activity that people ever had to confront. I look something over: "And so-and-so and so-and-so. Well, so? And so, and so. Well, all right. Well, that's not our game. That particular one, that's not our game, so therefore just end the game." But then they start talking to me about the moral principles of actually surrendering or apologizing or the moral principles of not fighting the situation or the this or the that or something of the sort or they talk to me about the right ways to play the game. You get the idea? Ah, I just don't listen and this becomes very maddening to people.

When I say like this – this fellow is busily suing us for 16 pounds 10 and obviously... Suzie has a bad time with this because every once in a while she comes in, in a high dudgeon and says, "Look at the unfairness of this situation," you see, "and it should be fought."

And I will say, "Well, how much is it?"

And she says, "16 pounds 10."

And I say, "Forget it."
"Oh, I know, but it's unfair," you see, "and it's not just!" and so on.

And I'll say, "Well, uh – I – so it's not a just claim! So what? Pay it! Forget it! Skip it! Don't answer the letter! Who cares what you do with it; it's not our game. We're not solicitors."

This is amazing! But do you know, it keeps more randomness off the lines than you could possibly count. You have to take some little countermeasure occasionally, but you just take the measure to end that game. You don't play that game. See, I know clearly what game I'm playing and what game we ought to be playing. The game we ought to be playing is getting ourselves technically perfect with the mostest that can be learned. And as soon as we've got that game straight and that one's all squared around – well, that's our game. And frankly nothing can stand up against that type of a game.

So all these other incidental, nonsense games that people keep shoving in to you, trying to say, "This is the game you should play in the society at this time" – and one of those games is publicity. One of those games is newspaper. One of those games is (quote) public opinion (unquote). South Africa learned with horror that there were twenty-eight people, after a newspaper blast, who believed that our tests were no longer valid and I think the whole organization worked day and night for two months on a campaign to convince the public that our tests were valid.

Oh, no! That has nothing to do with the game we're playing; has nothing whatsoever to do with it. The game we have to play is quality, producing the results, clearing and straightening up the human race. That's the game we're playing. What does this have to do with public opinion and whether twenty-eight people in Johan... You know, for the length of staff hours that were spent on this, I could have called each one of them up on the telephone – well, I wouldn't say that I would do this – but say, "Well, this is the president of Witwatersrand University and I've just called up to tell you that the tests given at the Johannesburg Test Centre are perfectly valid. Thank you very much. Goodbye." [laughter]

If you want to play these games you can play some weird games. But I'm afraid the opinion of twenty-eight people – very aberrated people; probably down there in one of those deep Rand mines eight thousand feet below the surface – I'm afraid their opinion is not going to alter the course or destiny of Scientology. And there's no sense in spending any time in on it.

Well, what is there sense in spending time on? We know what can be done. We have demonstrated it and demonstrated it. I have been able to audit and produce results since about 1947, but I haven't had a vocabulary formed up that evidently communicated because we're not talking English. When we talk about the mind, believe me, we're not talking English. Nor are we talking Latin or Spanish or Greek. Man has not known anything about the mind; how could there possibly be a language that described it?

And it's taken quite a long time trying to get some communicative syllables together that would mean something to thee and me and get them clarified so that we've got our communication straight. Now, that's Scientologese. There's something on the order of about 472 words in Scientologese. There are 8,767,942 Latin terms that a medical student must learn, so I think we're allowed 472. That's an exaggeration; they actually wouldn't be able to remember...
that well. [laughter] But if you want to look at a medical or psychiatric dictionary, we have actually less terms in Scientology than appear in the single classification chart used in Germany. We have less actual terms.

Nauticalese. Now, these days I'm amusing myself; I'm taking a shadow on the water and putting a yacht under it. [laughter] And – it takes some doing because I can't afford one of these big, beautiful, streamlined yachts, like you write somebody a check for a hundred thousand pounds and say, "Deliver to the front door with a pink bow round its funnel." And the probability is even if I could, I wouldn't do it.

You talk about Scientologese and its communication complications, imagine this one: Nauticalese, the language of the sea, even confounds sailors on architects. For instance, I've had several letters recently where we were talking back and forth trying to find out what each other meant. Now, here is a language that goes back at least ten thousand years in its development. It's made out of Egyptian and Phoenician and Greek and Latin and "Scandihovian," Anglo-Saxon. Frankly, practically every nation has contributed something to this which now appears in some outrageous mispronunciation in this language called Nauticalese. And there must be several thousand words in the technical vocabulary of going to sea.

I have just run into this head-on because I've decided to use a Spanish yard. So I decided I would translate all my English Nauticalese into Spanish. Coo! And I was impressed. I was impressed with the tremendous vocabulary that I actually had to confront translating over and becoming able to use in a brand-new language and it's staggering. It's several thousand words.

We have now, approximately, 472 words in Scientologese. Each one of these words means a very definite and positive thing. They are not susceptible to very much misinterpretation. An engram is a moment of pain and unconsciousness – oddly enough, give you an idea of the precision of the definition – contained in a mental image picture in the reactive bank of the pc.

Now, when you get a precision definition, you get a package of understanding and these words are understanding packages, but they are understandings which were never understood before. Therefore, they couldn't be otherwise than new words, but it'd be very worthwhile to know those words because they're packages of understanding.

I know right now I am working on the fringes of and have been for some little time, a dictionary of Scientology which contains the precise up-to-date definition of each word. We've been lacking that. But remember, we've also been lacking the ability to communicate to people how to clear people. And we've also been lacking a short and practical method of communicating with the preclear's reactive bank and communicating with the pc. Well, now when we're able to communicate directly and immediately to the pc, now is the time to publish a dictionary, because it means that we must have ended a sort of a cycle of communication. Do you follow that?

All right. We're in the business, then, of quality – the production of results. And not showing what we can do... You see, you don't make a Clear and then hang him up on the wall or hang him up on a signboard. This has nothing to do with it. You're not showing people what you can do; you're dealing with living beings. And when you make a living being that
can really function effectively in the society, you don't have to show people what you can do. No. Things will get done. You get the enormous difference? You put him out there in the society or he's functioning in the society and he's happy as a clam about what you've done for him and he's happy as a clam about what he's doing. And now you get a new functional aspect: You're building a society; you're not trying to show a society that you are doing something.

Now, I know the economics of the situation sometimes press upon us to have to represent this or that or attract public attention. All right, that's okay. But I'll give you this lesson: I myself to keep things going, have undoubtedly, from the viewpoint of many people, overstressed what we could do. You understand? Well, do nothing more serious than that, than hold it up as a good example. Hold it up as an example: "Well, Ron said we could do this and that and we weren't able to do this and that, so therefore this was not a good thing to do. All right. Therefore, after this, let's just do a good job of it," and then, you see, this thing will work out in total reverse. You understand?

See, I don't mean to apologize for ... 'cause all of my reality on Scientology is based first and foremost on what I can do and then secondarily on what I see other people near me do with Scientology and after that it sort of fogs out. I'm not positive about what can happen out there beyond line of sight, for one of the reasons is I get fallacious reports on it all the time. People are telling me the weirdest, wildest things and I go check up on these things and write people indignant letters and say, "Why did you do so-and-so?"

I think one of these rampages I went on one time resulted in the death of a person. A pc had died as a result of very poor auditing indeed – very, very bad auditing indeed – from my point of view. And I jumped all over the auditor and – this was many, many years ago – and the auditor up and died. This was here in England. It was a considerable shock to me. But looking over the thing, I found out the pc had been inclined toward death for many years and as a result it was rather inevitable that the pc should kick the bucket and that it wasn't the auditor's fault. You get the idea? There was actually a false representation about the bad quality of that auditing, you understand? The auditing wasn't that bad.

Now, of course, people expect me to stand back and go on a big withhold. That's a good way to damage somebody. So they expect me to get on a big withhold about everything that goes on. Well, I'm not on this kind of a withhold. What we are doing is what we are doing, not what I would like to make it look like. All kinds of things have happened. This has been a rather dramatic arena for the last eleven years. It's rather fantastic some of the things that have happened one way or the other, this way or that, good or bad. But the good of the last eleven years doesn't just overbalance the scales, it practically goes through the ground with a thud. It's tremendous, tremendous. I – the letters which I get rather routinely; the people that come up to me at congresses; the people I stumble into one way or the other; a letter I get out of the blue: "Of course you don't remember me because it was way back in 1952, but you audited me for two hours and it was a tremendous experience. And evidently the experiment failed, because you turned me over to another auditor after that. But it was tremendous and it changed my whole life and I have been well ever since. And now I want to thank you very much for that experience."
This – nine years later.

And before organizations, a letter from a fellow: "Thank you very much for saving my foot. They were going to cut it off and you came in and audited me. And I didn't know who you were or where you were until I saw an article about you the other day in Time magazine."

The article says, "Hubbard is a bum. He's a rat," [laughter] you know? My fan mail doesn't answer up to the quality of the article.

But the lesson we can learn out of all this is if we want to get anything done, we better do it. In other words, we shouldn't put up, for instance, a science and then have various armed services become very enamored with this idea and then put us to work.

You think I want to work for some armed service? You know, I resigned from the United States Navy in 1950 when they tried to pull me in and put me to work on the subject of research in the human mind. They might have been writing to people, "Well, we're -- we keep all kinds of records on Dianetics. We keep records on Dianetics..." And they had a standard letter which the United States Navy, Bureau of Personnel, I think -- I've seen so many copies of it. Scientologists have sent me in so many copies of it, it must be just a form letter. And it's to the effect that they're keeping files and watching it carefully.

But in 1950 they tried to kidnap me. They told me that I would be returned to active service to do this research if I did not return to do so as -- in a civilian capacity at high pay -- ARC break. Now they're very equivocal to the public -- they don't know. Now all of a sudden, eleven years after the fact, they've suddenly awakened once more and they have some of our people in the United States now doing the security checking for them, which is apparently official. I'm supposed to soft-pedal this. I'm not supposed to say anything about the Bureau of Naval Intelligence. One of the reasons why nobody can really list us as a Red in the United States is a very interesting reason: is because I was once an officer of the Bureau of Naval Intelligence and of course, they have my full record. So every time anybody tries to clobber one of our organizations with being a Red organization or communist associated or something like that, it runs through the files and runs into this fact.

Now that first service with which I had contact has now turned around and is apparently using Scientology. You say, "Well, this is great." No, it isn't great. Ah! To clear up the Chief of Naval Operations: Now, that would be great. If one of you were to write me a letter and say that you had made a Clear out of the Chief of Naval Operations, I would say, "Now we're getting somewhere." But that the Chief of Naval Operations has written a long letter saying how wonderful he thinks Scientology might be for some of his junior officers [laughter] -- I'm afraid I would not pay too much attention to it.

Now, perhaps by understanding these attitudes of mine, you'll be able to understand the course of publicity and what we do and what we don't do a little more easily. The final analysis of an auditor is not what a good press agent he is, but how well he can audit. The final analysis of an organization is not what a good press department it has, but how well it can train and process people. That is the final test. There is no further test.

Finance -- the amount of money a person makes -- is some index of success. It always is in this society, but it operates as an index of success: this person is that able. I don't care
how many rabble-rousers are going around saying people who make money are no good, it is always an index of a certain amount of service – the amount of money that a person makes.

But look, if it is not an index of service, then it must be dishonest money. Right? So – your basic mission is the delivery of quality in service and that is the only mission we've got. Now, if we can do this and if we ourselves in the process get the bonus of getting Clear, this gets to be pretty darn terrific. You've got the fundamental building blocks under a new civilization, you haven't got a bunch of rickety props holding up a rickety civilization. And I don't think too well of this idea of holding up a bunch of clunks that…

How many wars have we had within our own memories? It's quite numerous, isn't it? Well, war is a symptom of insanity. How many broad cataclysms of one character or another have – are we not being piloted through? You think you can bolster this thing up? I'm afraid not. But, you can lay the fundamentals and foundations of a new civilization. Not a new order; a brand-new thing – a brand-new thing; not by saying to people, "You must do so-and-so and you mustn't do so-and-so or we're going to shoot you" – that is the old pattern – but actually having in their midst people who do know what they're doing and who are not guided by their aberrations. Now, if that thing all by itself could happen, you would get a new civilization. It isn't up to us to tell people what kind of a civilization they should have. It is more up to us to put it in their reach to have one. And that's what man has never been able to do before.

The whole mission of the Special Briefing Course at Saint Hill is making people able to get results and if we don't do that, then we have failed utterly. That's the whole mission.

Now, part of getting people to get results, of course, is part and parcel of this other idea of putting able people into existence. So you notice that, unlike an ACC, here you are being processed directly and immediately by staff auditors. You're not puttering around over another case while that other case putters around over you. You get the idea? I mean, that's not what we're trying to do and we're getting rather fast results this way. Now these results may not look fast to you, but they're fast enough. Tolerance of change has an awful lot to do with how fast the result occurs.

Now, you're changing people's tolerance to change all the time, but you have to reduce their tolerance to change before you can change them. So it goes up on a sort of a – of a swaybacked curve. It starts in very slowly and then it starts going faster. That's because tolerance to change is coming up. Change is pain, to most people, because the fundamental of change is simply a shift in space of location. It's a shift of location in space. That is what change is. You have space and then you have a shift of location. This is very interesting.

And you have this other factor called "time" which is actually, basically, just a postulate. But time is change on a mechanical level. It isn't shift in space per unit of time, because that would be shift in space per unit of shift in space. That sounds kind of weird when you start thinking it over.

Rate of change is something I had an awful hard time getting through my head in engineering school. I mean, it was one of these things. Rate of change – I never could understand why this thing just wasn't quite right. Rate of change. And then I eventually found out the reason it isn't quite right is that rate of change is measured by rate of change. And every-
body was pretending to me that rate of change was measured by a constant called time, which wasn't any change, which was just some odd phenomena of some kind or another. It was a phenomenon that sort of drifted around in our midst and had nothing to do with it, you see?

Time has a temperature. Yeah, there's a startler: Time has a temperature. Time has a certain temperature. If you don't believe it, put some meat in the ice box. Doesn't decay as fast, does it? Put it out in the sun in August. It decays much more rapidly, doesn't it? "Ah yes," you say, "but this is the decomposition of the bacteria which is operating against the roodlepuffs." [laughter] No it isn't.

Time is a temperature. I don't know what that temperature is in Kelvin, but now that I know that time is a temperature, I can find it. And the moment I find the exact temperature, I could make any area, at any given instant, timeless or speed its time up. I know that sounds very strange. But this is a great discovery in physics. Only you know about it, but it is a great discovery in physics. It's rather a staggerer.

We have several of them. "C is not a constant" is one of them. You know, the constant they use in atomic physics is not a constant. The speed of light is not a constant. It varies!

"Well, yes," you say, "Well, within all practical purposes, it doesn't vary. But..." Now, what's this "practical purposes"? Whose "practical purposes"? Now, here's something else: No, the speed of light depends upon the velocity of emission.

So C is not a constant. That's one of these discoveries. Another one is "Zero is a variable." And, of course, every time you have a zero in an equation, you've got trouble and mathematicians since time immemorial have known this. All you have to do is divide by zero or multiply by zero or something and something weird happens in the equation and you mustn't do that! [laughter] And yet, these fellows have never deduced from this the horrible truth that zero is a variable. There is no absolute called "zero."

I'll give you an idea: You say, "Well, there's nothing." A nothing of what? And the second you've said "a nothing of what" well, there could be a nothing of a ton of apples and there could be a nothing of a pinch of sand. Well, which is the greater figure, the nothing of the ton of apples or the nothing of the grain of sand? [laughter]

So in other words, zero is a fabulous variable and accounts actually for what they call, inelegantly, "the bugger factor" in physics. It's a technical term in physics. It's also a technical term in the Navy, but... [laughter] we won't go into that. I'm sorry to bring it up. But zero is a variable and apparently if you divide by zero, you're in trouble – and you add... You can apparently add zeros without too much difficulty unless you're dealing with money. [laughs] And you...

Now, wherever you have holes of this character in the basic sciences of a civilization, of course you have trouble. They can't quite handle this particular zone or area and it keeps getting out from underneath them and trouble keeps occurring.

Now, zero and the constant of time most got out of control with the atomic bomb and produced, oddly enough, a difficulty with a thing called temperature. Because the atomic bomb is very hot and when exploded in amongst a city or over the top of it, succeeds in roast-
ing the population rather thoroughly. And the only real sin there is that there's nobody around to eat them, I think or some… [laughter]

Zero is a variable and they didn't know it. C is not a constant and they didn't know that. And they got this trouble called temperature – and hot temperatures and bad temperatures and so on.

Well, there's some odd things about this. When the atomic bomb was exploded in Hiroshima, nothing moved for twenty minutes – not even the twenty minutes. Something weird happened with time. And most of the survivors and some of the data that comes out of there – if you read it carefully, there's hardly any record that doesn't mention time, some disturbance of time. Well, if time is a temperature and you get a tremendous temperature alteration, you're certainly probably going to do something with time, right? That's going to mess up.

Now, that's as far as I am into it at the present moment, only I know now for sure that time is a temperature and that is a brand-new principle of physics. But what this present society at this particular time doesn't know is basically that it doesn't know. That we have also discovered.

For instance, we have diplomats running around, settling problems on international affairs which could have enormous consequence and they don't know that they don't know anything about diplomacy. They couldn't possibly, because their efforts result, don't they, in wars and upsets and so on.

All right. So there is another factor that we are dealing with, is that it is a very extremely dangerous thing to not know that you don't know. Apparently that is probably the greatest sin there is: to have an area of knowingness which you don't know that you don't know.

Well, what is Scientology doing to the society at large? Isn't it telling the society at large rather consistently and continually that it doesn't know? It doesn't know that it doesn't know and it's apparently painful for them to confront the fact that they do.

But your best road – your best road – is to find out what you don't know and remedy the situation. That is always a road to wisdom. It's not a self-cancellation, you know, or cancelling out what you do know, but it's just finding out what – honestly, what you don't know. And as soon as you know what you don't know, you are far wiser than you were a moment before.

So that all study should actually begin on the basis of finding out what you don't know, not finding out something new. Now, that's a rather odd thing, but it becomes very clear in just a moment. Several of you have had assessments on SOP Goals and have come up with your goal and have come up with your terminal: Do you feel different about existence? Do you feel different about existence? Yeah, kind of weird, isn't it? Well now, that is the exact same principle applied. Look it, a few years ago, a decade or so ago, you didn't know that you didn't know this, did you? And then for a while you found out that you didn't know what you didn't know. But you knew you didn't know something. Do you remember not knowing, but knowing that you didn't know what your goal and terminals was? Well, it's an odd feeling, isn't it?
But do you know that is way in advance of not knowing that you don't know anything about it? See, it's an increase. Even if it's uncomfortable, it's an increase of knowledge.

Now, all of a sudden as you're running in auditing, you're finding out more and more about this terminal and more and more about this goal, you see? Coo! What's this? And a great deal more knowingness and wisdom is at your command than was before, right? But it had to be entered in upon at its rockest rock bottom with finding out that you didn't know about it.

And oddly enough, the only thing that is wrong with your case is that vast area of their own beingness that they don't even know they don't know about and that's what makes them aberrated.

All right. Let's say some fellow up here is going into the subject of – let's say, some fellow in Parliament. And he's beating the drum. He is absolutely sick to the point of nausea over the fact that these poor herring are being slaughtered off of Iceland.

And he's just having one awful time, you see, about this. And he's just causing all sorts of fuss and consequences of one character or another. And he wants to sign treaties and suppress the catching of herring or something, but he doesn't even know that he's trying to suppress catching of herring. He's just trying to pass what he calls "fish conservation regulations," or something like this, all of which will amount to catching more herring, much more brutally.

He doesn't know that he spent his whole last life as a fisherman catching herring off of Iceland. Nor would he even know that this would open him up for the consequence, you see, with this many overts on herring, of now protecting herring madly. But he also wouldn't know that this reactive obsession with protecting herring will only lead him to slaughter of herring. You see what he doesn't know? So, of course, he's a very unhappy man, because he doesn't know where he's going, why he's doing it. He has no practical solution because if he did get one, he himself would be the first to defeat it. Now, he's in a puzzle. He's going around in circles.

What it would mean for the destiny of England if you in this room were suddenly turned loose as a crew to find the immediate four last lives on every member of the House of Commons. [laughter] It'd be fantastic! It'd be fantastic!

There are fellows there who just got through being officials in India – Indians – who are now running English bodies. That's for sure. There are people there who are doing this, who are doing that, who are doing the other thing. They have no understanding of why they are doing it. But because they don't, they will immediately come off with a defeat. Whatever they try to do they will defeat themselves. That's part of the aberration.

So we have a whole bureau of the government or a big department of the government, set up to prevent war. Do you know that it's going to prevent war madly, day and night, but because it's doing it reactively, not analytically, it is going to do nothing but bring on a war. What they resist, they become, because it's all reactive. They have no way of handling this whatsoever.
That's why I say, not that you can't do anything about the society as it exists, but that the best remedy for the existing society is to put able men amongst it. And the first thing you do when you do that is put men amongst it who will one, know and two, will know when they don't know. And that way you've opened up the whole highway toward enlightenment, education and a future for this race.

Now, the bulletin – to get down to much more practical matters – the bulletin of May the 25th, 1961, gives how to bring about a Release. It's the preparatory steps of SOP Goals: how you bring about a Release.

Now, what's a Release? A person is a Release who knows he won't get any worse. That is the oldest definition there is to Release. A – when he finds out he's not going to get any worse now, you can call him a Release and he knows he's not going to hit the skids and go. So that's a very low definition – very low order of definition. I mean, it's a very – very low state of case actually, but it is far better than a non-Release because this fellow knows at least that he isn't there yet. See, he knows that.

Well, Miss Zilch up here selling lingerie in London doesn't know that, see and neither does some fellow wearing enormous ceremonial robes up in London, either. He doesn't know it, either. They know they're going to get worse – amongst their knowledge – and that there's nothing can be done about it.

So the first test of Release is just that: They know they're not going to get any worse now.

What would a Release look like on an E-Meter? Well, you would have your sensitivity fairly low on a Mark IV British meter. You would have your sensitivity fairly low, down here and you would get something on the order of a whole-dial swing or a little bit better than that, when you squeeze the cans. You ask him to squeeze the cans, with the sensitivity all the way off, it's going to go plong! It doesn't have to hit the pin and come back over and hit the other pin. In other words, it doesn't have to be seven or eight dials, but it's no – your meter manifestation is something of that order.

And the tone arm here is not too far goofy. See, it's not down here at 1.2 or it's not over here at 6.5. It doesn't say that auditing won't put it there, but it does say that it stays down here in the middle range someplace – 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, something like this. It's going to be in that zone. Ordinarily if you'd pick the fellow up anytime during the day and put him on an E-Meter, if he weren't being audited, why, he'd strike into the 2.5, 3.0, 4.0 range. He'd be in here someplace. That would be kind of an E-Meter manifestation of what a Release is.

Now, I had a question the other day which was quite interesting. And that was "The people who have loose needles at low sensitivity must be bad off because they don't get much needle action when you ask them charged questions." Well, look-a-here: The looser the needle gets, the less charge is effective on the person, so of course the questions get less drop. And you may get into a situation where you have to jack up your sensitivity on a loose needle case to get off the little, tiny withholds, because they don't really think they're withholds. But at the same time, those withholds don't prevent them from being audited. What do you know?
A PT problem will prevent this person from being audited. But a little, tiny withhold: he'd still stay in-session on it. You got it?

Now, the state of Release is no more, then, than the fact the fellow knows he's not getting any worse, probably that he knows he's getting better. This is quite important – quite an important thing for a person to be able to get to that state. That is the first, most important step on the ladder to Clear. He knows he isn't going to get any worse.

Well, this would mean, at the same time, that he has a reality on Scientology; he knows it works. So he knows there is a remedy to make him better. This would also, then, be part of the test of Release: Does he have a reality on Scientology? He knows it'll clear things up?

That appears to be something that's a – merely self-congratulatory to Scientology but it isn't. The fellow knows that he can get someplace with it. That's important. He knows he can go someplace. He knows there's a higher zone or area that he can go into.

All right. The next thing: If you were to make a Release test and get very rough about the test and actually upgrade the state considerably so that you would be sure this fellow isn't going to fall on his head; you would have your Help, Control and Communication levels in such a state that when you say "communication" to this fellow, he doesn't flinch and fall off the pin and get very upset or the needle doesn't instantly stick. You got the idea?

You don't get, then, a bad needle reaction on these buttons of Help, Communication and Control. Those are pretty good then. Now you know this fellow is going to be a credit to you before you start patting him on the back. Actually it's a slight deception because the fellow is a Release before you establish this point, but now we've got the further point: Is this fellow going to be able to hold his own? And for our own satisfaction, then we require that he isn't going to get oddball needle reactions just because you say communicate to him or help to him or control to him and then for sure you've got a Release. And that's all the state of Release is.

Now, that is the state of Release, actual – the fellow knows he isn't going to get any worse and he's got a reality on Scientology and he knows it's working. See, if a fellow knows Scientology is working, he has reached a state where he can as-is by inspection certain things. So therefore, he will tell you Scientology works.

When a fellow tells you Scientology doesn't work, he doesn't have the ability to as-is by inspection. You got that? It is nothing more complicated than that these people go around talking about "Scientology doesn't work," "Scientology does work." You know, one or the other. Phooey! They're just saying, "I can as-is by inspection" or "I am totally incapable of doing a cotton-picking thing with my bank." That's all they're saying to you in actuality.

All right, so you have this – these two first conditions, that is the actual state of Release, so that you would actually have, then, another condition, a special type of Release which we'd call a tested Release or a stable Release, which would be the fellow had no adverse needle reactions on the buttons of Help, Control and Communication. Do you follow that? Well, at that stage you can issue him a certificate and a lapel button. I mean, he – he's all right.
Now this doesn't say that if he gets tangled up with a fire engine and loses his grandmother on whom he dotes utterly, that he isn't going to practically go into a flat spin, because life still is very much capable of putting the thumbscrews on our boy. You understand? But he'll be able to come through it better than he ever would have been able to before.

All right. Now let's take our next state up and the next state up is actually MEST Clear. And a MEST Clear is simply somebody who has a floating needle with the sensitivity well off and who doesn't get reactions on normal, routine questions; and who is reading, at the time he ends his processing, at 3.0 for a male and 2.0 for a female. 2.0 for a female, he [she] has a floating needle. 3.0 for a male, has a floating needle and under ordinary questions about life and so forth, you don't get any needle reaction. That's a MEST Clear. And that's all there is to MEST Clear. That's the total test reaction.

What's important to you about it is that a MEST Clear isn't stable. So just as we have the stable or tested Release, so do we have the stable or tested Clear. And it takes a lot more SOP Goals to stabilize a Clear after he is Clear. See, he reaches MEST Clear; now we've got to make a stable Clear.

Now that's quite important. And you just run more goals. You just find more goals and more terminals and try to audit them and they actually start blowing by inspection. Because the keynote and the common denominator of any case is "The better off it is, the more it can blow by inspection, the more it can as-is by inspection."

And you get somebody who is in the zone of Clear and I won't tell you that a firetruck running into him won't mess him up, but I will tell you that the engram has no persistence. His healing rate is fabulous. That's because he can as-is the incident. He looks it over and it blows!

Now, trying to run an incident on somebody whose tone arm is 1.2, whose sensitivity is 16 and whose needle is just like glue no matter what you say to him – now we're going to run an engram on him. Of course, we get him into the beginning of the engram and that sticks him. He's better off – because he was actually in the beginning of the engram – he's better off in – now that he doesn't know now what is in the rest of the engram. [laughter] And if he were never going to get any more auditing he'd never find out either.

All right. Compare this to trying to run an engram on him – on a Release. Well, you'd probably be able to flatten engram on a Release in maybe three, four hours – two, three hours, something like this – even if you did it pretty badly. You see, it's kind of sloppy auditing. But an engram being flattened on a Clear, if you could find it, if it would react – you know, the fellow has just fallen down and had an accident or something like this and you get a reaction on this thing – the process of looking for it and trying to locate what happened is the end of the engram.

But on the other hand, he could put up the engram again and could react again if you ask him to and he might do it to be pleasant [laughter] and then you would probably get a reaction on it. But he'll do this to a relatively slight extent. In other words, its thinkingness has an effect upon the bank. That is the common denominator of all case states up to Clear.
How much effect does his thinkingness have on the bank? Now, you first start a person in – you see, giving the person SOP Goals is pretty therapeutic, actually – giving him a Goals Assessment. It goes along slowly. You're using one of the oldest processes known (repeater technique) coupled with another old, old process of about 1957 which is Goals Processing. And these two are actually processes. You're not running them for processes. You're trying to find the goal – that's the reason you're running them – but they are processes and they do result in a therapeutic gain for the case, which is pretty good. But you will notice at the beginning of a Goals Assessment that the length of time it takes to get a goal to null on some cases practically make you hold your head. I mean, the goal stays in and stays in and stays in and stays in, and then all of a sudden gets a little less and then a little tiny bit less and then a little tiny bit less and then it disappears.

Whereas toward the end of your Goals Assessment – let us say you've gone on an heroic, long-stretch Goals Assessments that's going to take about thirty-five to fifty hours – and don't be surprised if one takes that long sometimes – you get a goal, you repeat it twice and it disappears. You see, that's how fast thinkingness is able to effect – make an effect upon the reactive bank. That's all there is to that. That is the common denominator of all cases.

A psycho: The bank has total effect upon him and he has no effect of any kind on the bank. No effect on the bank; he cannot control this in the faintest, so that he does everything it says. A psycho is actually an engram bank in full dramatization, whether he's a computing psycho or a dramatizing psycho, see? The individual not only can't have any effect on the bank – this would be utterly, utterly unthinkable – the bank has a total effect upon him, you see?

Now he gets up to the point where he doesn't really have any effect on the bank, but it isn't really a total effect upon him. Then we get up to the grade: the person has a little bit of an effect on the bank. And then we get up to a higher grade of the person can affect the bank quite easily. And then we get up to a higher grade of where – "What bank?" That'd be your common denominator of cases.

Now, the thing you should do to encourage field auditors, to encourage Scientologists who don't know too much about this new routine – you who are here at Saint Hill; the things that you should say to them is, "May 25th, 1961, HCOB: Follow it very closely because there'll be two or three Clearing Series books – more than that; there'll be four or five Clearing Series books – which amplify it."

In other words, by reading these books you could do this other thing, the May 25th bulletin. And that is to produce a Release, but this is a pretty high quality of Release you're producing with this, you see? This is pretty high.

Actually it is something like building with an engineering factor of safety of about a hundred. You know – you know, most bridges are built to take five times as much weight as they'll ever be called upon to take. Well, in this particular case, if you're using this HCOB, May 25th, you're building about a hundred times as much stress as is required to qualify for Release, you see? But you tell them to do that one – that's the one to do – and to leave Goals Assessments alone and not to fool with Goals Assessments until they have had special training in them. And that way you could do the most good for auditors around. You actually
could. It – there's nobody trying now to compartment up things so that there's the nobility and the plebeians amongst auditors, you understand? I mean, nobody's trying to do this. I'm just trying to get every moment of auditing to count, that's all.

Now, supposing all the auditing done around the world – supposing every hour of it counted. *Wow*! It would be a big gain. Supposing there were none of this wasted at all.

All right. I just had a case today of a fellow who'd just had seventy-five hours of auditing and he claims that he's in ruins and in flinders and he's made no advance of any kind whatsoever. Well, I've asked for a total review of the case. But I inevitably will find that somebody has been trying to assess a case who didn't know how and spent a great deal of that seventy-five hours messing around with an assessment. And then that the person didn't know how to do a Security Check and then that the person didn't know how to do an assessment or make up a five-way bracket for running. And of course, seventy-five hours went up the spout.

Well, it's just *silly* to waste auditing like *that*. But you can encourage people to learn to use an E-Meter and to give a Security Check. You'll find them very interested in learning how to give Security Checks.

How to use an E-Meter and how to give a Security Check: that should be the most elementary action that a person could undertake with it. Because you see, if a person can't do a Security Check and get each level asked clear, he can't ever clear rudiments so he shouldn't be auditing the pc, should he? Ah!

So your first task would be to get somebody to be able to do a Security Check. All right. If he learns how to do a Security Check and can do a Security Check well and can get every level clear and get the reaction off of the needle at every level as he goes down and wind up at the end absolutely confident that the pc, at that stage of case – of course, at certain stages of case, naturally, a pc does not *know* all of his withholds. Don't go on the basis that at any given moment a pc knows everything he is withholding, because, you see, he's withholding it from himself. The only reason you don't remember your past track 100 percent is that you're withholding it from you. Forget – withhold, you understand?

Well now, the keynote of this case that made no progress during the seventy-five hours is that the auditor gave him at least two Security Checks and the case is complaining that his memory hasn't improved. Add those up: *Ahhhh*, that means that there was no Security Check given that was effective in the least bit, because if any Security Check – particularly this new Joburg HCO WW Form 3... [laughter]. You mean *that* can be given to a person all the way down the line and his memory doesn't improve? Oh, come off of it!

Nobody could convince me of that, you see, because I know exactly what forgetfulness is. Memory trouble and forgetfulness is withholdingness, that's all. You pull a few withholds off somebody and his memory improves.

I imagine your memory when you were a little shaver and had just busted the cookie jar – I'll bet you, you couldn't remember the top of the house from the basement for a few minutes. You know? For a day or two or three. You were going around, "I hope nobody finds out who busted the cookie jar," you know? And your attention is all involved with this and
you're withholding it from people. And then you've undoubtedly had this odd phenomenon happen: You forgot that you did it.

Well, withholding things from people results in withholding things from self. And when you cure up withholding things from people, you stop withholding a lot of things from self. So the inevitable result of a Security Check would be an improvement of memory. Right? Somebody says, "I want my memory improved" – security check the living daylights out of him.

Now, a Security Check represents what the person knows he is withholding at any given instant and a few little borderline things that he'd forgotten he was withholding. See, those will come up, too.

Now he's got to have an increase of – well, you could say sloppily, "He's got to have a case gain." No, we could be much more technical. He has to have an increase of responsibility on the dynamics before he'll get a different Security Check pattern.

Now, if you increase his responsibility he is going to remember a bunch more withholds. Ah, the second that you increase his social responsibility, personal responsibilities, familial responsibility, he all of a sudden is going to remember a bunch more withholds. Lord help the fellow who has his responsibility increased without getting them pulled – without getting the withholds pulled. God help somebody who is going over that hurdle! Because you know what'll happen?

Lessening the overt comes in under that category. The individual has made his withholds and overts all right by lessening the withhold, lessening the overt and he's pushed it out of sight. He says, "Well, the Central Organization isn't any good anyway, so it was perfectly all right for me to do mean things to it." And then one fine day – one fine day – he suddenly discovers that the Central Organization is doing the best it possibly can for him and does him an enormous favor and the withhold unlessens. His withhold – you know, the overt – the overt gets up in size. He realizes it's an overt!

See, it was perfectly all right before. It was all explained because "The Central Organization was no good." But all of a sudden, he finds out the Central Organization was some good and immediately, the overt that he had not-ised springs up into full life and beingness and he gets very unhappy. He becomes miserable. He comes slinking in the front door, afraid to look at anybody and if he dares confront the organization at all… You get the idea? Now, that's the unlesssening of the overt.

Some fellow said one time, "You know, when I was sixteen my father knew nothing – absolutely nothing. He was the most ignorant man I ever had met in my whole life. And by the time I was twenty-one it was surprising how much that fellow had learned." [laughter] Now, supposing this were accompanied at the same time by realizing that the guy was some good? See?

Let's say he wasn't fairly standard circle; let's say he was, finally, a fairly good guy and all of a sudden the overt appears. Everything you've done to this guy suddenly swells up. Now, when you've done a lot of overts to somebody who then kicks the bucket and then you
found out they were perfectly innocent of all the things you accused them of, you feel *terrible!* Why?

The overt unlessee, because the reverse process is the one engaged in. To make oneself feel comfortable one lessened the overt by saying the target for the overts was no good. "Perfectly all right to do to this fellow. He was only a bum. He was no good." Now, all of a sudden, we find out he isn't a bum and this unsettles the basic human mechanism of making our overts all right. You see? This is a weird mechanism.

Well now, the same mechanism occurs under the heading of responsibility. And responsibility goes this way: The individual is totally irresponsible in the society. And he's going around robbing lollipops from little babies and he's doing all sorts of weird things in the society. And he didn't consider this was wrong. But now his responsibility increases and all of a sudden he says, "Hey, what do know! I've stolen lollipops from little babies and that wasn't so good." At that moment it becomes a withhold.

You will have criminals, ten-timers, you know, they've just been in and out of the jail doors so fast that they might have caught pneumonia in the breeze, you know? They'll sit down, "Oh yes, I murdered this fellow and I robbed that one and I did this and I did that," and there's not even a tremble on that meter. "Yeah, raped, marred and burned. Took an old lady's false teeth, kicked her in the head, knocked her down the stairs. Yes, I routinely went around and upset wheelchairs with cripples in them, you know. Yeah, oh yeah, yeah. Oh, I've been a bad boy all right! I sure have!" and you don't get a tremble on the meter. The guy's social responsibility is so microscopically small that he doesn't regard any of them as necessary to withhold.

And that is the definition of a criminal and why criminals are rather dangerous fellows to have around. Because nothing they do has any faintest bearing on anything. They're irresponsible. In other words, they're at the behest of the reactive bank and they have nothing to say about it at all!

All right. You'll say someday when you're doing a Security Check – you didn't get a reaction on the needle but you asked the fellow, "Well, did you ever burgle anyone?" You know?

And the fellow says, "Oh yes, yes, at this place and that place and the other place and so forth and then I was there. I remember this. And they sent me to the pen in Cincinnati for doing that. And then I came over and I was in Wormwood Scrubs. And – uh – uh…"

You'll say, "Boy! Hey, I'm really getting somewhere with this case!" Aw, the hell you are. He isn't confessing, he's bragging. He doesn't consider these withholds. He's trying to convince you he's a dangerous man. And it is all too easy to think you have really done a good Security Check on this person, because he does have things that the needle will fall on that are withholds. You do a Security Check by the needle, not by the conversation.

It's not what you would consider a withhold, but what the person being checked considers a withhold. Got the idea? With a lot of criminals, it's out there on a second substitute: his pal – the things he won't tell you about his pals.
And you can go right back over a Security Check that a person has passed with the greatest of ease. He's told you. "Rape, murder, sudden death, revenge, arson. Oh yes, yes, desertion, mutiny." He goes down the line, "Yes, oh yes, yes, yes."

And you say, "Well, I'm really getting someplace." Needle isn't doing anything, see. "I'm really getting someplace," and so forth. Well, don't make that mistake.

When you get to the end of it and you don't think you've gotten any place and that needle hasn't wobbled and this case is no better off than he was before; you're going to have to do another Security Check on this fellow in some other guise or wise. You're going to have to find out what are withholds to this guy and you'll very commonly find they're about his pal. So ask – just Hobson-Jobson the whole Security Check into a second dynamic proposition: "Do you know of anyone being burgled?" "Do you know of anyone burgling anybody?" in other words. **Ohh, clang!** "Oh, I can't tell ya that. Day'd rub me out!" [laughter]

It's by the meter. The meter reacts on what the person is withholding.

And the Security Check is not designed to do a check on the life story of John Q. Criminal, see; it is designed to get off what he considers withholds. So that would be one of the little fine points about giving a Security Check.

So this seventy-five-hour pc was undoubtedly sitting there giving all sorts of long and sad stories about all the mad and mean, horrible things he'd done. But on none of those Security Checks did the auditor look at the meter to see if he was getting a reaction on what the pc was talking about. And he didn't probe around with those Security Check questions until he *did* get a reaction and then get it off. Do you see how smart you have to be to give a Security Check? In other words, you run a Security Check by the meter, not by the life history of the person.

And you say, "Well, you've ever burgled anyone?" Ah, needle doesn't do anything. And he says, "Well yes, there was Doakes and *buther-nth-er-nuthr*..."

And you say, "Well, thank you! Thank you. **Good! Good! Thank you!** All right, **good!** All right. Now, do you know of anybody who ever burgled anyone?"

"**Ahhhh, huhuhuhuhuhuhuh.** That's different. **Ahh-huh-huh-mm-bluthhmhm-huhu-huu-mm-huhuh-bu-hummm-huh-mm...**" You get this kind of a twist around. You have to find out where the guy lives on the Responsibility Scale in order to do a good Security Check and you have to pull those things which can be made to fall.

All right. Now you turn around and what do you do? You give him an assessment on the Prehav Scale. And you just run up that Prehav Scale assessment. And the very best way to do it is to find the level that ticks and then find the Secondary Scale and then go over the whole Secondary Scale until you find the level that goes *clang*! And then you take the level that goes clang and you run it on the person in a five-way bracket on the subject of something or someone or ... Make up your five-way bracket.

You can say "something" to the person, you get a fall. You say "someone" to the person you get no fall. So your five-way bracket is made up on "something." You get the idea. You have to test your auditing command, which is another subject entirely.
But in other words, you give him this run on the Prehav Scale. You flatten out the motion on the tone arm. And when the motion ceases to be wild on the tone arm and comes down and gets rather narrow, you give him another assessment on the Prehav Scale. And you run him with another five-way bracket till the motion comes out of it.

Now, you haven't assessed this person. You don't have this person's terminal, you know, or anything like that. And when you flatten off this second run, you pick up your Joburg Security Check sheet – a new one, a fresh form – and you roll up your sleeves and you give him a new Security Check and you are all of a sudden going to find that he has withholds that he never suspected before. Now what is this all about? It means that the individual's responsibility rises with the general run on the Prehav Scale and it brings him up to a bunch of zones and areas where the overts have unlesened – the targets of the overts have unlesened. And if you don't get those withholds off and those overts off as they come up, of course the case will make no further progress from there on. He'll be in agony.

I saw this happen to a fellow one time. He had tremendous – he was an organizational staff member and he had tremendous overts on the organization – none of them very criminal. But the more he – they audited him, the worse off he got. It was his opinion there was nobody in the organization that was any good, the organization was no good and that everything it was selling was blue sky.

When he found out this wasn't the case – He'd been sitting back there in Lord knows what corner of his medulla oblongata he was living in – if he was living in that, it was probably the back of the tip of his right – his grandmother's right ear. All of a sudden, all these overts unlesened. See, they became overts. After that, they were perfectly justified, but they suddenly weren't justified anymore because the organization was some good.

_Coo!_ How horrible! And the guy just went into misery. He just went into _agony_. It was in Johannesburg but we weren't using Johannesburg Security Checks along with auditing at that particular time. And he moped and he moped and he moped and the more – the more effective the auditing got, the worse the fellow felt. Look that over.

Naturally, if he's been saying, "Scientology is no good" to himself all the time and yet here is Scientology working on him like mad, obviously Scientology is some good. Therefore the overts were on Scientology. He was being processed into his tomb practically. And the only way he finally saved his bacon was fly out of the organization and take up a job that didn't bring him into very much contact with Scientology. He did do that, too.

You get the exact mechanism which was proceeding there. As the individual went along, then, and improved in his case, no mechanism existed to thoroughly pull off all of his overts on life. So unless you pull off the person's overts on life fairly routinely as you're auditing him, as contained crudely, viciously and meanly in the Johannesburg Security Check, the person can get miserable under auditing gains. See, he's suddenly waking up and he realizes that there are some people around who aren't total tramps – amongst them, you, his auditor, or something like this. And this makes all of the meanness of his actions against you suddenly recoil on him.

Well, all right. If you believe in poetic justice don't give him a Johannesburg Security Check; just keep auditing him on as effective an auditing regimen as the Prehav Scale general
runs. You'll practically kill him! You see why? He's gaining in responsibility, therefore his overt is looking bigger and bigger and bigger to him and then don't give him any opportunity to get them off at all. Just skip that and go on and improve his case and improve his case and improve his case and don't give him any chance whatsoever to get off that. And, of course, he will get into a double twisteroo. His case doesn't dare improve because it'd kill him and he sets his heels and makes no auditing gains. You got the idea?

Now, there's the exact mechanism behind this May 25th HCOB bulletin. Now, this is what field auditors ought to be doing – they ought to learn their – how to do a Security Check. And they ought to learn how to give general runs on a Prehav Scale. And if they could do those two things, they would be in the stars. They would be getting case gains all over the place. Do you see that?

Every hour of auditing they put in would have some effectiveness and usefulness before it. Furthermore, they would make a Release. And that is how you make a Release. You give the fellow a Security Check. This puts him in communication with you to some extent – enough for the purposes of auditing. And then you assess him on the Prehav Scale – Primary, Secondary Scale. And then you run the level in a five-way bracket and you flatten one level, you flatten two levels – that's probably enough.

Now pick up the Security Check and give him a new Security Check and you're going to find some new things have turned up. You get those things off and he is now happy to progress some more. Otherwise, he won't be happy to progress any more because he's got these overts one way or the other.

So you give him his new Security Check and then you assess him and you run him on two more levels on the general Prehav Scale and then you give him another Security Check. And you're going to find out that every Security Check is a bit different. And warning: If the Security Checks aren't a bit different, he hasn't had any gain in responsibility and is making no case progress.

So the Johannesburg Security Check serves another purpose: it serves the purpose of telling you – total absence of graphs and tests – it tells you whether or not the case is making any gain. And if the case is making no gain, then there's obviously, these two things exist: First and foremost, he is either suffering with a tremendous ARC break with you or he's being audited straight up against a present time problem. One of those two things exist if he's making no case gain. That's all that exists, by the way, because you're going to get all the withholds with a Johannesburg Security Check. So it reduces no case gain down to fantastic ARC breaks or horrendous present time problems.

Now, how do you handle somebody's present time problem? Supposing you were a field auditor who didn't have any education along this line at all and you were giving somebody a present time problem sort-out. And this is the second time the person has come in to you with a tremendous present time problem with his mother-in-law and it just seems that this one is getting in your road all the time. Now, I'll let you in on something: it would be very easy for you to do this, a little less easy for somebody else to do this. You would assess the person on the Prehav Scale – Primary Scale only. Don't spend any time at it. Assess this person in the PT problem – in other words, the personnel of the PT problem on the Prehav
Scale – and run maybe two, three brackets only. Because look, it's such a microscopic piece of track that it won't run any time and your twenty-minute rule disappears instantly – the second that you handle the Prehav Scale, the twenty-minute rule vanishes. You couldn't run twenty minutes on a level on his former wife. You just couldn't do it! You see, you're running it by name and you just couldn't run that – that – that. You could run it on "a wife" or something like this, because this has got some track to it. But you couldn't run it that way. You got it?

All right. Now, you'd have to sort out, then, your rudiments. And this can get sometimes very tricky – sorting out your rudiments, Model Session, TRs and so forth. This can get out – this can be very tricky. Various things can happen. There are various boo-boos can be made one way or the other. The pc self-audits himself between sessions, is one of them. Pc has had a tremendous bust-up of some kind or another between sessions and you don't detect it and you audit him in spite of it. In other words, you've got present time problems or something of the sort messed up here. But you did – you mishandled the rudiments. That's all this amounts to. Something went wrong with the rudiments. And when I say, "Something went wrong with the rudiments," I simply mean, the person wasn't set up to go into session.

Now, there are ways of doing rudiments with a meter, but there's also your power of observation. And the pc comes in with one arm in a sling. Well now, you don't put him on the E-Meter to find out if he's had an accident to his arm. You get the idea?

The pc has been very, very able to talk to you in all other sessions and this session isn't saying a word. Something has changed here. Well, you'd better find out what it is, even though you've started the session. You know? And the pc formerly has been able to be – communicated with you, is perfectly happy, is perfectly cheerful in being audited and in – everything's going along fine, or is awfully mean in being audited and is awfully vicious and all of a sudden isn't mean or vicious. I'd sort of keep my eye open on it. [laughter] Maybe the pc is sunk into apathy or something. Could be, you see. Or the pc's gotten better.

I would at least ask him, "Have you – have you experienced any peculiar or particular change that you have noticed between the last session and now?"

The pc would say, "Oh, yes. I've decided I'll live." Well, this would account for his no longer being mean. But these wild changes that occur without your auditing are something that you should suspect. The commonest action is the pc leaves the session with the tone arm at 3 and returns to the next session with the tone arm at 5. Now, something has gone on between sessions, that's for sure.

But this straight routine: using your TRs and a Model Session, getting a Johannesburg Security Check, then running a couple of runs – general – on the Prehav Scale and Johannesburg Security Check is what you ought to tell field auditors to do and tell people to do who don't know how to do SOP Goals. You got the idea?

All right.

Thank you.
FLATTENING A PROCESS
AND THE E-METER

A lecture given on
1 June 1961

Here we are. I think this is the first of June. What planet is this? [laughter]

All right. All right. This is a seminar, the Briefing Course at Saint Hill. Now, what questions do you have today? Yes?

Female voice: Is it possible for us in TR on Model Session to have some training in the meter, because I found yesterday that an auditor I had, just hadn't got this. And I kept feeling "If she doesn't look at that meter, she's going to miss this fall." And --.

Yeah, that's right. I get that myself once in a while when being audited. You know, I say, "Well, where are we? Just where are we?" Because the auditor is sitting there doing an obsessive TR 0. He's not doing TR 0; he's doing obsessive TR 0, you see? Which means to them, "Look at the pc. Look him between the eyes before you shoot him", [laughter] or something. And this obsessive TR 0-you find this mostly in recent HPA students. They really go mad on this. They never do get themselves between the meter and the pc, you know?

You can actually confront a pc, you know, by looking at a meter. Did you know that?

Well, anyhow, anyhow, that is a good point that you have brought up. Now finish your question.

Female voice: Well, that's all. Is it possible for us to have that incorporated at a late stage as part of the TR 0 in training in Model Session?

I should say that would be perfectly all right. I'd say it would be a sort of a high-school version of it. You give the fellow a meter and let him have the meter in his lap while he's doing confronting.

The coach, however, is not on the meter. And the only time this was ever suggested, it was suggested that the coach hold a meter with the pc not on it. I never quite got why the coach would be holding a block of wood which looked like a meter. That was the exact earlier one. It didn't have anything to do with it.

But a block of wood or anything that had mass and weight, while doing TR 0, I'd say would be an upper-stage TR 0 and would be a very good thing to do. And while running Model Session and so forth, why, have a meter parked around. This would be a good thing. Your suggestion is very well taken. Your question is answered "yes."
Okay. Any other questions? ... Boy, I'm glad you're that smart. Gee, I'm glad you're that smart. You know, I – you know, when I get up that smart... [laughter] Gee, I'm going to be real proud of myself.

Well, if you haven't got a question, I will tell you about some mistakes that are made. The first and foremost of these mistakes is while running a level flat – running a level flat. This is the commonest mistake which is being made in HGCs, Academies, co-audits, from hell to Halifax: They don't run the levels right.

Now, let me give you a very brief summary of what this is all about. In the first place, we have discovered how to establish whether or not a process is flat. We have discovered how we can obey Auditor's Code Clause 13. That's for the first time, this question is answered for auditors.

I never have any trouble with this. A lot of auditors never have any trouble with it. But the majority of auditors do have trouble with it. "When is something flat?" That was the burning question, you see? Did the needle whistle at you, or what happened?

And as a consequence they overran and underran and so on. And there was a great deal of conversation around this particular point down through the years, trying to establish this and bring it home or develop some kind of a system by which the communication would become adequate. That communication has been developed and is found in E-Meter Essentials. You run the pc on the tone arm.

Now, there is an exception to this; there is an exception to this called the rock slam. And I will cover the rock slam as the exception in a moment, but don't think that I am not aware of this odd exception (and it isn't an exception).

But as long as the tone arm is waving about on a process, you are guilty of a breach of the Auditor's Code if you leave that process before the tone arm is motionless or nearly so. Now, we can communicate that, can't we? In other words, that E-Meter will sit there and it will tell you whether or not a process is flat.

Now, something can intervene in this. A pc between sessions – you should always notice where a pc reads before he goes out of session and notice where he is reading when he comes back into session. Because if the reading has materially changed – he's gone out and played with mud pies; and you'd better find out about it because he's got a withhold from the auditor and so forth.

That's the first and commonest error, by the way, of flattening a process. The pc goes out between sessions or even during a break, in an HGC, maybe goes, calls up her husband in Cincinnati or something of the sort and says, "Dear, I've just decided that you're the dirtiest, filthiest skunk I have ever heard of." Comes back into session again and that tone arm is reading 6.5, or it may even be reading 7.

You know, when a pc can't read on the meter, he is simply reading at 7 and that's not even a joke. Seven is between 1 and 6. And you'll occasionally find somebody who (quote) "won't read on a meter." Well, it's just due to: the mechanics of the tone arm don't turn through 7.
Responsibility increases from 2 to 1 to 7 to 6. And you're going to find a pc every now and then—it's not as rare as you think, running the hot bombs you're running—reading at 7.

All right. So let's say the pc was—went off the meter. This is the most baffling thing I've ever seen happen to an auditor. The pc is ordinarily reading at about 5, comes back on and isn't reading anyplace on the meter. And the auditor is liable to report the meter broken or something of the sort. Well, it's just a fluke. The pc has begun to read at 7. All right. Seven doesn't read on this meter, you see?

Seven is actually higher in responsibility than 1.

So anyhow, there ought to be a 7 on the meter. Okay. There is that variation.

Now, as this pc goes out of session reading at 5 and comes back into the session not reading on the meter at all or reading 6, or more ordinarily goes out reading at 3 and comes back into session reading 5, and you just go on running the process; the process isn't running. Why? Because something has happened to the pc that's given him this present time problem, and so forth. And the whole thing about that is your rudiments are out.

So therefore, when you stop sessions and give breaks and start sessions after these breaks, you always start the thing with Model Session. This keeps you from making these flumdumptious errors, don't you see? So it's always a good thing to end rudiments before you've had a break and start rudiments after you've had a break. I don't care whether it's a lunch break or a cigarette break, see? As long as the pc has gone out of your sight during that break, you're going to have to run end ruds and beginning rudiments. All right. Therefore, this won't get in the road with your flattening a process.

See, because that could be a vagary and throw this whole computation out. The pc is running; the tone arm is waving madly back and forth. You have a break, comes back; the tone arm isn't moving.

You say the process is flat and then you go on and assess for a new process. And now you have a level left unflat on the case and a pc being audited with a present time problem. You see, the solution to that is always keep your rudiments in; that is the smartest possible thing. Always keep your rudiments in.

Okay. Now, if you inevitably and invariably do this, you'll be all right. And this rule applies, then, of: you run a process as long as it produces tone arm motion. That tells you whether or not the process is flat.

Now, this little rule about a quarter of a tone or a half a dial, or something like that, is a safety factor. It won't trouble the pc and it won't assess again if it has gotten down to reading a quarter to an eighth of a dial of motion. You won't find that level again as hot. You understand?

If you leave it that way for about twenty minutes—you know, it's just moving that little bit over a period of twenty minutes—you can safely leave the process. That's the rule.

Now let's see how the rule is got around. There is lots of ways to get around these rules, and this is the one which has now come up. And this is being done everywhere broadly and with the maddest abandon imaginable. Now that we have a way to flatten the process, we
have abandoned the idea that it takes a process any time to get working. So you can run five processes in an afternoon if none of them ever started to work and leave five processes unflat in a single afternoon's auditing. And it has just been done.

London is just staggering around from "ARC breaks from Ron" and unable to flatten "O/W on Ron" today. [laughter] That's just literal truth. They're having an awful time because Ron came down at 12:20 last night, getting the last reports, and found – ooo! I spent an hour taking it apart and so forth. I found that pc after pc had just been run level after level. I couldn't let it happen one more day, could I? You certainly couldn't have put another five-and-a-half-hours' worth of unflat processes on it.

And somebody just actually took their finger totally off their number, and even though this has been part and parcel, occasionally on remarks, they had not caught it as it went by.

When a pc has to read or be assessed with a fairly high sensitivity knob to get a third-of-a-dial drop, this is always true, and it's occasionally true on other pcs. This is a rough pc, now. That's some pc that reads with a high sensitivity knob to get a third-of-a-dial drop; that is a pc that has a very low profile when he comes in. Any one of these conditions, not all of these conditions, have to be present to make this true. And it also may be that you're just running an awfully sticky level on any pc. You got the idea?

So this could happen at any time, that you assess for a process, and then the first three hours of run on it don't really produce any tone arm motion except a quarter to an eighth of a dial of motion, which of course is the definition for a flat process.

Well, let me ask you this: Why did it fall on assessment in the first place? What mystery do we have here?

Now, only a person who has got an occasionally floating needle, who is getting right up straight toward Clear, can possibly flatten one of these things down in minutes. You'll notice as a person is coming through toward Clear that they do flatten them in minutes, but then it becomes very obvious. The tone arm actually stops moving and it doesn't stick. It simply stops moving, with a fairly free needle. And it wouldn't do a bit of harm to overrun the process. Case is in a kind of condition to take it, you understand?

But these fellows that are – get these jerky tone arms and have a fairly sticky needle and have different reactions of various kinds will increase in read during the first period of auditing the new level. They'll increase in read, and then they'll get good tone arm motion. And then the tone arm motion will die out. And then, when it has read for twenty minutes for an eighth to a quarter of a dial of motion, it is flat.

So that is the whole statement – with the one exception which I will take up in a moment. That is the whole statement. In other words, motion quite often has to be run into the tone arm before it can be run out. You got it? And if a thing assessed and you didn't get any motion from the tone arm and you know this pc is not in marvelous condition yet and so on, boy, you just better keep running it.

And you – funny thing, you should ask yourself this question: "Why is it that hour after hour I can run this thing and it gets an eighth to a quarter? Why?" Well, it must be running
something. See, eighth to a quarter, eighth to a quarter, eighth to a quarter, so forth. It isn't tightening up.

The other phenomenon that you're trying to avoid is the needle freezing. Now, when a process is overrun on a bad-off case, the needle will freeze. The first symptom of this, you're entitled to know, is a rising arm, not a rising needle – forget rising needles – but you got a rising arm.

This pc has just been running along fine with a half of the tone arm dial division of motion. Been running dandy. Sometimes full division, sometimes a division and a half, sometimes a half a division, you know? I mean, it's just going along. And it's all between 3 and 3.25 on the tone arm dial, see? Between 3 and 3.25 here.

All right. We look at this and it's 3 – it's going 3, 3.25; maybe it'll go up above, see – 3, 3.25, so on, like this and here we go. And we – all of a sudden, 4, 4.25, 4, 4.25, 4, 4.5 and we say, "Boy, that was a nice move."

Test it for twenty minutes because it's liable not to be that stick; it's liable to blow down, see? But the first symptom of a flattening process is a rising tone arm.

Now, there are some auditors around trying to prevent tone arms from rising or thinking they've boo-booed if the tone arm starts rising. As a case is entered into processing originally, you will see this as the first... Maybe some of the mystery of how I know whether or not your – the level you're running on the pc is flattening out will explode under just this one fact: It's the fact you've started to get higher reads consistently, see? In the last hour you've been getting higher reads and those higher reads didn't blow down.

Now, if the higher reads were going to blow down, they would ordinarily have blown down in about twenty minutes or so. You see, they would have acted.

But that, as it drifts up first from a very minute motion... This is the actual behavior on the flattening of a process on a pc who is not – he's not up even to Release yet, is quarter, quarter, quarter, an eighth, eighth, quarter, quarter, quarter. And then all of a sudden you start getting it up, and it goes up about a dial. And then it goes little bit, little bit, quarter, quarter, quarter.

Boy, then it's the danger point, because this thing can actually go up to 5 suddenly and go clank! And you can practically hear the thing go clank.

Now, there's no danger in it going clank. There is no danger in it going clank and suddenly sticking and you going on auditing it that way for twenty minutes. It is just going to make the pc uncomfortable. It's going to make the pc uncomfortable and you're going to have to reassess and you're probably going to have to reassess with difficulty because the bank is kind of froze up. That's the most that'll happen to you.

If you were to run this for three days, sitting at 5 on a total freeze, as an auditor has done – two days, this was done by an auditor. And of course, my God, you couldn't have assessed the case; you couldn't have done anything with the case except one thing: run the auditor off on the Prehav Scale. The auditor will assess.
Did you know that an auditor will always assess when he has boo-booed? You know, you can – you always take all the bad auditing off of a case, if you run into any? You know that? And if you're real clever, and because you're here and I can tell you, it's all right to run very brief terminals; but if you take somebody who's only been with the guy for twenty-five hours and you run that on the Prehav Scale, well, it's sort of one command or something like this. And it's just too brief and it is – it's messed up; it gets messed up.

So on a twenty-five or a fifty-hour pc – I mean, where the auditor has only been with him for, oh, I don't know, at the outside a hundred hours or something like this – you'd better take the case apart with some old-time process. You understand?

"What have you thought about that auditor?" "What have you not told that auditor?" Any kind of an O/W situation or something of this sort.

Now, if the auditor is, let us say, the husband or wife of the pc you're trying to straighten out on this, or if there has been a long association going up in terms of years, now this, then, is a long-duration PT problem. "Long duration" is defined as years. That's a long-duration PT problem: years. A short-duration PT problem is in terms of months or weeks, see? We say long and short and then don't leave you wondering what we mean by long and short. It's years.

So it's all right to take a PT problem of long duration – i.e., years – and assess that person as a terminal by name on the Prehav Scale and run that level, and reassess and run the level.

Now look, do you know that it's probably less than fifteen minutes a level? It may be as little as that. This is one of the exceptions to the running, flattening on the tone arm, see? It's an exception. But of course you're doing something exceptional, so it's not much of an exception.

You're doing something very exceptional. You're taking a person that – well, they've known each other for ten years and you're running it on the Prehav Scale, which is calculated to go on the whole track. So you're doing something exceptional, so you have an exceptional answer. And it disobeys the twenty-minute rule. Twenty-minute rule – you don't run that for twenty minutes to find out if it's flat, see? See, this is a – this is not the same thing we're talking about.

When is a general level of the Prehav Scale flat? That is to say, we're just running it generally. You know, "Whom have you failed to help," you know, and that sort of thing. That's a general run, the generalized terminal: "someone," "somebody," you know, something like that. General run.

Or an SOP Goals terminal, which means a selected general terminal. But it's a selected terminal, see? All right. That terminal, of course, that will just run and run and run and run and run and run and run and run, because you – the pc's attention is fixed on it. He's in – zoo-fooog.

Now, these general runs – that is, "someone," "somebody," "Whom have you failed to not help somebody?" "Whom have you desperately not intended to help and prevented everybody from helping?" You know, that kind of a question. Very broad, you know?
All right. That has a briefer run. So your longest run will be found ordinarily on the SOP Goals selected terminal. Your next longest type of run is your general run, and those are long grinds very ordinarily. And it is those I am talking about – those two types of run, where you find the tone arm unsticking and beginning to move early in the process, then moving well, and then fading out and getting down. And eventually – early in processing – they will stick.

Well, if you can stop it just short of the stick, you're a good auditor. And you'll find it very easy to assess and all is well and so forth. But even so, you won't be in trouble, even though you stick it for twenty minutes.

But look-a-here, don't you stick it longer than twenty minutes. An absolutely fixed, frozen-tight needle for twenty minutes – you would have seen it approaching for a long time if you'd been watching. Motion would have gotten less and less and less and less and less, and it freezes.

Now, that is different from the person suddenly swooping from 3 to 5 and then it doesn't move at 5 for fifteen minutes or something like this, and all of a sudden goes to 2. Or the person sticking absolutely at 6.5 and then suddenly swooping to 1. This kind of an action is not an expected – you wouldn't expect that needle now to stick.

But this sticking needle is going to come about when you were running it all right and it already looked like it was getting flat and your flat rule would have taken it off then. And then it suddenly rose up and began to move even less. Now, all of a sudden it'll either move a little bit up, usually, or a little bit down and go clank! You can smell the rubber burning. [laughter]

Now, if you continue to run that tone arm while it's in that condition, day after day, man, you're not doing Scientology because you're in violation of Clause 13. You are running a process which no longer produces change.

The only change it's going to produce, of course, is just sort of cave everything in. But it's not a beneficial change.

So the process is not producing change, so you get off of it; here and now, you get off of it.

All right. Now, what is this other exception? I said, then, that this rule is not followed – going on with these things: the long-duration PTP. The guy for the last five years has been having trouble with his leg and he just sits in the auditing session with this hidden standard. He runs cows, crocs and alligators with great happiness. And at each moment after he runs the command, or every few commands, why, he kind of thetawise looks down at his leg, you see, to see whether or not that has been affected. "Well, alligators didn't fit in that leg, so it must be something else," you see? He's running with his attention fixed on something else. And he broke his leg five or ten years ago and it has troubled him ever since.

Well, you can assess that leg – and by the way, you can even assess it this way: His name, let us say, is John; you can assess "John's leg," something of that sort. It's always best to inspect the meter for a bit of reaction, but oddly enough, you don't even have to, to do that. You just know this is a long-duration PT problem. The best way to do it is to make a list of
terminals that the pc thinks it is. And then take a specific one, not take a general one. See, you
don't want this thing to be a profession. You don't want it to be a profession, that's all. Be-
cause he'll run on it for quite a while if you take it as a general thing, see?

You could even say, "your leg" – point to it now and then; bring him out of the past –
and it'll run. It'll run on the Prehav Scale. But of course, "flat process" as a law doesn't apply,
then, to a terminal which is a specific terminal being run or a problem of long duration.

By "long" we mean years. We don't mean – we don't actually mean longer than one
lifetime, see? That's within this lifetime.

And if we do that, voilà! We will have that thing taped.

But we run it on the needle. We just keep an eye on the needle – clank, clank.

Now, oddly enough, you will get tone arm motion, but it's a kind of a waste of time to
kind of track the tone arm motion. All of a sudden, the thing kind of frees up, the needle kind
of frees up or sticks, or something like this. And you ask about it, you'll find out the tone arm
has stopped, too.

But now, look-a-here. Here's the problem. If you ran this for twenty minutes – look,
the whole run in the first place was only ten minutes. Now you're going to test it for twenty
minutes when there was a ten-minute run, huh? This doesn't – this isn't bright, see? It's some-
thing like measuring the depth of a teacup with a Kelvin Fathometer. You see, it's just not
smart.

So you have to kind of run it on the needle. That takes a lot of auditor judgment to run
one of these things. You can't be a bad auditor and handle a present time problem of long du-
ration, that's for sure. You'll flub it every time. And also you can't run a pc, horribly enough,
who has a present time problem of long duration, on any other process than a present time
problem of long duration. There it is. That's it; you've had it.

So the moral of that is, audit well.

Now, there is the exception I spoke to you about, which is running the rock slam, and
that's not really a violation of "a process is flat when it no longer produces tone arm motion."
I'll show you this very clearly that if you had set here –. Now, you know a rock slam; a rock
slam is pretty – pretty wild here. And a rock slam can be kind of this, this, this wide, see?
That's a pretty good-looking rock slam, isn't it?

All right. Now, there it is, slamming back and forth there. It's going two, three inches.
Actually, rock slams can be a quarter of an inch wide, too, you know. But they're erratic.
They're not a theta bop. A theta bop is as even as a metronome and a rock slam is very erratic.

And look – look what would happen now – look what happens to the tone arm as I
make it rock slam. You got it? See – see what the tone arm is doing while I make this thing
rock slam. Hmm? Look at what the tone arm is doing. See, I've got this meter just sitting here,
just turned on and on set, and if – to make it rock slam doing that. Well now, I'm doing that
with my hand. But supposing the pc was doing it to it with its bank.

An auditor –. I have to tell you a joke, by the way. I just got one through the lines the
other day – this just – just got it through the lines. This was very, very amusing, and I hope
when the auditor hears, he won't be ARC broke. But I was quite interested. I misunderstood him completely.

He said, "The pc can reactively influence the E-Meter, so I'm having a difficult time running the pc."

And so I told him, well, I'd exorcised all the demons out of the thing, so he needn't worry about that.

But listen, that wasn't his question. That wasn't what his question meant at all. He believed that this pc was peculiar in that the pc's reactive bank was operating the E-Meter.

Now, this is an awfully good joke on this auditor because that is what an E-Meter is for [laughter] and what it was designed to do. And of course, the E-Meter always tells you before the pc knows about it. You see, even though it's just a split second, the meter knows before the pc does. So the common and ordinary action is, of course, to ask a pc a question, you get a fall on the meter, you say, "What was that?"

And the pc said, "Oh, was there something there?"

You know, that's kind of his feeling. Whether it's just for half a second, he's still got a feeling on it. He will once in a while kind of feel the jolt in himself and tell you, but he has this "Glmmp," you know, "What was that?" you know?

And then he says, "Oh – oh – oh – well, that's the time I robbed the bank. It was nothing much. I robbed the bank, yeah. Whew!" and the meter frees.

And that's what an E-Meter is for. And this auditor asked me, actually – put the question to me that this was a peculiar pc and that the peculiarity is that the reactive bank acted on the meter. But look, that's a good thing. This auditor, when he finally gets the answer to that, he has actually made a virgin observation of the thing, and he'll all of a sudden come up with an awful cognition on this. [laughter] You got the idea?

Well, that's better than just fooling around with it – with a box – because Ron said to, you know? And I think that in past years auditors used to do that. They just used to fool around with the box because Ron said you had to have one in your lap. [laughter] Because I would find the most remarkable settings on meters sometimes, and so forth, and all kinds of things going on, that had nothing to do with the pc or the case. It is connected directly to the pc's reactive mind so, of course, you get this answer.

Now, supposing the reactive mind was moving this, that way; and instead of you seeing it on the needle here, supposing the needle were being moved by the pc's reactive mind. To hold the needle at set, your tone arm would be doing this, see? My God, what – what – how much meter action do you want? How much tone arm action do you want, see? Get the idea? Look at that!

And you see, that's about what the reaction is causing over here, see? Meter can't even keep up with it. How much action do you want?

Well, the oddity is that when you're running a pc whose goal has rockslammed…
I'll tell you another little peculiarity, while I'm going by it, I noticed the other day. You know, the goal becomes less intense after you find the terminal. Did you know that?

Do you know why that is? Because the goal is the significance which surrounds the terminal. And the person's attention has been yanked off the goal over onto the terminal, where it was fixed anyhow. You got it? So therefore the goal, after you found the terminal, usually will read less now than the terminal.

For a very short period of time the goal reads as much as the terminal, but after you've assessed an awful lot of terminals, that goal starts looking awfully thin and ragged. And it still will – will flick a bit – it'll still react a bit – but it was the right goal. And it isn't the time for you to start doubting, "Well, was that the right goal?"

Now, you could probably strip a goal off by stripping the fellow's attention off all the terminals that that goal was represented by, see, and then the goal would go null. And the terminals went null. And then you go back and look for the goal and the goal goes null.

You see, the person's attention is fixed on the terminal. See, there is nothing in a goal for his attention to be fixed on. That is just air and theta. See, that's nothing. But a terminal is something, mmm. And he got into this goals line. And what you're doing is reversing this situation. He had a problem that had to do with a terminal, so he then reactively achieved a goal to solve this problem. And the goals he comes up with are solutions: If he could just do this, then that series of problems would be solved. You see, that's what a goal is. It's a solution to the problems which have been given him, usually by terminals.

And of course a terminal can also be just an idea to him, too – which is a bum thing; we hope it isn't.

He was approached all of a sudden by this terminal, and it – he got a problem – probably got some overts on the terminal or something. And then eventually, because he got overts on terminals in this way, the terminal itself approaching him could overwhelm him. That leaves his attention fixed on the terminal.

The little tag that is hanging out on the bank is "goal." You can always reach the goal, whereas you very often don't reach the terminal with any other assessment, see? I have found a more reliable tag in the goal. It's a little label, and it's sort of hanging out here in the light from the dark, dark bank, you see? And it's a little red tag and it says, "On the other end of this thing is something that has overwhelmed the living daylights out of me. If you will pull here, package will open neatly." [laughter]

First observation that something like this would happen, by the way, is clear back in 49. Every engram, by the way, leaves its own little tag. The whole track may be in a complete, spinning loop; all parts of the track are all parts of the track, and there it is in a crumpled ball. The odd part of it is that there's always this little tag reaching out of the ball that you can pull, and the track starts coming apart. You got the idea?

I'll give you an example. This boy has always been worried about red caps. Red caps actually upset him, and for some reason or other red caps are a very desperate and violent thing, so we'd better not have much to do with them. You get the idea? Red caps.
All right. You go into this case on the subject of red caps, and you will find a nice, great big, juicy engram that the pc knew nothing about. He was in a desperate automobile accident at the age of six and he hasn't a clue about it, but the driver of the other car was wearing a red cap. You see, there's always a piece of the engram showing.

Well, now, we've gotten smart enough here so that there's a piece of the whole track showing and that's called a goal. And you start knocking these goals out, one after the other – you actually do start knocking goals out; it's a form of auditing – and as you move ahead trying to find a goal, you eventually will find the biggest tag that has been left out. See, this little red tag, and it's the biggest, most visible one and nothing will pull that tag. And that is attached to the toughest terminal that overwhelmed the pc. You got it?

So now you're going to do your Goals Assessment. Well, don't be amazed that the little red tag now isn't quite so red. See, we pulled it; we've got fingerprints on it now. And it isn't quite representing what it represented before.

So after you've found a goal, you've proved the goal out, and it's there and it won't change and it won't move and that is it and there it is, boom – now we actually follow the string down and find out what it was attached to. The pc's attention of course goes, clang! onto the terminal where it was fixed anyhow and this little red tag will not read as much on the meter now. The goal won't read as much on the meter. The terminal will now read more than the goal, after you've really shook the terminals out. You got the idea? It's only for a little while that this tag will read.

Now, when you've got that terminal flat you've got to check for the tag again. And when you check for the tag again it's liable to come back and read better, because you've got his attention freed off of it and it may be attached to something else, too. So you always inspect the goal again. So goals tend to disappear on meter read, but they still flick, they still click and so forth.

All right. As you're running this case on assessment, this case develops, on the goal, a rock slam. And as you're assessing, you just – rock slams become more and more visible, more and more visible and many falls are apt to drop into the category of rock slam. You start with a fall and you wind up with a rock slam. You got the idea?

When you've got a rock slam assessment on a goal, you'll have a rock slam assessment on the terminal or you haven't got the right terminal.

Now, you rock slam assess on the pc on the Prehav Scale. In other words, you assess only for levels that rock slam. Have you got the idea? You're running a rock slam case and it's all going to rock slam from here on out. Have you got that? Everything is going to rock slam.

So naturally in running the case you run the rock slam out. And if you don't have a rock slam – this is a conditional rule; needs to be proven out a bit more, but I think you'll find it holds true. When your rock slam has been gone – there's no rock slam of any magnitude – for a period of twenty minutes that level is flat for that terminal. You got it?

Why? Well, your rock slam is now somewhere else on the Prehav Scale. And the more you run an ordinary falling level, the more your pc is going to get upset because his attention
is affixed over on here, you see, and he can't keep his attention off of it. So he's actually shooting to another part of the Prehav Scale. Got it?

So you run rock slams out and the same rule applies. The rule applies uniformly and routinely. And that is simply this: that if you have assessed on a rock slam – whether on a general level or on a terminal/goal level – if you're assessing rock slams you must run the rock slam out only. And then for twenty minutes there must be no rock slam on that terminal. And that's, by the way, by the stopwatch practically; that's really twenty minutes. Then you can consider that level flat and reassess. And you reassess and find where the rock slam is now. And now you will get a new level that is rock slamming and you run that out. You got the idea? That's running by rock slam.

But as I've just demonstrated to you, a rock slam is a **terrific** amount of tone arm motion – fantastic amount, even though it's not visible. It's the needle that's going, not the tone arm. But if you were to hold that needle at set – if you could – you see, that was how your tone arm would be going for that level.

Now, it can happen that a present time problem of long duration can rock slam, and that means that the pc is on his rock chain, which is his goals chain in this particular case. That's why we call it rock slam, because that's his rock chain. And his goal is sitting on his rock chain. And so you're running right on down his rock chain.

Now, you're probably going to find more rock-slamming pcs than you really suspect exist. There are quite a few of them around. They are not a rare phenomenon. But that's how you do a rock slam.

If you do a general assessment and one of the levels rock slams, you've had it, because you now have to assess for rock slam. You won't find anything but rock slams on this case. You may find a fall, a fall, a fall, and then all of a sudden rock slams during the assessment.

Well, a rock slam persists. And the difficulty in assessing a rock slam is that the rock slam persists for several levels after you've turned it on. So, there is a rule about this: Every time when you're running a Prehav Assessment or you're running a Goals Assessment or something and you turn on a rock slam, don't go to the next five levels without getting rid of the rock slam.

Now, how do you get rid of a rock slam? You can run, essentially, TR 10. That gets rid of a rock slam. You just say, "Floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor," and there's no rock slam. You got the idea? Now you say the next level. But boy, do you note that that one you just had rock slammed because that's now what you're going to be looking for. You start turning rock slams on, on a case, that's what you'll follow down to. Okay?

All right. Good enough. I hope you're doing all right with your training, and I hope your auditing is coming along fine. You all look better.

All right. If you get a lot brighter tomorrow, why, you'll have some questions. Okay? [laughter]

Thank you.

_Audience:_ Thank you.
Thank you.

I was just looking at a car outside that's got a hole in its fender. [laughter] And I tried to audit it, and it didn't respond. So. It's in apathy. (That's what you call line charging one present time problem out of existence.)

Okay. This is what? The 2nd of June, isn't it?

All right. Now I trust you have some good questions today, and what's the first one? Yes?

*Male voice: Regard to energies and flows and the Prehav Scale.*

Uh-huh? Yeah?

*Male voice: Well, sort of a general question. Well, sort of – Could you give us some –?*

All right. I'll give you some gen on that. That's a very simple question and a good one.

We have this kind of a situation in a mind where we have a phenomenon where an individual has flowed in one direction too long. Whether that is out or in, he has flowed in one direction too long. Let's take something on which I have a fair subjective reality: A writer who has written too much. You know, he's just written-written-written-written. It's out-out-out-out-out-out.

All right. Let's take another example. Let's take a shipping clerk, and he ships-ships-ships-ships-ships-ships.

And one fine day he wakes up and he says – the writer says, "If I have to write one more book, I've had it. I think I will go off and join the French Foreign Legion." And the shipping clerk says, "Well, I feel very degraded and I'm going to quit." Why?

Because these things have flowed in one direction. Well, it's a phenomenon, an electrical phenomenon really, and we get an awful lot of our material from the field of nuclear physics, or used to, and now we're telling nuclear physics. That is to say, we're in a position now where we know a lot about energy and so forth, that the boys crawling in and out of the woodwork at the atomic-energy-university-grant areas never heard of, and are always quite amazed about. The phenomena of standing waves, of tendencies of flow, sizes of particles, or...
if there are any, and such things as this, are probably getting better known to us than to other people.

And you get a ridge because, actually, of the inertia of a particle. It's no more complicated than that. There's a little bit of Newton's law of interaction mixed up in all mental activities by people who have gravity effective on them. Now, if you're affected by gravity and you don't float off into the air, then to some degree or another you're affected by Newton's law of interaction.

Well, that's nothing much to you, nor here nor there, but actually is the basic reason for – and the postulates causing this thing – are the basic reason for frozen flows. "For every action there is an equal and contrary reaction."

All right, thetan believes this, so when he pushes a particle out, he also has the reaction, you see, of the particle coming back, you see? For instance, we push this E-Meter, and the E-Meter pushes slightly against us.

Well, Newton's law of interaction is not true, fortunately. It is only true for objects of comparable size and mass. The *reductio ad absurdum* is you stamp against Earth, Earth stamps against you. Well, I've never had Earth stamp against me, so – except when I was up in airplanes and got careless and didn't keep the airplane under me or something like that, and then it was obvious that I was standing still and Earth was moving toward me. The point is, here, that for objects of comparable magnitude – a push against the E-Meter, you can actually feel it in your hand; there's a slight backpush.

All right. The facsimiles of these backpushes are neglected. Your attention is on the E-Meter, don't you see? Be pushing it. Well, your attention – the attention of the writer is on pushing out the words and pages, and the attention of the shipping clerk is putting out books, you see?

All right. So if this is the case, then they utterly neglect and rarely as-is – because they're not terribly aware of it – this little backpush. Every time you throw a book in the mails, you see, why there was so much effort coming back toward one, and it's neglected.

Similarly, let's say, the colored gentleman who has a good, high-paid job: sticking his head through a canvas and letting people throw baseballs at him. I think that's a well honored profession of one time or another in carnivals and so on. All right. So here he has these baseballs coming in at him all the time – the visible picture, you see, is made of everything, but his attention goes on the incoming baseball.

Yeah, but as this baseball is coming in, actually there is a contrary reaction that he pays no attention to, because he's interested in the baseball. He's not interested in that contrary reaction. He wishes there were more of it, if anything, you see, to slow that baseball down. And the next thing you know, he will have too many baseballs thrown at him.

Now, he's actually the – it isn't the injuries of the baseballs or anything; it's just the fact that he's built up a ridge in front of his face that consists of not the *incoming* baseball, but the resistance going back *against* the baseball. You got the idea? Well, it's the resistance back against that baseball that sticks there, not the baseballs. So he has too many baseballs thrown at him and all of a sudden gets a horrible feeling of pushing out that way.
Similarly, the fellow mailing too many books gets a horrible feeling of a mysterious, undefinable pushing back against himself. You've got the idea? And he couldn't possibly explain what this pushing back against himself is. He feels like he has pressure on himself.

Why, I had somebody the other day talking about she felt she had pressure on her face, see? Well, it's just this – it's the reverse push. So therefore it's inexplicable. He knows it can't be books, you see, because books go out, and this pressure he's feeling is coming in.

And the fellow with his head through the canvas: He knows it couldn't be baseballs because baseballs come in, whereas this pressure makes him feel like he's losing everything in front of him. You got the idea?

Well, he'll feel like he's losing everything in front of him up to a point where he can't lose any more in front of him without it becoming painful. See, he's got an outpush. See, the reaction of the mind against this incoming object is this outpush, this outpush, this outpush.

And the next thing you know, he just figures he can't push out one more thing. If he did, it'd kill him. He's sure of this. And at this moment he has a stuck flow. If you ask him to push out one more thing, he says, "That's impossible." The one thing in the world he knows he can't do is push out that one more item, and he goes unconscious. And that is dope-off. It's flowed too long in any one direction. It's not a simple mechanism where just "flow too long in any one direction produces a stuck flow." I've given you the whole gen of it here. It actually produces a reverse flow. Flow too long in any one direction produces a reverse flow to it. You got the idea?

So frankly, at that stage of the game it's a toss up whether he's going to pass out because you throw a baseball at him, or he's going to pass out because he resists something or tries to push something away from him.

Get this exercise: "Now get the idea of a baseball being thrown at you. Now get the idea of throwing away something." That's as far as it's going to run without locking up, you see, because you – now you've got to say, "Get the idea of a baseball thrown at you. Now get the idea of throwing away something." What are we doing?

In essence, we're running, really, a flow that is all in one direction, but we're running the flow itself and his resistance to it alternately, and it goes flip-flop, flip-flop, apparently.

Now, we say, "Get the idea of a baseball being thrown at you." "Thank you." "Get the idea of a baseball being thrown at you." "Thank you." "Get the idea of a baseball thrown at you." "Thank you." Now, one of two things is going to happen: Either the field or the energy particles in front of his face are all going to go black – see, that's a symptom of a stuck flow – or he's all of a sudden going to get an avalanche triggered, and the next thing you know, all the baseballs that have ever been thrown at him, hit him.

That's an avalanche. Brrrrrrrr! – they come in, you see? He could just as easily get an avalanche of resistance. But he'd be in awful bad shape to get the avalanche of resistance, you got the idea? Actually, what we mean by an inversion is the avalanche of resistance. You see? The fellow has no longer any effect from it coming in. He's only affected by resisting it.
Now, if you want to see some guy in this kind of a state – and they are around, in practically any case you could find this mechanism on them – you say to this fellow, "Now get the idea of resisting a baseball", and he gets the baseball in his face. Now you say, "Get the idea of a baseball hitting you", and he feels like he's going to fall over on his face because he feels himself pushing out. You got the idea? These flows have exactly turned around. And that's what we know as an inversion, and that's actually why we call it an inversion. Because it's a flow gone backwards.

Now, postulates follow this kind of a thing, you see, and the fellow will change his mind on the postulate. Instead of interest, he gets a peculiar interest. Well, it follows down the mechanics of this other thing.

Now, why don't we run O/W, O/W, O/W, O/W. Of course, O/W is just dandy because that's out, it's in, it's out, it's in; it's reach, withdraw, reach, withdraw, but only from one person. And let me tell you something about reach and withdraw from one terminal: It doesn't account for all of the motions possible.

Now, as long as the individual is below change, O/W is effective. And he only runs well on O/W from what he caused and what he withheld – as long as he's below change. That's the make-break point of O/W. "O/W, A Limited Theory" – I call your attention to that bulletin. I give you another datum right on the top of that bulletin right now, and that is that the limited theory of O/W stops at the level of change. There is the point below which O/W is 100 percent effective, and above which it ceases to be effective. Change is the explanation of it all. Why?

Well, I'm sorry. I don't feel as glib today as I did the other day when I explained it to somebody very glibly. But it was sort of interesting. It's a sort of an involved explanation, and there'll probably be a better explanation for it, but I explained it perfectly and then I didn't listen to myself. [laughs] And – but it was – it's like this: the outflow and the inflow gets locked up in some particular fashion. And then below this level, the individual is totally individuated: he can no longer change his viewpoint; he can no longer experience change; and the moment he becomes very afraid of a change occurring – leaving him on some individuated point of the bracket – . And as they go crazy, they don't go down from O/W.

On a lunatic, a real raving lunatic, you'd probably have to find the bracket that was live, and it would be way below O/W. See, it'd be some, oh, I don't know, any one of thirty-two sides of the bracket, you see. It would be what others were doing to others that would be the only side of the bracket that would work. It'd be the others doing it to others or something like that, and then that would be terrible. They have great reality on others doing it to others, and as you shook his mind up about it a little bit, you'd just shift him around on the bracket and he'd say, "Well isn't it terrible how I caused World War II." When you know personally he was – he had a body in pawn on Mars at the beginning of it, you know. He'll all of a sudden come up with obsessive cause. Well, actually that's a high point, but it stays in for quite some time. As long as the individual is allergic to change, he individuates, because the change on various flow lines are extremely productive of these ridges.

Let's say the individual is fluid on the subject of change. He doesn't mind change. He can handle change; he can experience change. So therefore, the baseball coming in and hitting
the fellow with his head through the canvas – well, if he could experience all the changes that were there, he wouldn't resist it.

But if he starts resisting the changes and starts setting up this Newton's law of interaction, the next thing you know, why, he's halfway around the bend on the subject of O/W. He thinks there will be a consequence of everything he does. He just knows he won't be able to breathe without there being a consequence. All he's got to do... therefore, to go through life – it's a perfect solution – is that every time you pass a sporting goods store, you don't look in the window and see a baseball lying there on display, you see? That's a good one! That's fine! Now, we know that. That's safe. You know? He knows there's going to be a consequence to what he does – everything he does.

So he knows better than to walk down blocks that have sporting goods stores in them. And then he knows better than to go downtown where there might be that block. And then he knows better than to go out in the yard, because, you see, he might see the town. And we get the odd phenomenon of somebody being stuck in the house, and then we can't figure out: Why is this man stuck in the house? And we start running houses. No, it's baseballs. [laughter]

Now there's the goofball reach of this, and it's practically unplumbable. But you can follow it down with an E-Meter and find out why the individual is stuck in the house: He's trying to avoid being hit in the face with baseballs that are no longer being thrown at him, and this is very logical. "All – all horses sleep in bed" sort of a proposition.

By the way, that's becoming such a stable datum that somebody told me the other day that they were going to start making Simmons beds for horses.

Anyway, here's – here is your change. So when an individual can no longer tolerate change, he becomes afraid of consequences, because the consequences of change, of course, are change. And he can no longer stand by consequences, so therefore, he's going to have consequences. So the moment that he's worried about consequences, why, he's into the O/W bracket. And that's why everybody on this planet can run O/W so easily at lower stages. But as you go up on SOP Goals, you run out of this.

And I have not burdened your brains, and I have let you waste some auditing time, by making you run all brackets from the beginning on everything, because the Prehav Scale is fairly rapid and it will very shortly catch up with all brackets. You got the idea? The change gets leveled for a level of the Prehav Scale. In other words, a tolerance comes up. And all of a sudden, instead of it only being effective on himself to others, it becomes effective on other brackets.

Now also in view of the fact that the individual can be stuck on these other brackets and then it'll bring it back onto himself, for a case below average or a case above average, it is safest to run brackets. You got the idea? And for the average case, you waste a little time running brackets. But you had better not tangle your wits up with at what point he ceases to have the O/W mechanism sort of thing function – cease functioning. At what instant, on what subject does he have this function? Well, I couldn't calculate it myself, so I'm not going to expect you to. So the safe thing to do is run brackets. You got the idea?
So fear of consequence, which is to say fear of change, results, then, in a resistance to change which brings in Newton's law of interaction. The guy must resist changes or motions. So as soon as he has to resist changes or motions, he starts setting up these ridges as I described to you at the first part of that – this statement, you see. And when these ridges are set up, the only way to take them apart is take them apart on both sides alternately. You take apart the push out, you take apart the push in. Therefore, it doesn't matter whether the individual is stuck on pushing things out or stuck on pulling things in; you're going to take apart both of it anyhow. And then it doesn't matter if he's really spiny on some point or another, as most any mind is, another bracket out here to another. You know, this interchange out here. He's dispersed outside of himself and this is really the one he's running and – while he's sitting over here and not running it. So it's best to have that bracket functioning, too, don't you see? And you save time and you don't bog a case.

Now, what it requires to run the exact number of commands necessary to get the exact flow out of the road is actually beyond your ability to detect at this stage of the game. But running all sides of a bracket evenly takes care of all the flows you will encounter without jamming any. So it's a way out of the rat race.

Now, if an individual goes unconscious – which is to say he can't confront the change – if he goes unconscious at some point while you're running a good five-way bracket, one of two things is wrong: He's either got a bracket that is so unbalanced that it won't take both sides of it. (So, well, all right. So what. So he goes unconscious. He'll recover.) Or more particularly, he isn't doing one of your commands. And in view of the fact that this is the only one that can get in your road – that he isn't doing one of the commands of the brackets somewhere – then when a pc goes unconscious, you should always check if he is having tremendous difficulty with and isn't answering one side of the bracket. And if he isn't, all right! Don't hang him with it. Just check him over, you know?

The way you do that is you ask – just once around – you ask him the question, "Did you – ", not "Have you been answering it," but "Did you answer that?" Just once around. "Now, did you answer that to your satisfaction?" And the fellow says, "Well, uuhh, no, I – as a matter of fact, I never have been able to answer that leg of the bracket."

In other words, you're – you're inadvertently guilty of having given a number of auditing commands without getting an answer, and you must always – one of the basic rules of auditing is you always get an answer to your auditing command. One command, one answer. One answer, one command, also.

Although that sometimes gets disobeyed when you run into a very looped up bracket that'll avalanche. You know, you're on some hot subject with the pc, and it goes brrrrrrt! and you've got a whole bunch of them. And the funniest thing I ever saw was a pc in a staff Clearing Course one time, sitting there, he said, "I can't answer the what have you failed to help, you see, because it just keeps going through my mind..." And he looked very round-eyed at the auditor and he said, "It just keeps going through my mind: 'Who, who, who, who, who.' You just triggered the automatic side of the bracket. That's all there is to it.

Now, does that answer your question, Ken?

*Male voice: Yes it does. Thank you.*
All right. We got another question? Okay. Gee, I'm glad you're getting smarter. Yeah, Jan?

Female voice: One came up today which was on just how much, on American meter, the relaxation of the pc's hands while running a process may influence the tone arm position, and whether it's just okay to allow for this. And I checked how much it just was with somebody not being audited, and whether you could just allow for that relaxation of the hands as being indicative of some mass shifting, so you count it as process effect anyway. See what I mean?

Don't worry too much about it.

Female voice: Just don't worry about it.

It's just like I ask a pc, "Now, all right. Now, have you got a withhold?" And he wraps both cans around his head and changes the shape of his feet and – and kicks the E-Meter and backs up and coughs a couple of times and so forth. Well, I say it read. It read. I ask him again just to make sure. It always does. Similarly, this is just taken into the gross error of the situation. Trying to eliminate anything like that as an error would be nearly impossible.

Female voice: Yeah. It amounted to practically half a tone on an American meter...

Sure.

Female voice: ... just a relaxation of the hands that wasn't even visible, particularly.

That's right. I wouldn't worry about it too much ...

Female voice: Yeah. All right.

... because they're not going to relax and tighten their hands for the bracket.

Female voice: Yeah.

You know. You've got a meter – an inherent error in any meter that has to do with the pc being connected to it. And it's not a very gross error.

You can do some weird things. You can have the pc hold to the tips of the electrodes just with his thumb and finger, and get one of the highest tone arms you ever cared to see – nice, heavy, high tone arm with a heavy needle. Yeah, you can just have him hold – just hold the tips of the can, just barely touching both cans, and you get a very tough looking pc. But you can get a workman with calluses and have him hold onto the cans, and you don't get a tough looking pc because of the calluses.

The size of the person's hand might have something to do with it. A lot of factors could enter into it, but actually it's not gross. It's not enough to bother with. The E-Meter tells you most everything you want to know. And in view of the fact that you're adjudicating basically on reaction of the meter over a given period of time, we can assume that the pc over any given period of time – if the process is flat – is more or less static. So you see, it wouldn't tell you the process was flat or not flat when it wasn't flat or something of this sort. It's not even anything that you should watch for but you should do this with an E-Meter, just like it says in E-Meter Essentials. That it isn't kidding. That's a whole drill.
You should actually get somebody to sit down and go through all the body motions that there possibly could be, and handle the cans in all sorts of weird ways, and lift their fingers and put them back again, and cough and sneeze, and just watch what happens to the needle and tone arm of the meter. And then, that is the best way of sorting out body-motion reactions on a meter, and you can actually get so good at them that you don't... The only one I have to look at is when I'm getting a rock slam, or I start to get a – I'll get a momentary rock slam of some kind or another. I will normally look over at the pc's hands to find out if he lifted his finger, because that can be approximated. You can lift your finger and get a rock slam, but it isn't constant enough and you will all of a sudden see that it is the hands or it is the rock slam. You can differentiate there, too. But always make sure that it isn't somebody going – playing Morse code on the – on the electrodes.

Now there's one more point about this. You can take both cans in one hand, as you do in these "point out" things, and you will find out that the left side of the body and the right side of the body, and the right side of the body versus the left side of the body are all different. And this is apparently of great astonishment to many auditors, and it upsets them no end. Well, I don't know. So the – you remember the old epicenters? It just means the – the guy's epicenters are out, that's all. If you wanted to know if a pc's epicenters were in good shape or not in good shape, have him hold both cans in his right hand, then have him hold both cans in his left hand – put Kleenex between them, and both cans in his left hand, both cans in his right hand – see if the read is the same. If the read isn't the same, his epicenters are out.

What are you going to do with this today? Nothing. It's one of those little things we cannot live without knowing. You know, it's like reading the almanac. But I've seen – I've seen auditors get quite concerned with the fact this happens. It also will read differently if you shove them under the pc's armpits. It'll also read differently if you hold him down, take his shoes and socks off, and adhesive-tape the cans to the soles of his feet. It'll read differently, but only in terms of how much resistance it's measuring.

Now I can imagine it one day, if this E-Meter ever gets into the hands of the government, that is about the – 50 percent of the populace will probably be getting their E-Meter checks that way. The cops will jump on him and the fellow says, "I won't pick up the cans," and the cops will jump on him and hold him down and adhesive-tape the cans to the soles of his feet and find out if he murdered his grandmother. And because the guy is resenting it... Anybody who would do that probably couldn't read a meter anyhow, and if he was a member of one of these existing governments, why, he'd then, of course, say, "Well, it had a reaction. Ah-ha! Murdered his grandmother. That's good enough for us. Hang him!" Actually, they – that wasn't what they were after him for; it was because he hadn't – he hadn't not paid taxes. Yeah, it'd be a pretty confused picture.

Was there another question?

Female voice: Well, it was just that today we found out how to produce a perfectly steady, continuous rock slam on a meter with a body reaction ...

Good.

Female voice: ... with the cans.
Female voice: Just take the cans in both hands and keep rotating them like this. And you get a beautiful, steady rock slam that just goes on and on.

Good enough. All right. All right. Take the cans in both hands and twiddle them, and rotate them round ...

Female voice: Just goes round and round.

... and round and round and round and round, and you get a rock slam. That's worth knowing. It's a good way to demonstrate a rock slam. It's worth knowing how to demonstrate any of these phenomena. Very interesting. Okay, is there anything else?

Female voice: Ron.

Yes?

Female voice: I would like to have something on tape with regard to why the various levels are on the Prehav Scale. Because some people come up to me and they say, "Why is this Create here?" You see, and I have to tell them, "Well, this is obsessive create, you see? "And I'd like to have ...

'Tisn't, you know? It's reactive create.

Female voice: Well, reactive create, yeah.

All right, that's good.

Female voice: All right.

I'll answer that.

Female voice: Yeah.

Why are the levels on the Prehav Scale on the Prehav Scale? That's a pretty broad question. [laughter] I'm not laughing at Suzie but I just suddenly realized that somebody asking that question, that would be an interesting question to bring up. Holy cats!

Female voice: No, I just wanted the levels gone through, so I can take ... Yeah, well, that's – that's approximately it. That is the same question.

Female voice: Right.

Boy! How much time we got here? Well, I'll tell you, I've been studying the mind for a number of years and there are various phenomena have been noted. And these phenomena are not necessarily in agreement with a sane and normal society, the way it thinks it operates. And that's why we're winning, because with this sane and normal society that everybody thinks is operating, nobody's winning.

So you see, there would be – basically and foremost, we would have had to have recovered some of the broad differences between how people think it ought to be and how it is. Now, if we've recovered this broad difference between how we think it ought to be and how it is, then, of course, we can as-is some of the difficulties and upsets of a human being. But if
we stay with how it *ought* to be, or how we're educated to believe it should be; ah, we're hung with these alter-ises.

Now we've got in the Prehav Scale, pretty close, actually, the way it is, and we haven't got in the scale the way it ought to be at all. So it comes in with a dull crash to find God at the bottom of the Prehav Scale. What? Cause and then Faith.

Oh, I'll give you an idea. I'll give you a perfect substantiation. I don't hang around on – on the backs of auditor's chairs ready to stick out my chest like a pouter pigeon and pat myself on the back saying I was right. I merely make a disgusting habit out of being right, and I sort of take it as a matter of course when it works out that way – although it's usually very interesting to me that it did work out. It seems curious sometimes.

But it's like this: A pc the other day in an HGC was audited on Faith, and he blew straight out of his head, of course. Where would you think a level was, that the first moment that an individual touched it, he would sort of, kind of disappear out of the body and away and gone and here and there and everyplace else – wouldn't you say that was a pretty low level?

And yet that has been the most highly advertised commodity for the last two thousand years that anybody has been trying to sell. You talk about selling blue sky. Everybody has been rushing up and down the streets with a nickel on the drum selling "Faith! Faith! Faith! Faith! You've got to have faith! You've got to have faith!" We've got something here in which you don't have to have any faith to have it work, and that is, of course, the most astonishing thing in Scientology.

So, here comes Faith: I put it on the bottom of the Prehav Scale because it belongs there, because it's a non-observational level. It is the most non-observational level there is. There is no other level that is as least – as less observational than Faith. Everybody's got faith. See?

Well, by definition, faith is accepting something without inspection or observation, and no checkup of any kind. Now, that isn't anything wrong with faith. There isn't any – there isn't anything *wrong* with doing this. If you didn't have some confidence in your fellow man and walked around a little bit blindfolded, you'd never get these surprise engrams. [laughs] But I don't mean to be sarcastic. The thing actually is there. It isn't that Ron put it there. It's where it is. So there it is. All right.

Now let's take up this next thing – as long as it's amongst us girls here – let's take up this thing called, if you'll excuse me, God. All right. Let's take a one-Akhenaton proposition. See, there's only one and there he is, and he caused everything. Get that now: *he caused everything.* Do you realize what shape that god would be in right at this moment if he did nothing but make and create things, and you could never reach him and never say anything to him? Now, what do you think would happen?

I'd say that anything – if it was just one thetan that was called upon to make all these solids and spaces, what kind of a duress must this fellow be under to have to propitiate the lot of us that much? I think if there's anybody spun in, it must be this god.
You look at all the signs and analyze it anyway you can in running pcs or looking at life, and you'll find out at once that this cause -- you know, just cause, you know? Like that. "I'm going to hit you with the thunderbolts and you can't hit me." Brother, what that would do to a thetan! So I figure God plowed in a long time ago. [laughter]

Now, that's an awful comment for me to have to make but that's -- that happens to be -- actually happens to be my full belief on the thing. I've looked it all over from every side, and I can't get away from this opinion that if there was one God, man, he's had it!

And I even thought one time of, gee, you know, we could whip together a handy, jim-dandy little religion here in the "Society for the Resurrection of God", see, on the basis that the poor fellow plowed himself in helping us all out, and that we should give him a hand now. I know this all sounds very loopy and very ridiculous, but that is why that level is there. It works there.

Now anybody who is on an obsessive cause is practically nuts. Now, we are talking about, of course, the reactive reactions. This E-Meter tests reactive reactions and that's all it tests. So if we had nothing but analytical reactions on a scale, then the scale would be of no use to us whatsoever. So we're looking for the deep-seated things. The Prehav Scale is actually the reactive scale, the reactive bank scale.

When an individual is at length able to have, he doesn't have to have a bank. So of course, the bank disappears at the point Have. So there wouldn't be anything to measure of any kind whatsoever if we measured it on the analytical scale. But there isn't anybody in this corner of the universe that I know about right now that knows what that analytical scale really is except our Axioms 1 and 2. That's the best description of it.

So the analytical Have scale -- above Have, the analytical scale would simply be Axioms 1 and 2. Those are the only basic truths there are. Those are fundamental truths. If anything is true, then they're true. All other truths are the result of postulates, considerations and agreements. So as a result, it would just depend on what a bunch of thetans got together and agreed would be on that scale. That's -- that's the whole thing. And they'd say, "Well, this is the scale and we're going to have saucepans at this level and we're going to have chimney pots at that level and we're going to have singing 'Dixie' at this level and that's our scale." And in view of the fact that they were analytical and could change their minds and weren't very serious about it anyhow, of course, that would be the scale.

No, we're talking about the fixed, driven-into-concrete, now-I'm-supposed-to, this-is-it, can't-be-violated, this-is-why-we're-here scale and that's the Prehav Scale. And this is the order of the value of postulates which are fixed postulates and which are not usually changeable and have never been changeable in the absence of Scientology. And that's what that scale is all about. But as far as that's concerned, I think it's a quite remarkable scale.

Now, at some time in the past, at the beginning of track sometime, this scale must have been dreamed up just about like that. Now, to recover the scale again is quite a trick. Now, I'm not trying to tell anybody that all levels that are on the present Prehav Primary Scale that should be there are there. There might be some levels that aren't there. I could think of a dozen to put in offhand, but how much time have auditors got to assess the Primary Scale? And they're all on the Secondary Scale anyhow now.
Now, there are also some repeating levels on that scale. For instance, at Cause, you might not get a fall at Cause and you would get a fall on Blame and Blame was on the original scale, you see. So you have to watch that Primary Scale rather alertly. But there's harmonics. So you'll get more drops on the new Primary Scale with its sixty-six – sixty-five levels – you'll get more drops going up and down it, than you would get on the old scale, because there are some action words in it, rather than conditions.

There's another use to this scale that I haven't burdened anybody's wits with yet – by the way, just in passing I'll comment on it – and that is a combination inside the Primary Scale. And man, that can get so involved that it is marvelous. Let's supposing you assess No Motion – this is the most flagrant example. Let's supposing you assess No Motion and as you're assessing you found out Agree fell and – falls and No Motion falls. Now you go into the Secondary for No Motion and then into the Secondary for Agree, and you find which two falls on that, and you'll get some of the most remarkable combinations of commands you ever heard of. You just try it sometime. You won't believe some of them.

You can't run No Motion all by itself. The pc is just liable to run into a brick wall. So you can combine it with almost anything that is on the scale, but it's usually Like, Dislike, Agree or Disagree. But remember you could combine it with anything on the Like, Dislike, Agree, Disagree Secondary Scales, which gets pretty remarkable. And then No Motion could be assessed all the way out onto its Secondary Scale, and you'd get some word for No Motion. And you just look it up when you see these scales and you'll howl with laughter because it makes some of the most fantastic combinations. But listen, it's going to make sense to somebody.

All right. Well, now, I hope – I didn't mean to slight your question in any way because it should be stated. I haven't given any lectures, done any talking about this Prehav Scale. It's just sort of grown and the only lecture I know of about it – or, the only lectures I know of about it – are in the Johannesburg Congress tapes and it's advanced so far now beyond those that there's hardly any recognizing it.

Its levels may not all be exact. They might not be the exact level wherein, but they don't have to be. There's no stress on this. Now, if I ever find one of them out, I'll put it right and tell you about it. But it usually is pretty good. The top of the scale is the top of the scale and the bottom of the scale is sure the bottom of the scale. And individuals will start to get a rise as you go up that scale at certain levels just like they did on the original Prehav. So all is pretty well with it. I'm very happy with it.

Does that answer the question?

Female voice: Mm.
Anything else about it?

Female voice: Mm-mm.
You sure?

Female voice: Mm-hm.
All right. Okay. Is there anything else? ...All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. And have a very, very good weekend, will you?

*Audience: Thank you.*
Routine 1, 2 and 3

A lecture given on
5 June 1961

Thank you.

If this were a formal lecture, I would be wearing a jacket and a bow tie. But I find I'm not able to talk well with a bow tie on. Keep restimulating all the people I've hanged in France. [laughter]

[part missing]

Well now, there are a few questions before the house, I am very, very sure. So give me a question here, quick. Yes?

Male voice: You talked about what it means when a preclear comes in, a different tone arm reading than he went out at. Well, what happens if the pc comes in at about the same tone arm reading but his sensitivity has changed sharply in the meanwhile.

That's an interesting point to notice. If the pc comes in with his tone arm out, you would, of course, at once be suspicious. You always check a pc's tone arm when he leaves session – it's on your reports – and you always glance at the last reading so that your next reading, when he comes back into session again, you can check against that. And that is about the first thing you do between sessions: You look at that difference of tone arm reading; and if you find a vast difference of tone arm, you of course want to know what happened between sessions – practically even before you start one. You got the idea? It's of that order of emergency.

Now, the things I have found on pcs happening between sessions are quite interesting. What do we mean "between sessions"? We don't mean overnight; we mean solely, strictly, completely and utterly if they get out of the auditor's sight at any time – during a break, I have known pcs to instantly go to the phone, call South Africa, or something, and tell the husband, "I have just decided you are a louse and we are through," clang, you see? And having expended forty-five quid or something like this to deliver themselves of these sentiments, come back into session again feeling very self-righteous, but won't run.

You got the idea? It didn't take them very long, but that was it, man. They got a brand-new overt. And every time a pc is having trouble with a case, this is a subject of overt and withholds.

So, now the question comes up, "What if the sensitivity knob goes out?"

Well, this would be very strange and peculiar indeed, because it would mean the whole E-Meter had turned a dial or two. You know, it might have gone all the way around the
dial. It would be an accident almost that it would come up with the same reading, but you had better check both sensitivity and tone arm. That should be added in, so thank you for the datum.

You've got a considerable importance now – just speaking and carrying with that – right along with that goes your rudiments in. Definition of rudiments: what it takes to get a session running and the pc in-session. Definition of in-session: willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case. Are rudiments a process to get the case on the road? No, they are not. You run rudiments with a third-of-a-dial drop. Why? Because you've got a Joburg Security Check these days, and you don't have to be too sniffish for those withholds. And if it's a big withhold you'll get it on a third-of-a-dial drop if it's going to stop the session. The rule is that if the needle does not drop a third of a dial on the squeeze test, and at that setting no rudiment clanks, the pc, you will find rather consistently, is perfectly capable of being audited. Got it? So you don't use rudiments to waste auditing, because the processes today in the rudiments are so much weaker than any other process we've got that you are wasting time. Got it?

However, as you're going through with a third-of-a-dial drop setting, the needle does a twitch, *kerbango*. When you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and it goes twitch – third-of-a-dial drop – you've got to handle it. Now, how do you handle it? You say, "Now, what was that?"

And "What was what?"

"Well, I had a little drop here when I asked you about a present time problem."

"Oh well, I suppose that's my... I've got to phone... uh... I've got to phone New Siberia" (the American Medical Association address). [laughter] "I've got to phone New Siberia at three o'clock and report," or something of this sort.

And you say, "Well, is that a present time problem to you now?"

"Mm... no, no." And it doesn't twitch.

You don't run it. Also, that is the extent of two-way comm. Two-way comm that goes four questions, turns into a process. You understand? And there are processes much neater for all two-way comm situations than you're going to two-way comm.

The American auditor has this frailty more than the auditors in other parts of the world. They'll run two-way comm for two hours. Don't do it, because there's just too many processes now and Prehav is too hot. And even the rudiments processes are hotter, you see, than two-way comm.

But two-way comm does give it an opportunity to blow. And that's all you do, is give the pc an opportunity to as-is the situation. He doesn't as-is it, process it. Don't two-way comm it out of him. See? Give him a chance to as-is it by saying what it is, and the fall disappears, and you're all set. You can ask him as many times as you want to the same question or some variation of the question. You know? "Are you withholding anything" "Are you keeping something from me?" "Are you embarrassed because you are being audited today?" "Have
you had some nasty, cotton-picking little unkind thought about the Director of Processing?"
"Have you suddenly decided Ron ought to be hanged?"

If anybody is going to do anything to me, they better not try to shoot me. The only overts I've got that I'm tender on are hanging. They'll have to hang me.

Anyhow, what's the extent, then, of handling these rudiments to get a pc in-session? Third-of-a-dial drop, and right down the list of Model Session, asking them twice, six or eight times – I don't care how many times you ask them – to find out what it is. That's one thing. Now, two-way comm would be a method of getting the pc to as-is this situation.

"Oh, your withhold is that last night you made love to an ape. All right. Now, how is that now?"

"Well, I guess it's all right."

And man, if that needle doesn't move, take it, man. That's all right. Just because you have peculiar ideas about relationships with apes [laughter] is no reason to follow this up at all. It's all going to come out in the wash. Furthermore, if the pc is still dramatizing something – now, wave your ears on this one – if a pc is still dramatizing something, it is too deep-seated to be reached in rudiments or by two-way comm. You got that?

So PT problems, ARC breaks, that sort of thing: ask about them. If you see a twitch, find out what that twitch was. That's the first thing, see? Well, that's not two-way comm; that's just interrogation to find out what the devil the auditor-pc relationship is here. All right, now you've found out what the twitch is and it's still there. Ask him exactly what it was. He tells you. Don't follow that up with another question and another one and another one, you understand; put your brakes on smoking right there. You say, "Well, you had relationships last night with an ape. All right, good. Now, how does that seem to you?" Clang! Well, you're going to do something about this?

In the first place, it's some kind of a weird overt-withhold sort of a situation. But it's certainly no longer a withhold from the auditor, is it? He told you. He might not have told you all. It's all right for him to tell you all of this withhold. You got the idea? But it didn't go away. Now is the time to run a process. Got it?

This came up on a present time problem. See where I'm heading? You see, you asked him present time problem; you got this kind of an oddball answer. What are you going to do about this? You better find out, if it's a problem to him, well what it is. Get rid of it. Get rid of it one way or the other on the rudiments. That's the best rule. Don't let it go off into the processes. But you're not going to handle the situation as a neurosis or a psychosis or something of the sort in the rudiments, you understand? You're trying to get it out of the road for auditing.

So you say, "What part of that situation could you be responsible for", or something like this, because it's a present time problem. And he tells you, answers a few questions. You say, "How's it seem to you now?" You don't get a fall. On to the next one, man, quick. See?

If it doesn't as-is with two-way... You can ask him all the ways you want to. It's a misdemeanor on your part, arrestable in the "Court of High Council", for you not to ask him
something in several ways to find exactly what it's falling on, you understand? That's a mis-
demeanor not to do that.

But now to go on nattering on two-way comm, trying to get this thing as-ised as two-
way comm, is a lousy waste of time on your part, that's all. Because a process would do it a
lot better. So you found out what it was and it didn't as-is. Now you run a rudiments process.
All right, you've got a rudiments process; it knocks it out; you carry on.

Now this interesting problem comes up. Supposing the person has a big withhold from
George. Big withhold, see? So you run O/W on George. Well, in the first place, you've done
something a little adventurous. It's all right; go ahead and do it. But you get tone arm motion
on O/W on George. Aw, that's too bad. You're running O/W on George. You better run it; you
better flatten it. But there are dozens of better ways to handle George, don't you see? This is
kind of unfortunate.

The tone arm starts moving from 3 to 6 on O/W on George. Well, now you've got a
process that's biting, you've got a pc that's running, and you've had it. What do you do with it?
The rule is the tone arm has got to be a quarter of a division or less for twenty minutes of au-
diting before you can leave a process. This applies, unfortunately, to the rudiments.

That's why you're always hopeful for a null needle on the rudiments. Because you
don't want to audit the case with the rudiments. But at the same time, if you ignore a drop on
the rudiments, with a third-of-a-dial drop sensit in it, you've had it. You won't do anything
in that session.

Now, you could crank up the sensitivity to 16 and ask the rudiments. Now what are
you doing? You're running the case, aren't you? "Are you withholding anything?" Ladies and
gentlemen, fellow students of Homo sap: Takes seven hours on some people to do a Joburg,
and you've asked it in one lump question. Now, what are you going to do? Sensitivity 16 is
your mistake. It wasn't a rudiment that fell on a third-of-a-dial drop.

By definition now, what is meant by "a rudiment out"? One of the rudiments are out
and the case is being run with a rudiment out. Now what is meant by this? It means there is a
reaction with the meter set at a third-of-a-dial drop – a visible reaction on the needle when the
meter is set at a third-of-a-dial drop. If there is a visible reaction on the meter with it set for a
third-of-a-dial drop on the can-squeeze test, that rudiment is out and you've got to do some-
thing about it. You got it?

Now, what about these cases – what about these cases that keep trying to go Clear on
us? And I suddenly realized the other night, although I've given you advice that you'd better
get your sensitivity knobs fixed, you know you're never going to get them fixed? There is no
sensitivity knob that will turn off far enough. When a person starts going into a floating tone
arm state, when they're up about Release, it'll just float further and further and more and more,
and you'd have to turn the sensitivity off further and further. And at some point the meter is
going to become nonfunctional. So you would be going toward the same situation as simply
turning your sensitivity knob off. Well, if a pc insists on dropping three dials on a third-of-a-
dial drop can squeeze with your sensitivity all the way off against the off switch, see, I'm
afraid there's only one other sensitivity cutdown that you could do, and that's just turn the
meter off. [laughs]
So what happens to this rule as the person goes Clear? Well, the rule is not very important as the person gets loosened up to that degree. How do you like that? It is not very important. Because what is the behavior of a needle as the individual gets more and more up toward Clear? The needle swings less and less on heavier and heavier charges. That's interesting.

I had a D of P ask me fairly recently, "Well, I don't think this is correct about this third-of-a-dial squeeze and the sensitivity and that sort of thing. Because people that are coming in here with loose needles are obviously in very bad condition, because they don't get much needle reaction when you ask them about ARC breaks and things of that sort." Naturally it's not a charged question to them.

But on somebody who's plowed in, down on the borderline of the nether regions, you ask him if he's got an ARC break and you get *wham, wham, wham, wham, wham! And you say, "Well, what was that?"

And he says, "You lighted a cigarette while you were lecturing"

Free floating needle, as the cases advance on up the line: Well, this is about three-dials can squeeze, see? You've got it – sensitivity as low as you can get it – three-dials can squeeze. That's all you can do about it. And you say, "You got an ARC break?" And you get a one dial-division drop. See, there's a very loose needle and you get a one little dial division – one of those little tiny things that's about a quarter of an inch long, you see? And you ask him that and you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, actually I was withholding it from you that I just wrecked your car last night." Only this same person would be also in this category: You'd say, "What!" you know, and explode all over the place. And you'd say, "Well yes, I also took it into the garage and it's now been repaired and is sitting in your garage." You get entirely different action. Of course, he probably wouldn't have wrecked the car.

But look, you get some kind of a reaction like this: "You lighted a match while I was thinking", you see? Three-dial drop.

Now, you see a twitch on that, see, you just see a twitch. Of course, you can only really read him in twitches on such a case. And you say, "What was that?"

Say, "Well, I wrecked your car last night. It's still lying out on M1. Police are looking for you as a hit and run driver. But I didn't do anything; it wasn't my fault. Actually, you left the keys in the ignition." [laughter] And you generally will get a smug smile following it. You get an entirely different set of reactions for the same existing situation. Is that clear?

I'm covering over rudiments with you and what rudiments amounts to and what meter reactions amount to and so forth. We go over these things quite often, but they are the most important thing, because if your pc is not in-session, you're not getting any auditing done. But we have to define what is meant by a rudiment being out. It means the rudiment is out; you have to correct it.

Well, you can always find a rudiment out. How do you like that? Just by turning your sensitivity knob up to 16 and say, "Are you withholding anything?" Or "Do you have an ARC
break with anybody in the whole world anywhere?" "Is there anybody anywhere in the world that you have an ARC break with?" And of course, you're going to get needle reaction. So your auditing is totally reduced down to doing nothing but rudiments, nothing but rudiments, nothing but rudiments, nothing but rudiments, nothing – and they're not very good processes.

So of the two hours and a half that you have for an auditing session, you spend two hours and fifteen minutes running the beginning and end rudiments, and you spend fifteen minutes on the process, see? And that isn't what's getting the case there. The rule is the case cannot be audited with the rudiments out. What is meant by rudiments out? A visible reaction on the needle with a third-of-a-dial squeeze setting on the sensitivity knob.

Does that mean that a person who has a very loose tone arm, then, could have allowances made for him, so if he gets a drop on a present time problem, and you know he's got a very – he drops about a dial, and you can't set it down any further than a dial – does that mean you ignore his twitches? No, he's in for it. But this is okay, because he'll blow them on two-way comm.

You'll say, "What is this ARC break?"

And he'll say, "Well, the cook sneered at me this morning. He put a sneer on my shredded wheat biscuits, you know."

And you say, "How do you feel about that now?" There'll be no further reaction.

You see, the looseness of a needle at minimum setting is a direct index of state of case – the most direct state-of-case index there is. This is your diagnostic switch, right here, this sensitivity.

And if you, to get a third-of-a-dial drop, have the guy sitting here at sensitivity 16, and even then don't make it, you're dealing with a CCH case, brother, and don't think you aren't. We've broken our hearts on enough of them. CCHs they get. You understand?

Now, that doesn't mean that all cases that are run on CCHs are instantly in this horrible condition. But it does mean that the case has not been showing adequate gain in processing. Processing over a long period of time: We have a record of this processing; they haven't been showing enough gain; there must be something haywire someplace. We check them over: We can't find present time problems, ARC breaks, withholds. They just don't seem to have anything here anywhere. Well, you've got the CCHs, so you return the case to it. Got it?

Now, that doesn't mean that all cases that are run on CCHs are instantly in this horrible condition. But it does mean that the case has not been showing adequate gain in processing. Processing over a long period of time: We have a record of this processing; they haven't been showing enough gain; there must be something haywire someplace. We check them over: We can't find present time problems, ARC breaks, withholds. They just don't seem to have anything here anywhere. Well, you've got the CCHs, so you return the case to it. Got it? Just like you can turn an SOP Goals case back into a Routine 2.

Now, you're going to get that bulletin in very short order, if you don't have it right this minute. I imagine we're pretty stacked up in the bulletin department; we're getting out the Secondary Scales.

But you got three routines these days. Routine 1 is CCHs and Joburg Security Checks, and CCHs and Joburg Security Checks, and CCHs and Joburg Security Checks on a one-for-one ratio. (Experimental at this moment that it's one-for-one.) Why?

The CCHs boost up the individual's responsibility for his environment. And then he blows his head off because he's now all of a sudden got withholds that he's – now feels responsible for. So you have to pull the withholds off to keep from killing the case. You got it?
You raise a case level, he runs into his withholds, begins to be more responsible for the world around him, and all of a sudden – crash, he's had it.

He actually feels like somebody is running over him like God Juggernaut is letting him have it, you know? Complete with the stone wheels. He feels terrible. You've increased his responsibility, he realizes he's guilty of many things on all dynamics, and you give him no opportunity to get rid of them.

And that is the only thing that has ever been stalling cases in Dianetics and Scientology over the last eleven years. That's the thing that stalls them. That's why they hit a ceiling and halt.

They halt because it'd kill them if they got any better. Because if they got any better, they'd be more responsible for what they've been up to on the whole track. You got it? All of a sudden they realize they have overts and withholds, and it damn near kills them. And this would work out with almost any case. So you run the CCHs to increase their responsibility, and you pull off their withholds with a Joburg. And that's the routine.

Now, I don't know quite what the optimum ratio between the CCHs and a Joburg is. I don't know if it's one for one, one for two, one for three – who knows. Hour for hour I'm talking about. What do you do? Security check them for three hours and CCH them for one? Or CCH them for three and security check them for one? Well, we're just taking it out at even level and say, well, we're going to start in at one for one. So that's what it is right now: one for one. One hour Joburg, one hour CCHs.

All right. That means that you don't suddenly stop a CCH process that is terribly unflat and give the Joburg after one hour, you understand? But if you've been five hours flattening this, you can be totally prepared to spend five hours on Security Checking. Got it? It's however long they've been running the CCHs up to a temporary flat point.

One more mention of this. CCHs are run in strict accordance with Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code: A process must be run only so long as it produces change – this is not a direct quote; this is an interpretation of it. It's a breach of the Auditor's Code to run a process that is not producing change. It is a breach of the Auditor's Code to stop a process that is producing change. Got that? What's change in the CCHs? Well, you run CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4. Let us say that all during the running of 1, the test is twenty minutes. The person, whatever they're doing, must be no change of reaction in twenty minutes. Got it? Twenty minutes, no change in the pc.

Now, what's that mean? Well, the pc is a meter. What would the pc be reading on a meter if the pc were trying to leave? ... Come on, what would it be?

_Audience_: Theta bop.

That's right. The pc is the meter. You don't have the pc on a meter; you can look at the pc, see? Got the idea? All right, now let's get another one. You're trying to run CCH 2, and there they go, and you're getting them all set and so forth. And all during the time, they're just running like a wound-up doll, see? There's no change of reaction, there's no change, no comm lag, no nothing for twenty minutes. Man, that's flat as far as you're concerned. It isn't biting or it's flat or we don't care what; you go on to the next one. You got the idea?
All right, supposing on one of these CCHs the pc is simply 1.5ing the entire time. Just madder than hell, you see? "The idea of running such a process on me. You realize this process is only reserved for psychotics?" Actually, it used to be; it isn't now. "Process is only reserved for psychotics, and you think I'm a psychotic, and who do you think I am?" And they keep this up for twenty minutes — process is flat. New look, huh? Supposing the pc lies down in the middle of the floor and can't be made to rise for twenty minutes — process flat. [laughter] You got it?

So the process is run in strict accordance with Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code: Run a process only so long as it produces change and no longer, and don't stop a process that is producing change. You got that?

Well, that means — doesn't mean by the way that you have to audit him all night. But that means in the next session you're running the same process. See? That process has got to come up to a flat point and the flat point is twenty minutes without a change — whatever the pc is doing. Pc insists every time he walks up to the wall that he turn around and with one foot, kick it, and he's been doing it for twenty minutes — he's had it.

You are no longer critical of what the pc is doing and no longer trying to force the pc to do the process. You just carry out your Upper Indoc-type CCHs and carry on as much as you can, but you're not trying to force something on the pc particularly, you understand? You're trying to do what he can do. Obviously he's incapable of giving you his hand during that period of time.

Now, you say, "Well, normally he would get over that sooner or later." Yes, he'll get over it sooner or later; go on to the next process. And when you finish up 4 you come back to 1, and you'll find out he's incapable for a while of giving you his hand.

In the first place, you're auditing a valence out and the pc up, and the only thing you get a reaction from is the valence. So if the case is progressing, why, this valence is acting up, because a valence fights for survival. You got it? There's comm lags; there's various things occurring, all the time, all the time. Well, for heaven's sakes, it's not flat so you carry it on. You got how to run them now?

That, by the way, is the original CCHs taught in London in 1957. We've gone right back to base on it. It is not for a psycho. They were originated ordinarily just for cases that weren't getting results on various processes. Case wouldn't get results on higher processes so we just kicked an awful lot of pcs over into this particular category, and London has had a great deal of success with CCHs up through the years.

At the same time, I didn't have much of a chance to straighten out the HGC as to how you ran CCHs, and they weren't running them very good. And they were, you know — I don't know — be perfectly happy to sit there and ask somebody to give you their hand, and they give you their hand, and do it just for twenty minutes. No. Six hours, twenty-five hours — the individual is simply giving you his hand. They just run it for twenty-five hours. It's a breach of the Auditor's Code. If he gives you his hand for twenty minutes on a stretch, that's it.

Furthermore, the CCHs are not run in Model Session. You say, "Here we go." "That's it." And that's the beginning and end of session. "I'm going to audit you now. This is the first
process. I'm going to say 'Give me your hand" – you can tell him anything you want to. You can even say, "Well, it isn't going to hurt you." Anything you want. I don't care what you say. But it's not run in Model Session. You don't pick up the ARC breaks; you don't pick up any of these things.

Why not? Because obviously if you're running that, the person doesn't easily blow these things. So you can just become completely involved with the case, see? Completely involved. I'd say the criteria would be this: If you did a long assessment, and finally the goal of the pc is to get even with the janitor – who is a momentary, present time terminal, and this is the only goal you can find on the pc – I'd say you were probably assessing somebody you'd have got along faster with with the CCHs. See, the terminal has backed all the way up to PT. Got the idea?

Now listen: It is not that you couldn't win with the other routines on the same case, because we are no longer doing routines because of case levels. That's a new surprise for you.

See, we've always had low cases get Routine 1, and the next cases get Routine 2, and the next cases get Routine 3, or something like this. Have you got the idea? It was always graduated that way.

Well, it isn't now. It's what is the fastest case gain you can obtain for the least amount of auditing. Got it? And it is all in the interests of saving auditing time, because all of these work, by the way – all three routines that we have – work on the same level of case.

You could take Roddy Green and find his goal, and find his terminal, and assess it on the Prehav Scale and run him. You'd get there. But your auditing ratio may be something on the order of about two to three per one. Takes you seventy-five hours to get there whereas you could have gotten there in the same period of time in twenty-five hours. You got the idea? So it's just in the interests of saving auditors' time that you do these things.

Furthermore the auditor doesn't get bogged down or upset because his case isn't winning, because he's being yakked at. You understand? Makes a smoother look all around.

So all three routines work on all cases, which is riches indeed. And you could expect sooner or later, when we hit the jackpot and pull that old one-arm bandit's hand and the gold sovereigns started pouring out of it all around the floor on technology, that this is what would have happened. You would have had at least a couple of routines that would have worked on all cases. Now we've got three routines that'd work on all cases.

There isn't a person here, by the way, who wouldn't pick up on some – the CCHs run in this fashion: CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, you see? 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4; just run as long as they're flat. It's very rapid running.

And we looked on the CCHs as being a very slow grind. Well, I point out to you that in 1957 they were not a slow grind, and they were being run in the exact style which I'm telling you about now.

See, we got it lost, because I couldn't quite grasp what was going wrong. We put it mainly down to the fact the auditor's intention wasn't getting across to the pc. That's not true.
That has something to do with it, but that's not the answer. The answer is a much more clean-cut answer than that: The auditor was disobeying the Auditor's Code, Clause 13. Okay?

He was not running processes as long as they produced change. Pc fighting, you know? And say, "Well, I'm not going to run this damn process a minute longer. I'm not going to run it..." And the pc would keep fighting him for three hours, four hours, five hours, six hours, whole intensive.

He'd say, "Well, I got to get someplace with this pc. I got to get someplace because the pc's fighting," you see? No, the pc's fighting is no change – no change by reason of the process.

But you can say, "Well look, the process wasn't being administered." Oh, you're looking physically at what happens to about 75 percent of the cases you have trouble with, is they never do the mental process that you give them. Except now you've got it physically. He's not doing CCH 2; only, you can see he isn't doing it. [laugher] I've had a pc come up to me and say, "Well, you thought that auditor was pretty good that you had there, but hu-hu-hu-hu-u-huh-huh-huh-huh 1 - I just had a twenty-five hour intensive from him - tuhum-hu-hu! Didn't do a single command he said. Ha! Ha!"

And I thought, "Why, you dumb bastard," to myself, you know. "You dumb sap! You mean to say that you wasted twenty-five hours of auditing time and gave the fellow something on the order of fifty quid, or something of the sort, just so that you could have the wonderful opportunity of never answering a single one of the auditing questions, but fooling him for twenty-five hours." Oddly enough, to the pc that would be eminently logical.

Well, you've got it out in plain, broad air that the pc is not about to do your auditing commands, haven't you? Well, so if – what if you had him on a mental process on the meter? What if you had him on a mental process on the meter, and he wasn't doing the auditing command but appeared to be? You know, saying, "Mm-hm. Mm-hm. Mm-hm."

You ask him, "What are you thinking about?"

"Oh, I'm thinking about the process. Mm-hm, mm-hm, mm-hm." Got a machine. Got a machine set up like a clockwork toy and every time you say the question, he goes, "Mm, hm-hm." Hasn't anything to do with anything you've said, see.

You say, "Do fish swim?"

He says, ("The auditor is trying to probe my secrets.") "Mm-hm." Got the idea?

Now, it's just an extremity of alter-is. Now, how much alter-is is there on the case determines what process runs him the fastest. So let's run CCHs and get any alter-is out into the clear, or anything of that sort. But anybody could gain on any of these routines.

Now, I'll go over these other routines with you very rapidly. I'll just tell you what they are.

Routine 2 is a general run on the Prehav Scale, Joburg Security Check, and the Hav-iness and Confront Processes all run in Model Session. I think that's the extent of it, isn't it? Is there anything else in there?
Mm! PT problems of long duration are assessed for terminal on that routine. You find a present time problem of long duration, you know? Keeps banging present time problem or something of the sort, and you run that. You assess that on the Prehav Scale. You find the terminal, and you find a terminal about the problem that drops the most; and you assess it on the Prehav Scale, and you run it flat, and you assess it again, and you run it flat, and you assess it again, and you run it flat, and you assess it again, and run it flat. That's a PT problem of long duration. Fastest way to run one for auditors at large. Actually you can get someplace just running engrams on them, Presession 38, but this other one is very, very easy to do and reaches all cases without any difficulty. So why not do it. All right?

That's the extent of Routine 2. What's Routine 3? SOP Goals Assessment – assessment for goal, assessment for terminal. And this is run flat, level by level, on the Prehav Scale, with what? Second step, Joburg Security Check. All three routines have a Joburg Security Check in common.

What are you trying to do with this case? You're trying to unbale this case and get this case up to a point where it is willing to make an advance. What do you mean "unwilling" to make an advance? All right, the case is unwilling to make an advance so long as and continually when the case finds he is turning on powerful and fantastic resistances and somatics and things like this. He doesn't dare get any better, because if he gets more responsible, he's had it.

Have you ever noticed that there are some very pretty girls around in the world who have a high level of irresponsibility? Have you noticed that? Well, actually, if you ran them into the middle ground, their beauty would be less. In other words, you'd audit them for a little while and increase their responsibility, and they wouldn't look so good. Have you got that? Isn't that odd? They'd be better but they wouldn't look so good. You got the idea?

Well, that would only obtain so long as they were stacking up withholds that you weren't getting rid of. So you could take a person who was quite irresponsible but good-looking – nothing they've ever done has any influence on the body. Now, you audit them, it has some influence on the body. They've got to – they've got to shoot the rapids, sort of, up the Niagara River, you know? They've got to go up Niagara Falls backwards, and it's a rather battering experience. Well, it becomes a very unbattering experience the moment that you keep cleaning up withholds, and you're going to see this phenomenon **continually**.

You make a little case advance, and all of a sudden you're on a long grind. What's happened? Well, the pc doesn't dare get any better, that's all. See? Case advanced rapidly and then something stopped it. You know? And then you grind, grind, grind, grind, grind – You've all seen this. Well, what was that point of the curve? I had to find out.

Well, it's the withholds. They suddenly get responsible for their overts and then they haven't any chance to tell you about them or unload them or unburden them in any way, and they just start kicking their heads off, that's all.

You'll find somebody who's had a case improvement, who has improved just a little bit too much for their tolerance, suddenly standing back of a chimney sobbing bitterly. You got the idea? "I'm no good!"
And we've had some casualties with that. That is to say, somebody has blown or something like that, you know? He's been improved a bit, but it was too much for him. You got the idea? Because improvement means an increase of responsibility for his past, present and future, which of course includes all the dirty mean, nasty, caviling, little two-bit tricks he's played on everybody.

And how did he get those things – how did he get those things excused? He lessened the overt. The old bulletin on lessening the overt—which by the way should be part of your bulletins. And they lessen the overt, and now you audit them, and they suddenly realize that that person they were so nasty to wasn't probably quite that bad, see? And this overt starts to swell up on them. Now you're doing it with processing and this is now a ten-thousand-horsepower operation, see? And the pc puts his two horsepower up against this thing, you see, and just tries like mad to stop the juggernaut. Only this overt keeps unlessening. Joe was not so bad; God, what's going to happen to them now, you see? So their whole effort now is to keep the overt from unlessening, and they no longer have their attention on the process. Got it? That's the exact mechanism.

So the case improves, you get a fast improvement curve, get the withholds. And you – all of a sudden you get another fast improvement curve, get the withholds; get another fast improvement curve, get the withholds. That's the system. You've three routines with which to do it.

And cases which are having difficulty answering auditing commands or having difficulty in auditing, or who would only run on SOP Goals in some kind of a present time situation, probably will audit faster on the CCHs as a general rule, than they would audit otherwise. They'll make more progress. You got the idea? You can get this person back up over Niagara Falls without so maw chain hoists. It's easier.

Instead of standing in there boxing with the alter-is – which they're not about to take responsibility for or run out. See, don't go on the basis that everybody, just because you alter the alter-is – you might not be able to find it exactly. See, the alter-is might have something to do with "have" and "would be". You know, any kind of a Hobson-Jobson situation where they're fitting one substitute with another substitute. And you might not hit it exactly. And you'd have to keep hitting it exactly. And it's very expert. Requires a lot of expertness to do that thing. You get their mind going off like a firecracker almost continuously and you can do it! It can be done, you understand? But it's probably slower. Certainly, for average auditor, slower.

All right, so the combination there is that this is the best thing to do for a case that might hang up otherwise.

Now, your next general run, your next general routine, is actually basically there. All cases could benefit from it, and it would be faster than Routine 3 in a lot of cases. But I have found out that auditors who are specifically being coached at long distance from us – which is very difficult – actually are able to do what is now Routine 2. They can do it. They can kind of dub around and make it work, you understand? But boy, you get them on goals and they're over the the hills and far away like a bunch of white-tailed antelope. And you just see these
little spots of white in the distance. Man, they don't grab that one. I've got it on my comm
lines and from HGCs and from every place ad infinitum, and they're just – no latch.

They can do general runs on Prehav Scale. Read one bulletin, do a general run on the
Prehav Scale, that's it. Do a Joburg Security Check, miss 50 percent of the questions, but it's
still functioning, see? [laughter] You get the idea? It's still functional in their hands. Do you
see that?

But this doesn't say that you couldn't take the person you're going to do CCH on and
find his goal. And it doesn't say that the person that you're going to do the general runs and
Joburgs on – it doesn't say you couldn't grind in and find his goal. You can actually find the
goal and terminal and so forth on anybody that you try. It's just a little arduous, that's all. A
little more arduous. It takes more time.

So in the interests of swift clearing is what these three routines are all about, and that's
the basis on which we're operating today.

And of course, you're here to learn about this, so I probably won't see you doing as
many Routine 2s. You'll probably get more Routine 1s and Routine 3s than you get 2s. But in
some HGC someplace, or out in the bush of – back of North Wallaby, why, you'll see an aw-
ful lot of Routine 2 – and you meet somebody back of North Wallaby, and he'd say, "Oh,
we're having so much luck on SOP Goals. Esther spun last night."

And you'd say, "What are you running?"

"Oh, we did a long assessment on her – twenty minutes – [laughter] and we finally de-
cided her husband was what was her trouble, so terminal was a husband. And it was by elimi-
nation. We talked it over in the rest of the conference, and we decided that was the only pos-
sible terminal. So we ran 'a husband' on her, and so forth. And the next time we did an as-
sessment, for some reason or other the whole scale was live, so we just started at the top and
tried to run each one flat on the husband. And you didn't give us all the data, you know, for
SOP Goals, and it doesn't work very good either." But you give them this Routine 2, and they
go off like a bunch of canary birds, and they get wonderful results. Okay?

Female voice: Yes sir.

Male voice: Question on Routine 2.

Yeah.

Male voice: The general assessment: Is that done purely on the Primary Scale or do
you carry – carry it over to the Secondary as well?

No, you can carry that on right on through to the deepest depths of the Secondary. All
assessments can be done Primary and Secondary, or just Primary. The worse off a case is or
the more Clear they are – the two extremes – both have to have Secondary runs on assess-
ments.

Second male voice: Do you ever switch from one routine to the other?

Yes, you sure do. Case isn't running very well on his goals terminal, or his assessment
or something, shift into 2. Be upsetting though to shift from 2 back to 1 because it's invalidat-
ing. Make up your mind at the beginning. If in doubt, always run CCHs. If you're in doubt whether he should be running CCHs or 2, run CCHs. That answer your question?

Second male voice: Yes, it does.

All right. The more you shift, changing your mind, why, the less sure you look and the less control you've got on the pc.

Second male voice: Precise running of the CCHs: left, right, or right and left, both hands – then do you – ?

Yeah, and on your head. And then there's CCH 1X [laughter] – there's, CCH 1X. That's a good one. That's a good one: Pc gives you both of his socks! [laughter] I don't mean to make nothing out of your question but it brings up this humorous point, Ken. It brings up this very humorous point, that the more CCHs I put out for various variations, the less CCH was run on the basics. And actually the variations practically killed the CCHs, the variations did. No, it's just right hand, man. It's always right hand. You're not trying to clean this fellow's life with the CCH; you're trying to improve his case so that he can get off his withholds. You got it? When you've got all his withholds off and he's totally responsible, and he's clean as a wolf's tooth, he's going to be floating, almost floating here on the needle anyhow, when you finish this up, you understand? And he's going to be so free on the needle that you start doing an assessment and he starts blowing clear on the assessment. You got the idea? You wait till you see this. You'll realize why you're running it. I apologize for making a mock of your question. Yes?

Female voice: Would SCS still come in the CCHs? Through the CCHs?

There are no SCSs in the CCHs. CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. There are only four of them that are valid. Now, the SCS does have a high CCH number, but you've got to read your – I see right now, you've got to read your CCHs from beginning to the end, because there are only four of them, and what was known as the CCH Routine is exactly a precise routine consisting of four processes.

And that's the only CCH Routine we mean. We mean no other variations. Okay?

Female voice: Yes, thank you.

Right. All right. Okay, any more questions? All right. Thank you very much, and that's it for tonight.

Good night now.
SECURITY CHECKS*

A lecture given on
6 June 1961

Thank you.

Well, here we are at the 6th of June.

And our course seems to be going very well. If you don't recognize me today – [laughter] Actually, as I explained to Edgar, it isn't, actually, that I like to wear my hair long; it's just that there aren't any barbers. [laughter] Go ahead, I dare you; try to find one. Since we took Edgar out of the profession, there's nobody anymore left in the world who can barber. There's a small fee for this commercial. [laughter]

All right. I suppose by this time you actually have in your small, moist palms a copy of the HCOB that has to do with these routines. Is it in your hands yet?

Audience: No.

Well, then it probably will be tomorrow morning. It's the first bulletin concerning the routines, and so on. Now, what's going to change that bulletin? Let's look at the future just a little bit.

We are not now trying to find out what auditors need as theoretical or ideal tools to clear people. We are not at that stage. We passed that stage a long time ago, actually. We are trying desperately to discover right now what auditors will use, and what they can use. And SOP Goals and its related processes have been in development for use for some time. Please understand that as a difference of action. There's two things: It's what will auditors use – what will they use? And what can they use? And these two things monitor what is put in their hands. You got the idea?

Now at first, just the Prehav Scale was put in their hands, and they had pretty good success with it here, there – just general runs in the Prehav Scale. They weren't able to goof it up too badly and they got some good success. And I had some rather resounding profiles sent in here. And everybody seemed to be very happy with the idea of assessing the pc on the general scale and cooking up some kind of an auditing command – even a bum one – and running a pc on it, and rudiments in, out or upside down, you know? And they got somewhere. They got somewhere with this. We got some good results. So we have to assume that an auditor not only will do it but can do it. See? 1) And – is it well accepted? and 2) is it within his realm of ability?

* Editor's note: In the Red Volumes, this lecture is listed as "Routine One, Two and Three" – Title was probably changed to differentiate from SH Spec 7.
You have to think of that when you're training students – training people in Scientology. It's what they can and will do. Now, if you have somebody who can only run CCHs and you have him in a group of people who are doing auditing on outside pcs, well, wouldn't you be rather foolish to give him a set of tools that he would not or could not apply. Because immediately your auditing results would break down right at that point – sharply, clearly and immediately. You get the idea?

Auditor can run CCHs, and yet you say run the hooble-goobles second differential of the integral \( zim \). That's what it sounds like to him, see? I mean, you've said something very comprehensible to you. You've said find his Havingness and Confront Process. And yet it sounded like the gobbledygook I just gave you, see? It doesn't make any sense to him. So with great willingness, perhaps salted down a little bit with making you wrong, he will go ahead and louse up the lot. Why? Well, he's being told to run something; he thinks he should understand this; and you may come around for a long time and find out that he just hasn't told you he didn't understand it.

Now, the test of anything is whether or not it produces results. But remember this – that a result is determined by several things: 1) the adequacy of the tool being employed. That is the first thing a result is established by. That is first and foremost. Nobody will argue about that at all. If you haven't got the tools, you can't do the job. That's it. And that's what Scientology is basically – the tools that do the job.

Now, this is modified by what auditors will apply or what people will use. You see? What will they use? And that again is modified: What can they use? So we actually have three sets of determinisms here on what is a good process. It isn't whether or not the process used under ideal conditions will produce every time a stratospheric flight. You see, that is not the test all by itself. Without that, nothing is going to work; that's for sure. But it's monitored by these other two things. And when you're training auditors, for God's sakes, keep that in mind. Huh! We've had the principle for a long time, but I never articulated it. And one of the parts of it was: If somebody comes in raw into an HGC, you find out from him what processes he has been having success with. You could also ask him this one, oddly enough: "What process has worked on you?"

And he says, "Oh, 8-C. 8-C. I had a wonderful gain back about '54. Nobody has run it on me since, but back about '54 I had a wonderful gain on 8-C. And I've run it on a lot of pcs and so forth."

And you say to this fellow, "All right. That's all you're going to run on pcs." And you know, you'll get better profile gains than if you told him something else. You got it? Until you can get him trained up and get a reality on something else, you had much better let him run something on which he has an adequate reality.

And if he's going to get a result, it's because he himself believes he can get a result. Now, you can enter far too far into the esoterics of all this. Look at the factor you're involved with. If an individual doesn't have a subjective reality on something, you cannot expect the individual to employ it with reality, can you? And there's nobody more sensitive to an unreality in a preclear than an auditor. But certainly there's nobody more unsensitive to unreality in an auditor than a preclear. Yeah, that's true.
So all of these things are monitoring factors on what auditors can and will use. And right now auditors broadly have apparently had considerable success with the CCHs over the years. They've been running them all wrong and backwards, because they've been running them doctored up and changed and alter-ised and "improved," see? When, as a matter of fact, it was something on the order of trying to improve the last space fleet that was developed in the last galactic empire at its utter peak, you see? And from there on all you were doing was pinning pink roses on the things. And you finally pinned enough pink roses and blue bows on these spaceships until eventually the fleet didn't fly anymore. That's about what happened.

Now, the original CCHs was the only thing on which I did any research, and it was done in the vicinity of 1957. I didn't employ them thereafter. It's an interesting story in connection with that: is I personally wanted to find out if I could audit this way. And I trained myself within a hair's breadth of auditing the CCHs. I could audit those CCHs in my sleep. You know, put on the perfect Tone 40 performance. You know, I grooved myself in – like you're learning Model Session now, you know. And I found out when I used this I got tremendous and very worthwhile gains. But it was used according to the old regimen. You see?

Now, all the research was done, all of the training of people on how to do it was done, and then I skipped it. And then we had an ACC or two, and we ran into modifications. For some reason or other, they weren't quite as keen to do the original version as they were a modified version – students.

Now, I just give you that in passing because this mustn't happen again to the CCHs. The CCHs work perfectly when done à la 1957. That was their nadir, and that was it. And it was CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. And they were done this way up in London.

There are some old tapes up there that'd utterly fascinate you – I think they're in the other room here – all about how you do the CCHs. And they're mostly tapes of "Don't alter-is it. Thank you. Don't alter-is it. Thank you. Don't alter-is it. Thank you." That's about what they amount to. That's what Ken ran into head-on here the other day. Because we had, actually, a good process system destroyed by about 1958, and it was less and less in use.

Well, why was it less and less in use? I wasn't paying much attention to it. And I was finding out that it wasn't producing the results before. And now that we need it, I've turned around and reviewed it, and I find out what is now called the CCHs bears no resemblance – any more than Little Eva did to Topsy in Uncle Tom's Cabin. They're just not the same breed.

CCHs are very simple. They're very straightforward. You do all the things it says. You put your intention into the pc. You don't Q-and-A with the things he does. You hold, actually, his body in an exact position. You run them close up. You're not trying to do anything but increase his reality and his control.

You see, CCH means Communication, Control and Havingness. And if you get this duplication – this was the sneak factor I suddenly discovered about the time of the first Saint Hill ACC: this duplication. So the less duplicative you are, the less havingness the pc has. Interesting, isn't it? Well, anyhow, there's the CCHs.

Now, the Security Check proposition. Now, I'll tell you what auditors wouldn't do the world around – what they wouldn't do. They wouldn't be imaginative enough to get the with-
holds off the case. I'll give you an example of a Security Check that was written at a Central
Organization. And I actually ought to frame it as how not to win. It says, "Do you have an
ARC break with Norma? Do you have an ARC break with Joe? Do you have an ARC break
with Bill and Pete? Thank you. You've passed the Security Check."

One just doesn't penetrate reality to that extent while one is taking responsibility for it,
see? One won't be responsible for taking the reality of this, because it's pretty grim asking for
withholds, see. All right.

Auditors were perfectly willing to make people well. They were perfectly willing to
audit people. They were perfectly willing to work with the most confoundedly gee-whiz cases
you ever heard of. But ask for that withhold? Well, they weren't unwilling to ask for the with-
hold. They were just unwilling to be sufficiently imaginative to do anything concerning it.

Oh, a fellow murdered his first wife, you see? The auditor would never bring himself
up to feeling that critical of the human race. You get the idea? Well, maybe the fellow just
beat his first wife. You ask him if he murdered his first wife, and he'll tell you, "No, I just beat
her." See, you can always overask a question, and auditors would not do that! Imagine it.
They'd sit there with their rudiments out, their rudiments out, their rudiments out, their rudi-
ments out. Well, it was killing people. I mean, not actually, but it was just murder, you know?
A guy was feeling bad, and so forth; the auditor never asked for the withhold!

So, we had to remedy this because this was a rather whirled-around condition. And
that whirled-around condition resulted in what? When I got down to South Africa, I found
that somebody had dreamed up a Security Check on my orders down there to parallel the laws
of South Africa. And these laws are very imaginative because they're dealing with people who
have extremely imaginative crimes. And actually there were things in there that I myself
wouldn't have thought of doing. Exceeded my reality. But over a period of years, South Af-
rica had collected them in their law books.

Oddly enough, the South African Security Check – here's a joke on Johannesburg –
contained originally, no single question concerning overt or withholds on the organization,
any staff members, any Scientologists, me or anybody else. Isn't that fascinating? Had omitted
that 100 percent from the zone of interrogation. And the people who were putting it out had
overt, really, only in that field. Fascinating, isn't it?

All right. Now, I put together this thing, doctored it up and called it the Joburg 1st,
see? But for a very long time – to show you how hard this one is to get into operation – peo-
ple will eventually wake up and use it. "Oh, oh," they say. You know, you've been standing
there; you've been screaming; you've been saying, "Use it. Use nothing else but it. Now use
that. That is a Security Check. That is what you're supposed to run on staff members. That is
what you're supposed to use. When you security check somebody, you use this form, Johan-
nesburg Security Check, HCO WW Form 1! You understand?"

And they say, "Okay." "Do you have an ARC break with Norma? Do you have an
ARC break...." [laughter]

Lots of people would like to rewrite this Security Check. And apparently the law is
this on rewriting Security Checks – it works like this: If the person is permitted to delete or
skip one of the levels of the Security Check, or if you give it to somebody to take certain lev-
els out that do not apply, the person takes out the very withholds he has, even though he
doesn't remember he has them. Isn't that curious? So you must never permit a Security Check
to be rewritten; you must never permit one to be edited for "special use". You understand?

I learned these things by accident. "Oh, you want all the Johannesburg Security
Checks sent in to you, personally. Well, here are all the Security Checks on the staff. We've
only given one Johannesburg Security Check." They've had it for months. They've got another
Security Check. Got the idea? So you have an HCO Policy Letter along about this time of life
that says, "The Only Valid Security Check." And when we say, "The Only Valid Security
Check," we mean the Johannesburg Security Check, or by whatever name it may be called by
HCO WW. And it will only be the complete form of a form issued at HCO WW. Got it?
That's how hard that one is to hold in.

That's interesting. They will give a Security Check. They will learn how to give Secu-
rity Checks. They will ask the most outrageous questions as long as they are written down and
are part of a Security Check. But then you've got this other impulse all the time that is going
around, a little bit here and a little bit there: "Well, it's not necessary to ask this question. It's
about illicit diamond buying. That only applies to South Africa, and we're up here in northern
Siberia."

I was speaking, by the way, as though I were in Chicago. They're trying to pass laws
out in Chicago these days that everybody who is pronounced crazy by anybody that happens
to know his name are instantly shipped to Siberia – I mean Alaska. Did you know that? Won-
derful way of get – clearing up the political scene. The only trouble is, the people who are in
power when they dream these things up never quite remember that someday they're going to
be out of power. That's because they don't know they're going to live another life, too. It's
very, very amusing that all the legislatures and so forth, on the laws they pass – because
they're old men and no longer effect them – walk into their next lifetimes and are totally sub-
ject to all of their conscription orders, to all their educational orders, to all their child labor
blah-blah. The whole lousy works, you see? And you talk about being cause of your own ef-
fect, God help a legislator.

Anyhow, in passing, this Security Check is not an alter-isable proposition. So don't let
people edit them and don't edit them when you're giving them. You say, "Have you ever done
any illicit diamond buying?" – "idb". Well, it's even a phrase in South Africa. Do you know
how many pcs we've caught in England and America on this? [laughter] Well, it's fascinating,
you know? Because it doesn't fall on illicit diamond buying necessarily; it falls on anything to
do with diamonds. And people – the weirdest things they will do with diamonds: they smug-
gle them, and they swallow them, and they ...

Now, that question alone is left in there as a bit of a gag. It's to identify the check, and
probably till the end of time I hope to keep that question in – "Have you ever done any illicit
diamond buying?" – just to identify the source of the check. But very shortly this is going to
become HCO WW Form 4 – Security Form 4. And it will be called by another name – be
called by another name – probably be called an HGC Processing Questionnaire. See, some-
thing very mild and innocuous, but it'll still be HCO W [WW] Form 4. There actually will be
a few more questions. There will be a whole section in there which could be at once applied to the student and could be applied to the HGC pc.

We found that an awful lot of HGC pcs hang up in processing because they get mad at the Chief Registrar, or they're discourteous to the Receptionist or something. And they're just having an awful time this particular morning, and we don't quite understand why they're having a hard time. It isn't what we think they should do; it's evidently what they think they should do, you see? They're having a dreadful time. And they start asking for withholds and they get a fall. And they can't imagine what dreadful thing this is, and they find out the pc didn't say good morning to the HASI Registrar. See, it's a withhold. They meant to say good morning, but they decided not to say good morning, then they decided it was discourteous that they had done this. You got the idea?

And they get messed up with withholds on Central Org personnel or Scientologists just in, really, the relatively few days that they're around the place. Because they come in, you see, on obsessive, unkind-thought automaticities. See? They walk in and they got unkind thoughts going off automatically, see? And it's going brrrrrrrrrr a thousand miles a minute. You know? Unkind thought here, unkind thought there, and an unkind thought someplace else, and an unkind thought someplace else, and an unkind thought someplace else. And golly! These things, these things get square across their processing line.

So it is in an effort to keep auditors from breaking their hearts and people from wasting their money; you have to give a full check. There will be a new section in it then that refers to students and preclears, the kinds of things that they possibly might do. And there will probably be a section in there for the benefit of the field auditor. Like "Have you said anything unkind to anybody you know about your auditor?" You got the idea?

Well, you know, you'd be surprised how many things are going to fall. And this auditor is trying his best, and he feels good about it all. And this pc is just withholding like crazy, because he goes out in propitiation and gets even with the auditor by telling everybody in the neighborhood what a dirty rat he is, and that he keeps seven women under the bed. (He only keeps two.) [laughter]

Now, the only way you can make one of these things work is to clean things up at the same time you're using it. You see, it's a two-edged sword. If you're going to be reprehensible about unkind thoughts about Scientologists and organizations, and if this holds people up, then it should be – we should be quite militant on setting it up so that we don't merit these things, you see? And this includes – oh, I don't know, I can think of several dirty words off-hand, speak – thinking of unkind thoughts.

There's been somebody crashing around the United States who has evidently – since 1952, has been complaining to me bitterly about all of the thetans that come in the night and PDH him. And he has now gone on an all-out in the United States, and he's writing mimeograph sheets to everyone telling them that they've been PDHed, and that everybody in God's green Earth has PDHed them, and Central Organization members have PDHed them, and I've PDHed them. What conceit! [laughter]
And I've shown you the little trick and actually written an article in *Ability* in America, which is probably out right about now. It's "The Sad T-a-i-l of PDH." And it's how you can demonstrate conclusively that the cat has PDHed you.

That's a piece of our technical training around here now. So those of you who have just come in, get somebody to show you -- show *you*, with *you* on the meter -- that the cat has PDHed you. The meter will say so, if you don't know how to run a meter. Or if you know how to run a meter very, very well, you can make a meter say almost anything by getting associative words in. And of course you'd really -- if you really knew a meter, they wouldn't fool anybody because they'd see the sporadic and uneven falls, you see.

You'd -- just association of words. Anybody will get a fall on "pain," anybody is liable to get a fall on "drug," anybody is liable to get a fall on "hypnosis," and anybody is liable to have done anything to a cat. So what you do is spot the moment when he's done something to the cat, and that was the date. The meter will answer up as "Has the cat PDHed you?" You just pick the moment of the overt, that's all. And he could pick the exact moment on the time track of something like this as long as he had an overt right at that instance, see? If it clicks. It's marvelous.

Difficulty is that a meter will not clear -- will not clear -- on an untruth. If the pc is -- if you're still -- you've still got an untruth and you're trying to foist off on the pc some untruth, the meter won't clear on it. But as soon as you put the pc through the jumps on this kind of thing, why, the pc clears on it, you see?

All right. How does a person get in a kind of a state that he'd run around saying all such incredible things, and so on? Well, he gets in that kind of state because he's had case advance without ever anybody pulling his withholds. So countering the fact that it might be a little bit embarrassing to have some of these things disclosed, is the fact that if it isn't administered, you don't get any case gain and actually will practically torture a pc by processing him for a long period of time without getting off his withholds. In other words, it's a very unkind thing to do, to use tools that boost his case way up and leave him with all of his withholds. Because his withholds now turn in, with responsibility, to overts about which he's going to feel very bad.

He managed to stay sufficiently irresponsible and *da-de-da-da-da-da-da* that they never bothered him, bothered him. And all of a sudden he gets a little more responsible, and he says, "I don't think it was nice to strangle that little girl. I don't think that was so nice. I wonder if it hurt her."

You know, and about this time he gets a little more case advance and he says, "Oh, God," you know? "But of course, I don't dare tell anybody. They'd execute me."

So he gets another little bit of a case advance and he says, "Blaw-rra-yea!"

He gets another little case advance, and actually he could get to a state of where he'd go -- be going around craving peppermint candy. You have forced him into a life continuum. You've snapped the valence in on him. You've increased his responsibility without permitting him to be responsible for what he's done. And when you increase a person's potential respon-
sibility without letting them be responsible for what they have done, no more desperately vic-
cious mechanism could exist in processing. Have you got it?

So if you don't administer a good, tough Security Check, and if you don't keep that Se-
curity Check good and keep it whole, you're just setting it up for pcs not only to not be
cleared but actually to start feeling miserable. Oddly enough, feeling miserable, they're better
off than they were being irresponsible. You got the idea? And they'll tell you so, too. But you
just peg them. You peg their processing gain. It isn't that you do something overt that forces
their case down; you peg their processing gain. And it'll peg right up to the point where they
become responsible for some overt act in the past. And there the case will hang. And that's it.
They've had it from there on. And you won't get any further advance out of that case.

So one of your rules is, is when a person ceases to advance rapidly, you just pick up
Mr. Joburg and start in at the beginning and run through to the end. And you all of a sudden
will find out why.

Yeah, but here's your theory: If you get all of his withholds off early in processing,
why, you won't run into this, will you? Oh, but wait. He doesn't know anything about these
overts. He doesn't even consider the things he's done overtime.

Here's this girl. She has kept all of her brothers and sisters in a state of total blackmail
and terror – the oldest girl of the family or something. She locked them up in closets. She's
responsible for one of them now being a permanent cripple, and so forth. And you give her a
Security Check. And the first check, the only real withhold that you get off of her is that at the
age of about seven she thought that her sister probably wasn't as pretty as she should be. And
that falls on the meter, but nothing else falls.

Now, the person has to be processed, and you suddenly find these other things. Those
withholds come off. You process them again. And by consistently doing this one against the other – processing against the Security Check – you
have an indirect measure of the progress of the case as well as opening up the road for the
case to drive on it. Because if the person doesn't have any new withholds, you have laid a
large ostrich egg in your last few hours of processing. See? But if you find new withholds on
a case that weren't hitherto disclosed, you know you're making progress.

So don't say to yourself, "Ah, I must be terrible at security checking, because after all,
I ran him on the general levels for about eight hours and so forth, but just before that I must
have missed all of these withholds. Look at them. How could I have been that stupid in run-
ing an E-Meter?"

No. They weren't there. Because a person has to have some reality on a terminal or a
condition before it falls on an E-Meter. And that's why you assess terminals, is because you
don't want to run a terminal on which the pc has no reality. And when this thing reacts, it says
reality. You could call it an ARC meter and you'd just be in dandy shape. It says reality! Rea-
ality!

Now, you know what's wrong. You know what's wrong with Mamie Zilch. You know
it's her husband. You know. So you take right off and you don't use an E-Meter and you run,
"Now, Mamie. Now, Mamie, you've heard of this process, O/W. What have you done to your
husband? What have you withheld from your husband? What have you done to your husband? What have you withheld from your husband?" and so forth.

And Mamie says, "Let's see, I – I uhm – I uhm – I actually find the question very difficult to answer. I really have never done anything to the brute. He kept throwing me down wells. And every time he'd back the car out of the garage, he'd call me out just to make sure that I was standing right behind it, so that he could run into me. And he used to write letters – I never saw any of these letters – but he used to write letters to all of my friends saying that I had venereal disease. Let's see. What else did he do to me?"

You say, "No. No. The question is 'What have you done to him?'"

"I've never done anything to him in my life."

You say, "Wait a minute. What goes on here?" Well, what goes on here is very simple. The pc has not taken any responsibility for any acts with regard to her husband. Now, it doesn't matter whether the husband was a good man or a bad man. You understand? The pc has taken no responsibility for these acts, and so there's nothing the pc has done to the husband is real.

So, what is the source and why do you come about with overts and withholds anyhow? It's basically, they're based on something getting unreal to the pc. So the more overts and withholds a pc has, the less a pc registers on the meter. And you'll finally find the pc floating here at 2 with a totally stuck needle, and they won't move off 2, and you can't get the tone arm off 2. The sensitivity is up here at 16, and you say to them, "Gee! You must be Clear."

You know, a lot of people checking out Clears very early rather tended to invalidate the state of Clear because they didn't know anything about a meter at all. There was very little known about a meter. But it takes that free floating needle. It takes that needle there that is going to – . When you first see one of these free floating needles, they're unmistakable. Ah, it's awfully hard to fake one. I don't think it could be faked. It's just a smooth flow with no sticks and no reactions, you see. Well, that looks an awful – that's with sensitivity way down here.

And that looks an awful lot different than a person at 2 and the needle totally stuck. And you kick him in the shins and you don't even get a drop of the needle. Well, that's a state of total irresponsibility. That's what that state is, because you're registering a dead thetan in a body that somehow goes on ticking. You're just getting the body reaction.

Well, of course, this pc is going to go down here to 1 – through 7. There's 7 on this E-Meter, by the way, but it can't turn to it. You once in a while will find a pc there, and you'll go nuts trying to get him on the meter. It'll be down here at 6.5, and then you'll get down here to 5, and you get down here to 4 – this is over a long, long course of processing – and he'll wobble around here for a while, and he'll finally get back here to 3, or if a girl, get back here to 2, and there it is. It's the same reading all over again. Ah, except the sensitivity is down and the needle is just floating, and the needle is no longer stuck. Okay?

But that's a high state of responsibility. Now, how can a person take responsibility for his acts unless you give him a chance to? And if he does take responsibility for his acts and isn't able to communicate them to you, he goes out of session. He blows. He doesn't finish his
intensives. He doesn't keep on with the auditor. He gets upset about auditing. All these various evils we have seen in the past are all explained by this mechanism of the person goes up and hits the ceiling. And the ceiling is the number of withholds for which he has become responsible and that he can't tell anybody. So you got to take out the ceiling and let him move up to the first floor. You got the idea?

So here's the picture, in other words, of this new bulletin. It just plays this mechanism about which I've been talking, one against the other. You give the person a case gain with the fastest tools you know how, and his responsibility is increased, so you get off his withholds. And the best thing to use, according to what auditors will use and auditors have used, is this thing called a Security Check. It asks them all, man. And if there's anything missing on it, they'll eventually appear on it. We don't care how long it takes to give a Security Check, because it's an unkindness not to give one. That's the story of this bulletin. That's at the background of this bulletin. Perhaps there are – a person can run SOP Goals on a person right out of an institution. If he were a good auditor, he could actually get the person's goals and so forth. Now, it might take him two hundred hours. The pc would be advancing the whole time.

It's merely what auditors will do. And at the present time you don't want anything but Routines 1 and 2 being run anywhere. You don't want to see these things run anywhere, including Los Angeles. You ought to send a cable tonight saying, "A bulletin is coming to you, date (so-and-so). Use nothing but Routines 1 and 2. And if I catch you using any other routines, I will have a few bleeding hearts. Because I can now run out my overts; I'm dangerous." Got the idea? Why? Because they've proved abundantly that they can run levels [Routines] 1 and 2. And they've proved abundantly they can't run level – Routine 3. They have proven this abundantly.

Some of the people who turn up here, some of the goals that have been found on them – man, all you do is ask them twice and you can't find it in the back of the meter or the bottom of the meter or anything else, and yet they've been run on it. Now, do you know what can happen if you find the wrong goal – wrong terminal on a pc? You can live-up the whole Prehav Scale, that's what's going to happen. And this is one of the tests: About the third time you have found a level, about the third assessment you give him on the terminal you have found, watch that list as you assess it. And if there's something on the order of a dozen levels live, eheaah, you've got the wrong terminal. The wrong terminal makes every level of it live. Look at the state you're putting the poor critter into.

The thing is so compiled that about four levels of it will be live anyway. You'll have four levels of it. But if a dozen up – a dozen or more – are hot and alive on this scale, it's not there's something wrong with the rudiments, it's just something is wrong with that terminal. So along about your third reassessment you could do a check on SOP Goals.

But that's kind of vicious, because do you know that if you only partially flatten levels on the general Prehav Scale on the goals terminal, you know you can make the fellow feel like he's nuts? He starts going kind of nuts. Well, you're driving a ten-thousand-horsepower machine, see, and it starts feeling kind of meummm. He's got level after level unflat. You yourself can demonstrate that.
We had some auditor up here – he was being coached over the telephone from Saint Hill – running somebody once. He had all of his data. He had it all laid out in tape. He could run it off like a parrot. There wasn't any reason under the sun he shouldn't have done it. And you know what he did? He ran four levels in an afternoon on one pc, because he'd interpreted the instructions – which wording, by the way, never occurred in any instructions and doesn't. He said he interpreted the instructions because they were written wrong. Well, they weren't written wrong I went and checked it out.

On all the bulletins, you never find "You barely take the motion out of the tone arm and then you reassess." That was what he thought the instruction said. It doesn't even use those words. You could say, reversewise, "You run it until the tone arm is barely moving," but not even these instructions occurred in the literature and instructions he was given, see? He couldn't even have made that mistake. It's sort of a whew!

Now, the assessment was fairly accurate and had been done for him. He didn't even have to do that. In other words, faced with goals and terminals, a lot of these people sort of go to pieces. Takes a lot of training.

Furthermore, the pc is so easily ARC broken – so very easily upset. He advances so rapidly that his responsibility is rising up to a point where he's got withholds by the bucket coming up all the time. And if he isn't well handled with perfect mechanical approach, perfect technical, perfect TRs, perfect E-Meter operation – I mean perfect – well, you're never going to clear anybody.

That's it.
POINTS IN ASSESSING
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Thank you.

I was going to say I can always tell when somebody is mad at me: They don't come to my lectures. [laughter] That happens to be a coordinated fact, you know that? People who don't – haven't attended my lectures in the past in Central Organizations, eventually squirreled in some fashion. Odd. Peculiar. So I always look around to see who's there, you know? It's my Security Check.

All right. Now, this is the 7th of June, isn't it?

Audience: Right. Uh-huh.

Marcabian intelligence report date – something or other. Did you hear about the Marcabians who had to PDH the Thedeans who had to – in order to make Frank Sullivan safe for democracy. Anyhow [laughs] – ah, it's a wonderful life.

All right. Now, I lectured to you yesterday on HCOB June 5, 1961. Tried to give you some very fast general coverage concerning it, and this bulletin was issued to you today. This bulletin is based totally and completely on what we have found people would do and what people can do. And they can do these. And although I can tell you innumerable ways to punch buttons on cases, innumerable ways to become aesthetically telepathic about cases, read their facsimiles and all kinds of weird things like this, it doesn't happen that over the last eleven years people have uniformly been able to duplicate this. So as a result, we have techniques and technologies, and we have taken it all down out of the beautiful esoterics of esoteria and have got it well situated now into the ponderous clank of something that can be totally understood and duplicated. Okay?

The trick of communication in Dianetics and Scientology is the interesting trick back of all the tricks. That is the one thing that has been the most difficult and is probably the greatest achievement. Other people might look at other things, but learning how to get things understood is one of the most difficult things – without developing a large vocabulary.

We could easily do this by inventing eighteen dictionaries and the 8,000 new terms you have to learn as a medical student and so forth – and we've got somewhere around 400 terms that are – 472 terms, I think, include all of the oddball ones we don't even use. In common usage, I think a Scientologist's vocabulary probably isn't over about 75 or 80 words that are completely strange and peculiar and have their own meanings. But once you define these words – once these
words are defined – people look at them and realize there was no such word. See, so we've had to make something that sounds like English, you see, then mean something. And it's very odd – as soon as I get out the dictionary – which I'm doing – I do that between 7:00 A.M. and 7:05 on my schedule. [laughter]

I must have an overt on buzz saws though. I did get to bed for a couple hours sleep this morning, and I no more than closed my eyes, than Farmer Jones opened up on a buzz saw. And you know, he is perfectly tuneless on the thing. He can't play it worth a darn. So he has now got another black mark in his book and our books. And factually – not for that reason at all – everybody is being very fed up, because they open up his book now and they find nothing but total black pages. You know, he's run out of black marks.

But trying to communicate to him, for instance, anything about anything is a very good example. Here's an actual example: You try to explain what the situation is all about. You draw a blank. You draw a complete blank. But he responds like mad to processing. Even anything as corny as a Touch Assist.

I ran an engram on him one day standing out in the front drive. The odd part of it was his hand recovered and everything else. He'd been kicked by a cow in a milk pail. And at first he thought the milk pail had kicked him. He didn't know when it happened. He couldn't locate when it occurred. It was sometime between breakfast and supper. He didn't know at what moment what had happened. He had no clue, and he was having a rough time. And his hand was all crippled up, and he couldn't milk. So I stood him out here in the front drive and ran out a bad hand. He became rather pathetically curious afterwards as to what we were doing.

There's no language to talk about it, you see? That's the trouble you have, you see? The no-language barriers. It's the no-language barrier. These words do not exist in the language because the understanding didn't exist in the language.

Now, words are based on agreed-upon understandings. And English is a Johnny-come-lately language. Most of these postulates hadn't been made or thought of for the last 200 trillion years. You're going to express them in English? People don't even know these principles.

However, you tell him a definition of a word, carefully, using, oh, I don't know, using twenty, thirty words, something like that – a definition of a word – he doesn't latch onto the word rapidly because the concept is brand-new to him, and he's rather stonied by the definition. This is something that's never occurred to him before. He can sense the truth of it. Something is going ding, ding, ding. "That's true, you know. That's true. You know?" But he can't quite grasp it. And while he's still in the throes of grasping this, recognizing there is a truth there, if you threw right on top of it a condensation of your explanation and his cognition in just the few letters contained in one word, you've almost collapsed the track on him, don't you see? He has to realize the principle before he can take the word. You got that?
It goes reversewise. A child has to find out that the stove is warm before he begins to understand what "warm stove" means, don't you see? Now on a thought level they have to understand the concept. Well, this is almost like processing.

It used to be fellows would read the Axioms and read things about it and get all sorts of cognitions. And you know, "Dianetics: Evolution of a Science": We have numerous cases of people in hospitals having been given this or finding it, and just reading the book and throwing back the covers and getting up and sliding into their shoes, much to the horrors of the nurse, and leaving and never being sick again.

What did this? It was basically a resurge of hope that there was some understanding of all this, don't you see? But it was the understanding alone. So the understanding operates as processing. You got it? It operates that way – it's clarifications.

Well, until you have somebody who has wrapped his wits around some of the principles, so that he isn't still going, "Let me see. Are all men bad? Are all men good? I wonder if all men are good. All men are ... are bad. There probably is two different kinds of people. There's the good people and the bad people."

I knew a nut one time that used to say, "Well, there are two kinds of people: there are happy people and unhappy people. And you're an unhappy person." And then she would add gloomily, "And I'm a happy person." [laughter] See, she had this all worked out.

And if you all of a sudden shoot something in and say, "People are thetans. And there's the overt-motivator sequence, and what they do to others, why, they think is done to them"; boy, you've just fired a philosophic salvo of fleet intensity. See? Wham! You know, and everything is reverberating from horizon to horizon, you see. And you say, "Now do you get the word 'overt-motivator sequence'? Oh, you don't understand the word yet. Well, you're stupid." And in training people, they actually have to learn the principles before they learn the words.

That'll make this dictionary rather interesting reading, because they look at the word, and they're perfectly willing to commit that to memory. And then they read the definition, and the fleet salvo reverberates from horizon to horizon, and they say, "What word was that? What word was that? You know? You know? That's submerged. That's gone. What are we connected with? What planet is this?" you know? That kind of thing. And then they finally come around and they say – they look at it again, and then they look at it again and then they run into it with familiarity. And then they get more and more familiar with it. And then all of a sudden they know the word. See, they can package it, because the understanding of it is so easily understood that it is thoughtwise transmittable. You got the idea? Until that time, they can't learn a vocabulary.

Now, you can do anything you want to, to teach people how to learn a vocabulary, but you run against the principle of the communication of the idea that is packaged in the word. And these ideas have not been familiar to man.

All right. Doing that in a relatively simple way might look complicated to people simply because their basic difficulty is trying to grasp some principle. And they haven't got a good idea.
of what an overt-motivator sequence is, and every time they try to face it, you know, it sort of blows the words "overt-motivator sequence"; they become meaningless. And what they haven't done is grasp the principle of the overt-motivator sequence. It is not that they haven't grasped the word. They could spout the word parrot-fashion, but they cannot understand this other principle, don't you see? See what we're connecting up when we're training people.

Actually, we know – would have no sounder method of educating somebody than teaching him the principles of Scientology under the guise of teaching him the vocabulary of Scientology. Got the idea? They couldn't help but have a repercussion.

All right. Now similarly, the operational actions which we undertake apparently are liable to shortness of understanding or misunderstanding Therefore, what will be done and what can be done by a person in Scientology, by a Scientologist, is monitored by what he can easily understand and what he is willing to perform. And you have that right here, and this is quite a triumph, this HCOB June 5.

Now, to a non-trained person, this bulletin would probably be gobbledygook, because it doesn't explain too much here. It's dependent on other publications, you see? It says CCHs. Well, of course, we've been through the ropes and we know what the CCHs are, but that wouldn't mean anything to – oh, I don't know – Menninger, presuming he's still alive.

"CCHs. Oh, must be something made up. Something made up."

"No," you say, "No. It's a repetitive thing. It's actually control, communication and havingness. When you apply control, you obtain communication, which gives the preclear havingness. And it is a method of entrance on cases which is rather infallible. And that's what CCHs mean." Look where you'd leave Menninger. [laughter] See? He wouldn't be around there, that's all.

In the first place, you've enunciated to him a principle that psychiatry, if it had any teeth left, would give them all if they had a formula by which they could actually bring back some sanity, see? They haven't got that. So you've thrown him this formula and control to him is electric-shocking people, and communicating with people is electric-shocking people, and havingness to him is electric shock or psychosis. So it adds up to him: "Well, control, communication – it'll drive people crazy." Get the idea? His adjudication. You see how he'd arrive at the point where "it'd drive people crazy", because his havingness is psychotics. This is all the havingness the man has, obviously. See, so control – that's electric shocking people. And communication – that's electric shocking people, because he knows you can't, see? And havingness – well, that's electric shocks and psychosis. Oh, psychosis. You can have psychosis, so that if you ran the CCHs on anybody, you'd drive them crazy. And they electric-shock people because it drives them crazy.

You see, you're baffled because you don't realize that you're dealing with short-circuited thinking. You know: A=A=A, therefore you do it. Fact equals fact equals contrary fact, so you dramatize it. So you're not even in that case dealing with thinking. As the – I'm not berating these people. I'm merely saying there couldn't be any thinking because there's bulletin after bulletin
that they themselves put out continually, saying that surgery and electric shock do nothing but harm people. And they go right on ordering them and doing them, you see, so that it must be a short-circuited thinkingness. So you're not penetrating at that level at all. Now how are you going to penetrate?

You say to this fellow, "All right. Now look. Joburg Processing Check. That is a series of questions which are asked the person to obtain from them data which they ordinarily have not handed out." And right away, Menninger says, "Ah, Catholic church." See? Thu-thup! So we now have the fact that we are driving people crazy by using the mechanisms of the Catholic church. [laughter] You get how you get a no-think out of this? This would be the no-think.

Well, it's very interesting to see how these things add up. But they are not gobbledygook to you because you've experienced a great many of these things – experienced them all. The only thing you possibly haven't experienced is being Clear, and you possibly have not seen a Clear floating needle.

As a matter of fact, I told an auditor in HGC London the other day that they ought to take the pc around and show the auditors a Clear free floating needle. And I got into the most oddball yippety-yap you ever heard of. Why? Because this is an unfamiliarity. We're in a zone of unfamiliarity, and even the despatch was misinterpreted. It caused a great deal of randomness, this despatch. The pc got hold of it and interpreted it that I had – was forcing upon her the concept that she was Clear. The auditor must have interpreted it similarly because never showed it – this Clear floating needle type needle – to any of the other auditors. The only thing I wanted them to do, if anybody had cared to read the thing – the only thing I wanted them to do, was to be able to look at a floating needle. Nobody had ever seen one up there, see? And this is a floating needle. And it was a wonderful opportunity for somebody to see a floating needle. Instead of that, pc is ARC broke and it has to be run in the next session.

Look at the randomness that suddenly developed here. Pretty wild, you know? You say, "Auditors, I want you to show a floating needle." Pc has an ARC break. Auditor doesn't go anywhere near anybody. Pc has a present time problem. The auditor is mad at me because I've upset the pc. See? Pc was haunting HCO – shouldn't have been – watching things coming in over the telex. Oh, wild.

Well, look, that's the only thing on this bulletin that the auditors in London wouldn't have a fair familiarity with at this stage. And it caused randomness. Got it? So it takes a little while to develop an understanding of things. Right?

You shouldn't be teaching somebody above their zones of reality, really. But you can reach them with processing and they then do gain a subjective reality on the thing. And you can reach them in numerous ways, don't you see? And you actually could teach them a bunch of these philosophic-level principles and then they'd get – even get a vocabulary if they got a subjective grasp on these things. But it's an auditing process. It blows enturbation off the case. And while it is blowing off the case, the case feels confused. So the instant reaction of Menninger is, "This is terribly confusing. I haven't got anything to do with it."
I had a psychiatrist reading Dianetics, and he was rushing out every few minutes and putting the electrodes on somebody and coming back in. [laughter] And he says, "Yes. Yes. I've looked at this book. I've – this book came in the other day. It came in the other day. And I looked at it, and I've looked it over. And I've reported it to the association. I think it's disgraceful." And he says, "I'm a Horney." I said, "Well what philosophy do you follow in your psychoanalysis?"

He says, "I'm a Horney man myself. I'm a Horney man." And he rushed out and strapped and shocked somebody else and came back in again. And he says, "I'm a Horney man."

And I said, "Well ..." I saw it while he was gone, I saw the book Horney, Karen Horney. So I said, "Well, what is Horney? What is the Horney offshoot of Freudian analysis?" and so on.

He says, "I don't know. I never read it." [laughter]

It'd be different if I was telling you that for a gag. But actually that's totally factual. Unbelievably true. He was a Horney man, but he'd never read anything by Horney. I don't know – how do you get it? Telepathic?

I think they'd call it probably, Freudianly, "telepathic emission", something like that. If you keep a book on a shelf long enough, why, you get it by contagion or something. Maybe some years later he expected as long as the book sat on the shelf, why, he would become all of a sudden imbued with its characteristics.

Well anyway, none of this bulletin, to a Scientologist, is apparently incomprehensible. And the only place a Scientologist gets in trouble out in the field and untrained, is in doing Goals Assessments. And trying to run SOP Goals, he can run into too many things.

Now, for instance, we've just run into one on a case today. Case was apparently flat on a level on the case's terminal. Apparently flat, but wasn't. Wasn't. Couldn't have been, because the case was still worried about the level.

Well, we were running the principle of running the rock slam out of the needle rather than running the motion out of the tone arm. And now a question enters: Is this right? I mean, is it right just to run the rock slam out or should you actually flatten that level?

But nevertheless, this case does not answer the problem, because this case might have had a present time problem not detected by the auditor or, after the rudiments were checked out, suddenly had a present time problem. See, the rudiments sort of boost the case's reality, and all of a sudden the case realizes it has a present time problem, so now doesn't get a rock slam. You see, the process isn't biting. Actually, their mind is on something else so the auditor thinks it is flat.

Tone arm motion reduced, in other words, by reason of a rudiment out. And the tone arm moving so little that the auditor would be brought to the conclusion that it was flat. I would be brought to the conclusion it was flat, reading the report, don't you see? So we go off and assess for another level. And then we come back and find the rock slam there 100 percent, because some PTPs have been handled on the pc.
In other words, we have this odd adjudication that we can put on running terminals, and that is that if a pc has a rudiment out, a level can look flat which isn't. And you can put that down in your book, because we've just discovered it and proved it out factually. Because when we went back to this level – two levels have been run since, but the case was bogging.

And in patch-up of cases on general run of Prehav and on patch-up of cases in general – of a general run of the terminal – of the goal, if a case isn't making much progress, you had better go back – that's why you must keep your auditor's reports. This is the way to patch one up, is go back and pick the earliest level run and that might not have been flat, and flatten the level, and come on up to the next level after that and flatten that, because that will now probably be unflat. In other words, you've got to flatten every level now that you've left unflat, and all levels will tend to be unflat, since the level you left unflat. You got it?

So you must keep your reports. The case apparently bogs. Well, the case had a PTP and an ARC break or something like that, and it wasn't detected, and for that reason the tone arm ceased to move, and you say the level is flat. And it's not, and you run a few more levels, and all of a sudden the case is having more and more PTPs, and more and more obsessed with upsets and problems and so forth.

Well, the way to patch that up is to go back and review the tone arm figures on each level that was run at its end. See? Get the end run. Review the last twenty minutes of every process level that has been run on the pc. Okay? And pick the earliest one that you suspect may not be flat. Got it? And to be on the safe side, pick the earliest one that you suspect. But you could – there could be a little bit later one that you might suspect more, but you wouldn't quite be able to decide. Well, if you couldn't quite decide – it usually will be quite obvious to you – but if you couldn't decide – well, go back and pick the earliest candidate and run it, because they'll flatten off rather quickly. You got it?

Now, take all the motion out of the level this time. Just run it down to a point of where it just grinds to a brake-smoking halt. Hm?

Now, what else would you do to patch it up? Well, if you've done a good Goals Assessment, you've got the hidden standards. You know, the person always looks and finds out if his right ear is no longer burning, so he knows the process is working. This is the standards. Lots of people have these standards. And these standards are actually present time problems of magnitude of long duration. And you're running a case with a PT problem that has a hidden standard. See? Well, why run this? Now you would do much better to use what it says here about handling problems of longtime duration under Routine 2, second page. Problems of long duration.

Now, we mean by a problem of long duration, years or within this lifetime. The problem must have existed for years or in this lifetime. Otherwise, it's a PT problem. It's less than a year; it's only months or weeks, hours, minutes, seconds: it's a present time problem of short duration. These are simply artificial labels to give you an order of magnitude.
So the difference between a present time problem of short duration and a present time problem of long duration are quite important to you, because you handle a present time problem of short duration always in the rudiments only. Don't take it into Prehav or into processes or anything like that. Just put it into the rudiments. And the rudiments processes that are supposed to be run in the rudiments will handle it, and you shouldn't do any more about it than that.

But a present time problem of long duration, which means more than a year and less than a lifetime – this lifetime, see – you do a Terminal Assessment just like you were doing a Goals Assessment. And you just keep hammering and hammering and hammering and running and running. And it's not something you do in twenty minutes, the way I've been getting it in auditor reports. "Well, we did a Terminals Assessment for the present time problem of long duration, and then we assessed for the level, and we immediately got to running it." And you look up at the assessment, and it's five minutes. Oh? Five minutes? How interesting.

You mean you could get a list of all terminals which might be involved in this problem and do an assessment by elimination in five minutes? Oh, yes. Like hell you could. You're looking at a couple of sessions, man! Let's get real. This person has a hidden standard. His right ear – he knows whether processes are working because his right ear doesn't burn. But when his right ear is burning, why, then he knows a process isn't working.

You had a case go through HGC London a very short time ago who had some kind of a peculiar thing of some kind. It was something as unlovely, I think, as if you will excuse me – a vaginal discharge and when this lessened, the process was working and when it got increased, the processes weren't working, and everything was being barometered by this rather fantastic action.

Now, that's nothing against anybody. You'd have to find that out. Oh, look. There is something connected here that is real to the pc. It must be more real to the preclear than the preclear's case, by automatic definition, because the pc uses it as an indicator for his case so that this thing must then be a substitute for his case. You got that? I mean, a substitute for the case. That's why you must know about hidden standards!

In other words, the hidden standard is more real to the pc than any case or life difficulties he is having, because he tries to find out if it is functioning or not functioning. He's sort of packing an E-Meter around on the side of his head, don't you see? You got the idea? Well, his attention obviously – this is merely a problem of attention.

There hasn't been a lecture, by the way, on attention and dispersed attention, attention units and so forth since, I think, something ridiculous like the end of June 1950 at the Elks Hall in – it was – must have been someplace in New Jersey – Elizabeth! Mmmm! The Elks Hall in Elizabeth, New Jersey. There was a whole hour lecture at that particular time on the subject of attention units and how they are trapped in the bank, and the individual is running only on 1 percent or 2 percent of the theoretical 100 percent of attention available to him, because his attention is pinned down in other places of the bank, you see?
Well, that's very, very interesting to us today to all of a sudden have this old one suddenly leap into view, full-armed, see? Because here it is; here it is. You're working with it right now. You're assessing for a goal to find out where the person has most of his attention. You're assessing for the terminal and immediately the goal would disintensify that you find the terminal really, because, of course, the attention is really fixed on the goal because it is fixed on the terminal. And the second it gets fixed on the terminal, you've rather unfixed it on the goal, so the goal will read less after you've been assessing terminals a little while.

All right. Your next point here is that if the pc has his attention on a burning right ear, well, for heaven's sakes, it's practically a total computation sitting right there on the side of the pc's head. So what do you do? You say, "What is it now? Has that been -- have you worried about that for some time?" You say, "Well, what would have to happen to you for you to know that Scientology works?" That is the cute question.

The pc always answers up and they give you some of the most remarkable answers you ever heard in your life. "Well, to know that Scientology really works, my daughter would have to get over her hives."

Oh, come on. This person's attention isn't even on himself. But nevertheless that is the answer. "Well now, has your daughter having hives been a problem to you for a long ..."

"Oh, well yes. Specialists. Take him up to Pennsylvania, take him up to Wyoming, and we've gone down south. We've gone practically every place. We've imported special bees to sting her and followed the very best directions we possibly can. She still has these hives. And we keep rubbing pickle juice into them all the time. And every night I have to get up five times a night and rub pickle juice into her hives so that she can sleep. And this has been going on for some years. And I actually feel guilty about it myself, you see, because one day she walked up to the stove when she was just a little child and -- she did. And I spilled onion juice all over her. Well now, ever since that time I think she's had these hives."

Hey, what better indicator do you want? You say something about the problem, and your pc goes off like a small firecracker, see? Like a string of ladyfinger firecrackers, you know. Pop, pop, pop, pop, pop, pop, pop. Pc real interested. Yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. Brrrrrr. Yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. Where do you think their attention is? Attention is on daughter's hives. So to clear this pc, you have to get her daughter's hives out of the way. [laughter] But you get her concern as a pc's attention off of these hives. If the hives cure up, it's totally coincidental. But they might. [laughter]

Now, here's the hidden standard. And this hidden standard keeps more people from getting released or cleared than any other single thing I know of except withholds. See? So it's just junior in rank to withholds for holding people up and holding cases up, you know? And actually, the present time problem is right on the goals chain. Always is. Otherwise it couldn't be a problem of long duration. It's somehow connected with it. So if you scrape the top off, the case assesses much more rapidly. That's the least that would happen.
And you might find yourself thoroughly, straight on the goals line if you did a very good assessment. You've short-circuited the whole thing, and this is running like a bomb, and after you've run three levels on this present-time-problem terminal of long duration, you assess the thing very carefully, and you don't find the Prehav Scale live on a dozen levels – oh, coo! You must be straight on the pc's line. And it didn't take you seventy-two hours to do the assessment. It took you more like about five.

So you get the values of a hidden standard? It's something to pay attention to. Something very interesting, besides being terribly amusing. I'll swear I have heard some of the weirdest statements that Homo sap has ever made, I'm sure, when I talk to them about hidden standards.

"What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology worked?"

"Oh, well – well confidentially, whenever I've been processed, I see whether or not my right foot ticks. And if it stops ticking then I know we're on the way, but if it starts ticking, I know we're off." You get the most interesting answers.

Now you say, "What else – " you don't ever ask this, but I've – can pursue the question line in other directions, and it becomes practically ridiculous. You say, "What else do you use this right foot for?" You wouldn't ask that in processing, but you get the most fascinating answers. They sometimes use it to find out if people are mad at them, what the weather is going to be, whether or not the food is going to agree with them, whether or not they're going to be sick. You know, in epilepsy the fellow always knows a certain feeling when he's going to have a fit, see, and he knows if he gets a certain condition, he's going to have a fit. Well, they use these hidden standards the same way. They know they're going to have some bad luck. Well, the nervous stomach, for instance. Fellow's nervous stomach turns on, he knows he's going to have some bad luck. He knows there's some bad luck coming up one way or the other. He uses his stomach to measure the future.

You find all sorts of people – this is the most common one: "Now, what would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?"

"Well, my nervous stomach would have to turn off."

"Oh?" you say, "Your nervous stomach would have to turn off. Well, very interesting. How long have you had this nervous stomach?"

"Well, ever since I was a child."

"Well now, does it ever turn off in processing? Has anything ever turned it off in processing?"

"No. I keep watching it." Then all of a sudden, "Brrrrrr, yap, yap, yap, yap. And this auditor and that auditor, and we ran this and we ran that, and we did this and we did that, and the other thing, and so on, and so on, and so on, and this stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach," see? Hidden standard, hidden standard, hidden standard. You got the idea?
Well, it's almost an assessment when you strike the fire on the pc's interest, see? He's going to be in-session on that. Man, is that pc going to be in-session. Well, he's already willing to talk to the auditor about it. He's already interested in it. So his attention must be parked around there someplace.

Now the mistake we have made is, not assessing this nervous stomach.

We can ask all sorts of embarrassing questions, such as, "Whose stomach is it?" [laughter] We can do a PreSession 38 type terminal search. You can do all sorts of things with this thing. They – that's the who – or what, who and when. "What's wrong?" and "Who had that trouble?" and "When did he have it?" It sometimes knocks the whole problem out just discovering this.

But now, instead of running a PreSession 38 type of operation on it – it is a faster action but a more – not always a faster action, but more certain, you know – in the interests of certainty – is to do a Terminals Assessment by elimination on this somatic, on this standard item. Is it his ear? Is it his head? Whose head? Whose ear? You got the idea? And we just – whose might it be? And a pc guesses about this thing, and it might be this one's and it might be that one's, and it might be an... You just write all those names down, you see? It might be his inner ear, so you say "inner ear". And it might be his lobe, you know, and you write down "lobe". And it might be his aeroglopis. And you say, "His what?"

Don't challenge it. What you want to find out is how to spell it. [laughter] It's his aeroglopis. And that's the mechanism that lets air in and out of the ear. And you never even knew it existed. Neither does medical science. Nobody has ever known this one before but the pc, you see?

And you'll find that the reason this line of questioning is so intriguing is because, of course, you have hit the primary source of individuation on the pc. This is the one that makes him different from everybody. It's sort of he knows who he is; he's the one that has an earache. [laughs] So he's different than everybody else, so it's the least duplicated area of the bank. So, of course, it'll fire off as an automaticity because it's most out of communication and therefore most out of control.

So locating the hidden standard and assessing it by elimination, by which you get a long list of terminals. Oh, I don't know, somebody's nervous stomach, you ought to wind up with a list of terminals of something like two hundred, something like that. Big.

Well, ever since we've started doing Goals Assessments on a highly therapeutic level, it is nothing for people to come up with 546 goals, and then come up with 546 terminals on that one goal. This takes some time, and it takes some doing. You don't do assessments in a part of a session and then get the show on the road, because you're usually wrong.

I should talk to you about something in assessments that's just occurred to me. I mentioned it to one auditor a short time ago and used the phrase, and it's never been used before, but it certainly is something that you should know something about. It's called a cognition surge. And it can throw your whole assessment awry. It's a cognition surge, and this is the source of most of
the charge you get on the bank. It isn't – when you're going over a whole bunch of goals and that sort of thing and the individual all of a sudden says, "Well, what do you know? I have always wanted to shoot magpies. And I don't even know what they are."

The E-Meter will react rather violently. It's a cognition surge. It's a release of electrical charge that goes along with the person having a cognition. And if you watch an E-Meter carefully, often when they're having a cognition – a real cognition – you will get a marked fall. Well, when you're assessing and you ask for another terminal, the person sometimes all of a sudden says, "Hah! What do you know! Airplane pilot, of course," see. And you get a steep fall that has nothing to do with anything, really, but the fact that he's cognited that he might have had something to do with airplane pilots, and this is what it's falling on. It's sort of on the assoc... possible association, and you'll get a mad drop.

Now, another thing When you're sometimes assessing for a level – which is more common – the individual all of a sudden realizes that there is such a thing as fighting wasps. This has just never occurred to him before, see? And you do – you're reading along, you're reading the assessment, and you're saying – it says, "Fighting. Scrapping. Knifing. Burning," and so forth. All right.

Now, right about the time you've entered in this line, you say "Fighting", and you get a great big drop on the needle. And you say, "Boy, with that much drop, that must be it. I won't assess any further," and have you just pulled a bloomer. Because it says "Fighting" and drops like mad, and that's why you always do them at least twice, you see, once up and once down. And the next one, "Burning – scrapping, burning."

Now you come back over the list again, and it says "Fighting", and it is just as dead as a mackerel. And you say, "Well, that is the most peculiar thing. How was it so hot when now it's so cold?" Well, you read a cognition surge.

The person – it's a "Whaddaya know! There is a possibility of some time or another fighting a wasp, you know? Ha-ha! Ha! What do you think of that? Ha! Incredible. Nobody could possibly fight a wasp. I always have known that. And here's the idea, but it's a funny thing of I've never thought of this idea before, don't you see?" It isn't the terminal level that you should run. It is simply the fact that he had an idea at that instant. When you come back over it again, it's flat.

There's nothing disappears off a meter faster. Sometimes when you're assessing terminals, you will find that terminal after terminal in turn pick up the cognition surge. And it only lasts for about five or ten questionings on the terminal.

It just – this fellow has never thought of himself as having been even remotely connected with being a rocket jockey. This is not a possible connection, don't you see? And not being a possible connection, of course, you get a tremendous blauw, bang, thud at the idea of being connected with a rocket jockey. But it doesn't have anything to do with the fact that the terminal is "rocket jockey." Got the idea?
A cognition surge actually occurs when an associated terminal or associated level to the one you're looking for blows off rather violently. And this happens during assessments of goals, terminals and levels. And when you get a disassociation all of a sudden – the guy all of a sudden gets rid of that one, your meter will react. And your meter won't react again. And the source of probably most bad assessments, or most assessment errors, is when the D of P sets the guy down, it falls off the pin, and they say, "That's the terminal." No. It's not the terminal. That was the charge a terminal made leaving. See?

Now, you ask him again about the same terminal, and you get a little flip, and you ask him again about it, and, man, is it gone. But sometimes a terminal will look terribly hot for about twelve recounts. Just look hotter than a pistol, and the pc is getting interested in it. But the pc's interest is not because he is that terminal or is being that terminal but because that terminal is blowing. He has just never inspected the fact that his unknown terminal was connected with this now known terminal. Well, the inspection of this will give you an E-Meter reaction. But it's a very short-duration reaction.

That's why on a goals terminal you grind them out by elimination. That is why on the Terminal Assessment you grind them out by elimination. And a PT problem of long duration you always grind out by elimination, because you'll just get nothing but cognition surge after cognition surge after cognition surge. And it's the one that's left you want. Because all of these things – you've entered, already, a random area. You got a goal fast, you see, which is actually to do something about – only we're not quite sure what – or to learn lessons from a burning right ear, you see? And you're in this brrrrrr area, and so you get all sorts of fireworks on the meter, you know, and terminals blow, and ideas, and he remembers people he never heard of before. Don't be too surprised if you get a couple of hundred terminals, and by the time you've got them all assessed, he says, "What burning ear?" See, don't be too surprised if this occurs. You get how you do this PT problem of long duration?

Now, after you've got the terminal and you do assess it on the Prehav Scale, you of course now run it the same way you do a goals terminal. You just run the levels flat. But they run flat awfully fast, so your twenty-minute rule doesn't apply. You kind of have to watch the needle. And you still can leave one unflat, by the way; have to go back and pick it up. Various things have to be done. Have to retrack your steps.

That's the only other thing I know of in here that you probably don't know – didn't know how to do – I hope you know some more about it now – is the assessment for this. Because I noticed most flubs at the present instant are now being made in assessing and running present time problems of long duration. And the flub just stems from these things. They don't make a terminal list, and they don't do assessment by elimination, and they grab too quick at these cognition surges. Got 'em?

All right. Once more I didn't ask you for any questions today. Some of you are now going to have terrible withholds.

Okay. Is there any fast one anybody really has to know before session tomorrow?
Alright, thank you very much.
Good night.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: ENDING AN INTENSIVE

A lecture given on
8 June 1961

Thank you.

All right. You haven't – let's see. What is this? This is the 8th of June 1961, solar system. Have to keep you oriented.

You haven't had any opportunity to ask any questions the last couple of lectures. I have simply decided what you didn't know anything about and filled you in. So now I want some questions. Of course, it's kind of cowardly asking you for questions in the first place because this assumes that I don't know what you're fogged up on. Yes?

Female voice: Exactly how and when the Havingness and Confront commands, and where, are fitted into a run on SOP Goals. Just where they go in relation to running the level?

When do Havingness – or where do Havingness and Confront commands get fitted into SOP Goals. Actually, I'll answer it for all sessions.

Female voice: Yeah.

If you have the pc's Havingness and Confront commands, you start the session with them after the rudiments and end the session with them when this room situation goes – when you ask about the auditing environment. The point there is you run them backwards at the end. You run the Confront and then you run the Have. You just run them at the beginning – Have-Confront – that is after the beginning rudiments – and at the end rudiments you run them Confront and then Have. This actually is quite mechanical.

You can take these two processes and throw the guy into his bank. See, you bring him into the room and then throw him into his bank. Just look at it that way, you see? He comes into the auditing room, and you say, "Is all right if I audit you in this room?" you know. You say something like this and he says, "All right." And you say, "All right." Far as you're concerned it's all right, but you haven't got him in the room yet.

Now, if you've got his Havingness and Confront, you move this over into his first process. In other words, you bypass the rudiments. You ask him if it's all right to audit in this room, and we don't care what he says. If you're going to run his Havingness and Confront Process the first thing you do – what does it matter whether it's all right to audit in the room or not? You're going to straighten this up shortly anyhow. Well, why isn't it all right to audit in the room? Well, he probably has a PT problem and ARC break and a withhold. That's why it's not all right to audit in the room. So who cares! It's there in the rudiments mostly to call attention to the fact that there is an auditing room, which might have been missed by the pc. You get the idea?
All right. So that's not anything that you handle, although there is a process given to handle it. But that process assumes – TR 10 in a Model Session – that you don't have the pc's Havingness and Confront Processes. So, you say, "Is it all right to audit in this room." And it goes wha-a-a-am, crash! And you say, "Fine", and go right on to your next rudiment. Don't use that as an excuse to waste auditing time. You got the idea? There's no point in it if you've got his Havingness Process.

All right. Now, let's finish up the rudiments. And our first process is now going to be a Have Process, and of course that nnhummp was mainly an ARC break, PT problem and withhold or one of them. So you've taken care of that now. Now you can bring him here. See, a present time problem has got him out there somewhere. So you can knock that out, of course, he's more here, isn't he?

So you run your rudiments and then you saw into the Have and Confront Processes immediately after the rudiments. Your Have first, and then your Confront. Well, you've handled his PT problem, his withhold and his ARC break and so forth, so therefore, he's more willing to be in session. You run the Havingness Process, and of course he tends to leave where he has been and arrive where he is at. And now you run the Confront, and you say – you're saying just the same as, "Just between you and me, I think you ought to take a look at your bank. It is time you ceased to avoid all this. It's a question of how can a thetan live in this much mush?" You got the idea?

So you say, "Well, let's now take a look at your bank. Let's take a look at your case." You could say this, you see, very splendiferously. Theoretically you could do that. you could – you say, "Well, here you are in the room." And you've straightened it up so the guy can be audited, and "Here you are in the room. And now, what do you think about your case?" See? Well, instead of saying, "Well, what do you think about your case?" you run a Confront Process.

All right. Confront Processes cycle. They go out of PT and into PT. So if you are very clever, you will run just one cycle. Out of PT and into PT. See? If you're very clever. Out he goes and back he comes. You say, "Look. It is safe to leave present time in this room. (1) The room is safe. We've just run Havingness on it; and (2) we are now demonstrating to you, that it is very safe for you to slide down the track a little bit. And when you come back, you'll still find the room here." What do you know!

You're saying that in essence then when you're running the Confront Process.

So, all of the processes today – all Security Checks, all everything – when, if in doubt about how to say "good morning" to the preclear, say it in Model Session. [laughter] Use Model Session for everything that pertains to auditing. This does not apply to a Johannesburg Security Check given for purposes of security only. There you don't even bother to clear the commands. You try to clear the commands, and if you don't clear the command, you look at the fellow and say, "Well now, listen. If I have to leave this one with it still falling off the pin, you realize you've failed a Security Check. Are you sure there is nothing you wish to tell me?"

He thinks this over for a minute and he says, "Well, maybe I'd better tell him about the bank robbery, you know? The illicit diamond buying" And so he sometimes gives up like that.
But you wouldn't work day and night, on and on and on and on to clear somebody's Security Check, you see, if it were to be given for an employment Security Check.

In the first place, somebody whose Security Check is so bad that, particularly on the subject ... The original question, by the way, "Have you ever cooked a company's books?" It sounded just a little bit slangy to me. It outcreated me on the subject. "Have you ever cooked a company's books?" And you now have that under the heading of "falsified", I think it is. And you strike that one, you see, while you're security checking somebody for employment, and it goes clang! And what do you want to clear it for? You wouldn't have the guy on a bet!

All right. So we finally find out, well, he only falsified them a little bit. He's just been entering everything into the petty cash column and sticking it in his pocket, or he's been doing something innocent here that should never be reprehended anyhow. When you're security checking as a Security Check – just *en passant* here – you must know what a meter's talking about.

It takes a good auditor to do Security Checking. You can't teach somebody in ten minutes how to do a Security Check and then trust any result he gets. Because what's he do? He gets somebody on the meter, and there's no – there's no meter responses of any kind whatsoever – you know that the person is totally irresponsible anyway. Dead thetan reading properly at the Clear read. And it all says, "There. That's all right with that." He asks all the way through the Security Check rapidly. He gets no reaction of any kind whatsoever, so he says the person's secure. The person just got out of Dartmoor Scrubs, you know – [laughs] just that day!

So you have to know something about pcs and a meter in order to size up the person, and if they're not getting any reactions anyplace on a Johannesburg Security Check – you know this is impossible anyway – your auditing experience. But you don't run that in Model Session, and you finish the check in any event. No matter who you're running it on, you always finish the check, but you don't necessarily spend four hours clearing up one level. You just want to know if he's hotter than a pistol on these various levels.

And one of the ways to do it is go right on through the check, *whammity-whammity-whammity-whammity-wham*, getting all the withholds that he gives you as you go by. And then you've marked several that didn't null, and go back over these and ask searchingly about them – something on the polite non-auditing attitude of "Well, you realize that if these levels retain withholds, as they apparently do, and you have not told me all, which you obviously haven't, that if you fail to do so, that is it; if you have failed a Security Check and will be rated here as an insecure person. Now do you want to tell me about it?"

And the fellow says, "Well, the meter must be wrong and so forth, and so forth."

You say, "Okay. You've had it." Reach down to the bottom of the page and say, "Failed check, such-and-such a date. Unemployable." That's it. Don't monkey with it.

That's not true in auditing, you see. You run that in Model Session and you get those questions just as clean as wolf's teeth. You see, there's a tremendous difference between giving a processing check and a Security Check, even though you're using the same list of questions. Now, you just take those things apart. So in – *en passant*, I mentioned that.
All right. Havingness and Confront is run after beginning rudiments in the order of the Have and then the Confront, and before end rudiments in the order of the Confront and the Have. Okay?

_Female voice: Thank you._

Right. Any other question?

_Female voice: Yes._

Yes.

_Female voice: You've told us this before, but it hasn't sunk in and I'd like for you to tell us again._

Okay.

_Female voice: If you're got something which has been restimulated by the questions in a Security Check, but it doesn't seem to be on the first ones, would you go on through and then check back on them afterwards?_

Not in processing.

_Female voice: No._

In doing a Security Check for employment or loyalty or something of this sort, some other purpose, yes, you would do it as you said it, but not for processing. You do not leave a falling level behind you. Leave nothing falling behind you. That's pretty hard to do. You very often get them falling on later things and in the panic about withhold – But remember, if it's been carefully given in Model Session, you will have the opportunity to ask the pc if he's withholding anything in the Model Session. And the reason you've got withhold in there at beginning and end rudiments, is because you get two cracks at the pc every session.

So, if a question were hanging up in that particular fashion and you couldn't seem to get anything out of the pc or get it clear, you might suspect, because of the sporadic reaction of the needle – if it's not on the button, you see, it doesn't act constantly, it acts sporadically. That means you're near something, but you're not on it. It falls and it theta bops and it rock slams, and then it goes null, and it falls and then it goes null, and then it rock slams and – you're just not asking the right question, that's all.

And if you were to get – I didn't say that you should get baffled at this point, but if you were to get baffled, you know, about the whole thing, a good thing to do is take a break. Well, you'd take a break by ending your session, wouldn't you?

So that gives you a crack at the withholds, doesn't it? And then you take a three-minute break. And then you start a new session. And this gives you another crack at the pc's withholds when you're clearing that rudiment, you see. And this time, you'd clear the rudiments, real hard; the end rudiment and the new beginning rudiment. And by the time you got back to the question again, you've probably gotten the withhold that he kept ticking or tacking on, and that question now will probably be free. And that is the – really the right way to handle it. I'm sure you can see the sense of that.

And the other point to make here is your pc, if he's doing this, is probably having trouble. And there's another co-related factor of this. If a pc is having trouble, his attention span is poor. If his attention span is poor, the best remedy for that is short-sessioning, which
in itself is a technique. If you were to take a pc who was having a lot of trouble and you were to begin a session and run TR 10 as the sole body of the session – just ten minutes of it, you see – and then run end rudiments and end the session, and then begin a session and run some more TR 10 and end rudiments; you would oddly enough get a lot of cases with formal auditing that are really CCH cases. So it's well worth knowing how to do that. So it is not a waste of time to do that. It is beneficial to do that. And I'd recommend that if you are having an awful lot of trouble giving a processing check, that you also add in this thing called short-sessioning. You could go at it like this: a session per question if he was having too hard a time. Then you'd sure get it every time, but that would be the extremity, the reductio ad absurdum. Okay? That answer your question?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Any other question? Yes, Reg.

Male voice: On the assessing for goals, we have the goal, the terminal and the level fine, and you tell us that they each – reaction should be the same for each – rock slam, rock slam, rock slam, throughout.

Mm-hm.

Male voice: Now, if on the Primary Scale you get your same reaction, is it then necessary to go on to the Secondary Scale?

No. This is a matter of judgment.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

Let me clear up – clarify up some things like this. This is the same reaction on the goal, the same reaction on the terminal, the same reaction on the Primary; now would you go over into the Secondary Scale? Would it really be necessary to assess the Secondary Scale? Well, we've gotten here our first question that tells us actually a Secondary Scale at this stage is too complex. There actually will one of these days be a tertiary scale. And rather than spend the next two months keeping you from having something resembling a complete scale, I relegated my final sort-out to after the first publication. So therefore, at this stage of the game, you find the Secondary Scale rather clumsy. There won't be anywhere near as many words as that on your present Secondary Scale when I finally get them all sorted. You see? A lot of those words will be over on the tertiary scale. So your question, then in the future will also apply to if you find it on the Primary Scale, is it any reason to go on to the Secondary Scale, if you find the same reaction. All right.

It would also apply then – well, if you found the same reaction on the Secondary Scale, would there be any reason to go over into the tertiary scale? You get the idea? So the question would be – could be broadened to include the whole future formation of the Prehav Scale. And I'll answer it in that particular fashion.

I myself had wonderful luck with the original issue, and the only ones that I missed, aren't now on the Primary Scale except under "motion" and "misemotion". The emotional states of pcs are missing on the Primary Scale. So what I would do – what I would do would be to take certain selected levels as necessary levels. If somebody has an original Prehav Scale, I will read you what those levels are, and I would say that if they fell on these levels, go to the Secondary Scale as a necessity, and if they don't fall on these levels, take it. See, I
can give you a qualified answer because it's a matter of judgment. I'm not trying to be complicated with you.

Now, any level here that was on the original scale, if that fell as much as the terminal—good, heavy reaction—I would go ahead and run it. And I wouldn't much bother with going over into the Secondary Scale. But those levels here which really weren't on the original, it would be safest to assess them again over on the Secondary Scale, even though they fell as hard as the terminal, for the excellent reason that they are too pervasive, with this odd exception: overts. Overts.

Now, you've got an overt situation, that if you get the general form "overt" falling as hard as the terminal, nothing has been told you except the person has an attitude. And you can go ahead and run, "What have you done to", and "What have you withheld from?", but you've already substituted an auditing command for this word overt, or you've done one substitution. So you for sure had better find out what kind of an overt. And the overt is the longest list.

Apparently the English language has specialized in ways and means of "overting" and for that reason, pcs have enormously odd categories for these types of overts. And from one pc, when they fall on the word overt, this means, refraining to think an unkind thought about them so as to put them right, or something very complicated. And to another pc, it means hitting them over the head with a brickbat. And that is the only overt there is. You get the idea? And this is peculiar to the whole list of overts. Each pc has a different type of overt that he considers an overt.

So it's such a matter for judgment that I for sure would move over into the overt list even though overt fell like mad. I wouldn't then just automatically run "do", because you've already done one substitution. What kind of a do? Let's find out, because it will fall on overt, but what does he classify as an overt? That is singular, the way that stands out. So you'd say, well, if you fall on overt, assess the Secondary Scale. That one for sure.

Now, looking over the rest of these levels, there are two more, which if they fell, would leave you with no recourse but to do the whole Secondary Scale, and you sure better had. And that's "emotional" and "misemotional". You better find out what is misemotion. Is it standing woodenly or is it screaming at the top of his voice or what? So again it requires the secondary list to qualify the term.

Let me forget what I said there at first. I can give you a good test. I just thought of one here. Any time you yourself would have to make a wild substitution for the level, assess the Secondary Scale. That would be the rule. Yeah. Any time you'd have to make a wild substitution to find out what it was all about, well just move into the Secondary Scale and you won't be guessing. Then you'd be safe. But if that is not the case, you can run any other of these levels. Let me say it that way. If that's not the case, you can run any others.

Now let me give you one further piece of data on that that is interesting. And that is, the goal fell a certain consistent amount or reacted a certain amount. The terminal then in its turn fell or reacted a certain amount. All right. That terminal is going to remain falling that amount, but when you check it back against the goal, you're checking it back as to how much the goal now falls. And this is not—not what's meant. It's how much did the goal fall? Because the second his attention comes off of the significance of goal and onto the solidity of terminal, you get a change on the goal's reaction. Your goal's reaction on your Assessment
Sheets must be noted very precisely as to how many divisions of rock slam – put it down in inches if you're not sure, in some guesstimate of inches. How much theta bop? How consistent? How much fall? How consistent? You put that down about your goal because you're now going to lose it. And you're not going to see that reaction on the goal until you've got a terminal cleared off of it.

Now you may be able to go back and find a lot of reaction on the goal again. And you might not be able to. So let me clarify that, just as long as it's part of this clarification. Yes, the terminal must fall as much as the goal; the level must fall as much as the terminal. But the terminal and the level alone can be measured against each other. You can't measure all in one breath, the goal, the terminal, the level. You can't say, "to pick gooseberries", "General MacArthur", and "failed withhold", and compare them one against the other. You couldn't do an operating condition of this character in auditing because "to pick gooseberries" is lost back in the limbo someplace, you see, and you'd have to get that one from your notes. Now is the terminal falling as much as you found the goal falling in your notes? Because this goal is now only falling in your notes. It's not falling on the pc this much. It still will react, but not as much. So checking your terminal against the level can be done however, directly.

You say "General MacArthur, failed withhold, General MacArthur, failed withhold, General MacArthur, failed withhold." You wouldn't do that, but I say you could do that, and you'd get the same reaction for General MacArthur as the right level. And that would be the only test.

But if anything leaves you in doubt – just to answer your direct question – if anything leaves you in doubt as to what auditing command to shove into this, on this primary list here, there are several here. Inverted Communication. You get this awful fall on Inverted Communication, you see. Well, what's Inverted Communication? Of course, one of the phrases that you can use for it is "intend not – to not communicate." But nevertheless this – could be other inverted communications, peculiar communications. "Communication on a via" is also a peculiar communication. You could ask, "Would you communicate to a cat on a via?" And the terminal's a cat, you know. And you get an awful fall on this thing. Well, maybe you could run it directly. "Communicate to a cat on a via." But you've got an Inverted Communication Secondary Scale that clarifies the whole thing for you. So it has a practical use as well as a pedantic one. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. Thank you.

Okay. Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: Well, it's still the query on the Havingness and Confront. Originally the thing on Havingness and Confront was you assessed for them after the first terminal was flying.

Yes?

Female voice: Now I know of three cases, you know, that had them added in . . .

Yeah.

Female voice: . . . while on their first terminal. When you – just at what point, now, on running SOP Goals, do we look for the Havingness and Confront?

That isn't the question you asked. If that's the question you mean ...
Female voice: Well, that's the one I intend to ask. That's the one I intend to ask.

All right. All right. Okay.

Female voice: When?

You ask when to run them.

Female voice: When to assess one and start including them in their sessions as a regular part of auditing SOP Goals?

All right. All right. I will also answer that. Answered it yesterday.

Female voice: Yeah.

How many parts or stages or stops or pause points are there in Routines 1, 2 and 3?

Female voice: Well, one at the end of beginning rudiments.

No, ma'am.

Female voice: Oh, yeah.

Now you track with me.

Female voice: You mean the other separate rudiment. Yeah, yeah.

If you're going to insist this exact question be answered, you track on this one now.

Take a look at it now.

Female voice: All right. Yeah.

How many places in the process of intensives ...

Female voice: Yeah.

... would be pause points – where you could use your power of choice on what you were supposed to do to the pc – are there, in Routines 1, 2 and 3 consecutively?

Female voice: As you finish each section of the Routine there's certainly a pause point.

No. Every – ah, yes. As you finish each and every section, any level, any Security Check, any CCH step, any anything ...

Female voice: Yeah.

... Have and Confront can be located.

Female voice: All right.

There's no point in being pedantic about something it'd be stupid to be pedantic about. You can find them anywhere, anytime, as long as you've got done what you were doing.

Female voice: All right.

So you do a case assessment, you can find the pc's havingness and confront.

Female voice: In other words there's no particularly optimum time to start using... ?

Oh, yes. Well now, that's a different question.

Female voice: Yeah.
Ah, but that's a different question.

_Female voice: All right._

You've asked me _can_. All right.

Now, you write down his name, rank and serial number and finish off with how many of his parents deserted how many of his grandparents or whatever, see? And you've got that all taped, you could turn right in, find his Havingness and Confront Process. You could do this case assessment, and you could find his Havingness Process. Then you could go ahead and run a Joburg Security Check and find his Confront Process. Oddly enough, you could find his Confront Process — and now we're getting unoptimum — immediately after you did this check, without damaging the pc in the least, or you could do it when he was totally finished with Routine 1. Wait until then to find his Confront. You could find his Havingness Process, actually, at the time he flattened his first terminal on SOP Goals running. By that time, you've _got_ to have it.

_Female voice: Ah. All right._

And that happens to be just about your last hung dog. Going from there on without finding the Havingness and Confront Processes is expensive in auditing time, because the pc never gets a chance to orient his bank or orient himself in the physical universe as he is running. So therefore, a great deal of auditing time is devoured from that point on, if his havingness and confront are not present.

Less auditing time is devoured proportionately to your being — toward the beginning of his auditing. The closer you are to the beginning of the auditing, the less auditing time is at stake.

For instance, you find that immediately after your case assessment, you're wasting time. So when we get that close to the beginning we're becoming silly, because one Joburg is going to change his Have and going to change his Confront. So you found them for what purpose? For their use in one session, two sessions, three sessions. Now you're going to have to find another Havingness and Confront Process. And you're also liable to get all balled up on "Well, let's see, his needle keeps tightening and the tone arm keeps going stiff here on his confront and I don't know what this is all about. It's just getting awfully confusing. I guess the pc is confused." No, he's changing!

And you are going to have a harder time finding the havingness and confront the earlier you find them in a pc's intensives, not sessions. The earlier you look for them, the harder time you're going to have finding the Havingness and Confront Processes. And the more time you're going to use doing it and the less use they will be to the pc because they're going to change anyhow. So you can get silly about this. See, it ceases to be just precautionary, and it becomes simply a flagrant waste of auditing time.

All right. Now let's move in to the CCHs. Let's say that this pc was going to be scraped all the way off the bottom. All right. All the way up the line. All the way through all routines. Got the idea?

All right. During the CCHs, locating his havingness and confront is of no benefit of any kind because you are not running in Model Session. You're running CCHs. So when are you going to use the Havingness and Confront? So once more you don't need the Havingness...
and Confront, but it would be perfectly all right to assess for them and get them. You got the idea?

All right. Now we get up to a point of where they become useful. They are now useful. And that would have to do with your general runs and Joburgs, you see. That would be useful.

Now, in view of the fact that you're going to run Joburgs along with the CCHs, you nevertheless haven't got too many sessions going there, so it — and your Joburg and the Havin... and the CCHs are going to change the case a lot. And you're going to have to find new Havingness and Confront Process. So you can just go on a treadmill of wasting auditing time by finding Havingness and Confront Processes practically any time through Routine 1.

You can just mark that right down in the book. That's practically a waste of time, because the case is going to change all over the place, and you're going to have to find a new one every time you turn around. So the pc's havingness runs down, so he's uncomfortable; well, he's been uncomfortable for a couple of hundred trillion years. Well, it won't hurt him to be uncomfortable a little while longer. In terms of auditing time, it's rather wasted to try to find Havingness and Confront Processes during the CCH and Joburgs that make up Routine 1.

All right. General Prehav runs and Joburgs at that level: Ah! Now we're getting somewhere. But the first run flattened is sort of the pc getting used to what's going on and getting his feet under him. He's already grasping too much! You know, "What's this? I — I my — all — all my life... Goodness gracious, could this be true? Uh, hauh! I uh ..." You know? He's terribly interested. It's — these levels are running at absolute obsessive interest, you know, practically, because you've got him of course, right where he lives.

All right. Let's say, "Well, let's stop being interested, pc, and let's stop talking about all the things you're trying to tell me about, and let's throw all this away because it's not much importance to me. Ha-ha, ha-ha, ha-ha. And we're going to find your Havingness and Confront Process. We've got lots of time to waste here. You've bought two hundred hours." Well, that's just about how it would sound to the pc.

All right. But let's get that first level flat. And let's get that good and flat, and let's get our first Joburg done at Routine 2. Let's get our first Joburg done, and let's get another level run and flat. Now the pc feels like he can breathe. And right about then it becomes economical to run your Havingness and Confront Processes. And it's economical, and continues to be economical right up to the point where it ceases to be adjudicative and becomes an absolute, utter necessity. And that's in Routine 3, first level run on the pc's goal terminal. And if you haven't found the Havingness and Confront by that time, your pc is now going to start to run very slowly, and you're going to wonder why.

Now, that's the whole story. So, possible? — anytime. Optimum? — sometime in the middle of Routine 2. Oh, I'd say in any time during the first third of the totality of Routine 2, it's kind of wasteful. But after that it becomes quite economical, to find them. Now you're saving auditing time.

And during the CCHs, oh man, are you wasting auditing time. But you can find them. And it's perfectly okay, and the pc will tell you he feels marvelous and isn't it a good thing, and his havingness is way down, and you've just set him up so that he can come into every session, and he's learned a new trick now. He hasn't got anything to think about. You're running the CCHs, see. He's learned this new trick: "My havingness is way down. How do peo-
people act? Let's see. It says in the textbook here. How do people act when their havingness is
down?" See, it's a new trick. Then he'll say, "Oh, gee, I've just found out there are a whole
bunch of things I can't confront." This is a big cognition. So he obsessively wants to try to
confront them. See, you're starting to get a process in the road of your processing. And the
pc's interest becomes unduly absorbed any time during Routine 1 with Havingness and Con-
front. That's all there is to it. Of course, I'm talking about a raw meat pc running in right from
the beginning.

That fairly clean, clear and cool and collected? Well, I'm glad I finally answered your
question.

Female voice: Thank you very much.

All right. Any other questions? ... Okay. What day is today?

Female voice: June 8th.

Yeah, I know it's the 8th but what day is it? This is Thursday. Let's see. I'd better talk
to you something about leveling off a case, in just a few minutes. I'll just give you a few min-
utes of "how do you level off a case." This would be true in an HGC. It'd be true in your pri-
ivate auditing, and so forth. A case is not going to get any processing for a while. What do you
do?

It is sequitur to exactly what we've been talking about with Have and Confront Proces-
eses, so I might as well add it in here. It is not just unkind, it is stupid, not to end an inten-
sive. Just as you would think it was stupid to fail to end a session. Similarly, it is very dull not
to end an intensive.

Well, an intensive of a twenty-five hours is relatively uneconomical. But it neverthe-
less has to be ended. I mean it's uneconomical to get twenty-five hours of auditing. Now, a
person just gets off the launching pad, and he's just going over the end of the runway lights,
and the control tower says it's time to whip stall. That's about what it sounds like, too. You
see, the guy has just taken off, you know, and he just gets the idea that he might go some-
place, and he whip stalls.

Fifty hours, that's fairly economical. He gets a chance to go someplace. All pcs could
be compared to the frog who climbs out of the well at the rate of three inches up in the day-
time and falling back two every night. But this is proportionate. The deeper he is in the well
and the earlier he is in auditing, the more gain he makes up in the daytime and the further he
falls at night. And so when we say, ending an intensive, it is better to cleanly and properly end
even a twenty-five-hour intensive. It is better to do that than to say, "Well, it's a waste of au-
diting time", because he'll feel better for it if you do end it right. Fifty hours: it's economical
to end them, because you practically stabilize the person's gains. You bring him out of the
woods and so on.

You end an intensive depending to a large degree on what has been run during the in-
tensive – what has been run during the intensive. And you would end the Routine 1 differ-
ently than you would end Routines 2 and 3. 2 and 3 could be ended almost exactly in the same
way.
Let me say what would be an optimum twenty-five-hour intensive even though it's uneconomical: A Joburg complete; one CCH flat. If you haven't accomplished those in the twenty-five hours, be rough, you see.

All right. How would you end this intensive? Well, you'd better end this intensive by making sure both of those are ended. The one CCH which you got flat, let's make sure that that's flat. And let's make sure that Joburg is now standing up and saying "okay". And that's how you'd end the intensive. Got the idea? I mean, you do no more than just check over these two items. Of course, you check over that CCH rather briefly because you can unsettle any process. Processes come to temporary flat points and then unflatten.

All right. That's about the best you could do. Except during the last hour or so, it would be very beneficial to run TR 10 – without Model Session or with it, it doesn't matter – but to run TR 10. All right.

Now let's take Routine 2 or 3. How would you end the intensive? I'd say during the last few hours of the intensive, do nothing but run the Havingness and the Confront Processes of the pc. Now, in a Routine 2 intensive of twenty-five hours, you should certainly have had one level – one general level – flat and one Joburg completely completed. And the person's Havingness and Confront Process found, and you would spend at least the last three hours of the intensive, preferably five, which would make the last HGC day of that intensive, doing nothing but running the Have and Confront Process.

Just run the Have Process to a loose needle, run the Confront to a slowed tone arm. You know, tone arm doesn't look like it's wobbling very much right this minute, so now we're going to run some Have, and then we're going back to the Confront. Now we're going to run some Have, we're going to run some Confront, and it stabilizes the case most gorgeously. And he walks out of that intensive feeling marvelous. If you do that and you do a good job, you stabilize the gains. Otherwise, he's still kind of stuck in the intensive. He's still wishing he had some more auditing. He's still fixated on all kinds of little factors. And the kind thing to do to him is let him gain from his gains, and you level him out with your Have and Confront.

Have, by the way, is never run further than a loosened needle. I see people running ten minutes of Havingness. This is incredible unless they're only getting in five commands in ten minutes or something. This is incredible! That's an awful boggled Havingness these days!

All you're trying to do is run it from needle test to needle test, can squeeze to can squeeze. Is it looser? That's it! That's it! That's it. And it's only about twelve commands. If you've got the right Havingness Process, it's twelve commands. That's it.

Now you can get fancy with the Confront Process and run it to what is called a blowdown, and that is to say the needle rises and blows down. You come off of it. See? One cycle of a needle of the tone arm, pardon me. One cycle of the tone arm. It will rise a little bit and blow down. And you run it until the tone arm rises, largely or slightly, and continue to run it until it goes thoomp! Or slides back down a bit. And you come off of it and you run twelve commands of Have, see. But somebody running ten minutes of Havingness is somebody – just like somebody eating sugar, you see – "I think I'll have some sugar. Would you hand me that hundred-pound sack?" It's very hard on the digestion. And this is factual. You see, the Have Process can run the case. And you don't want it to run the case, you want it to orient the pc in the environment. Please get its purpose.
See, you start running Have, and you run more than twelve commands of Have, and what happens? The pc's bank starts fluctuating. And the next thing you know he can run Have against the bank. And he's running – you're running the bank with a Have process, and you're not supposed to do that. You're supposed to run the bank with a Confront Process. So it's a misuse of the process. It's something like using a pair of shears to dig up a garden. Not quite clever.

And you run ten minutes with it, and you've got the guy going through engrams and his somatics turning on. That's Havingness? Oh, yeah! You can do fantastic things with Havingness. It isn't that Havingness doesn't work and it isn't that Havingness won't run the bank because it will! Boy, will it! But you've now started a new process known as "running the bank with Havingness." And you go more than about twelve commands with it and you've started that new process, and you're going to get tone arm motion, and you'd better run it now till the tone arm motion gets out of it, and ... But it's a misused process. It isn't for that purpose at all. It's to tell the pc, "Hey! Look! Physical universe!"

And he says, "Well, what do you know? Oh! Physical universe. That's pretty good."

And you say, "Good. I'm going to give you two more commands and then end this process. And, pow! That's it! And then you got the Confront, and you move right into the Confront, get a jiggle out of the tone arm ..."

[The tape ends abruptly as did the original recording.]
Thank you.

Okay, let's see. This is the 9th of June 1961, Saint Hill Briefing Course and you have had a bulletin today, or you should have had. Says something to the effect, I think sarcastic, snide, asking you if you're waiting for the E-Meter to play "Dixie" and I expect almost anybody at any minute to say, "No, we're waiting it to play 'God Save the Queen.'" [laughter]

But I'm quite happy about it, actually, in a and in a fairly exuberant frame of mind with regard to it, because I found out what's taking you so confounded long to clear people. And there's a general misconcept abroad.

And it although it's taken up in this bulletin which is what? The 8th, HCOB 8 June 61 you're auditing people's analytical minds out! That's right! I mean, this sounds incredible, but that's what you're trying to do!

And you know, you're not going to shoot any ducks if you keep going around shooting at crows. Well, it's true isn't it, huh? I know I've left you in a little bit of a mystery, but that is what you are doing.

"Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health", 1950. We change all the time. We change all the time, except we're always dealing with the same fundamentals. All we're doing is changing an approach to the same fundamentals. Now, I say we change all the time sarcastically, because somebody is always walking up to me telling us how fast we change and how we are changing and all that sort of thing and I say, "What have we changed lately?"

"Oh, well, what have we changed lately? Um."

"Come on, what have we changed lately?"

"Uh, well, um, we've changed the Axioms", the one thing that hasn't been changed for years. And I find out they don't know enough about the subject to know whether it's been changed or not! Which is always a good test if somebody tells you that.

Now, what we are doing is trying to approximate exactly what the mechanics which are already known to us about the mind, how these things are stacked up in people's minds, so we get a common denominator of approach. And of course, it gets simpler and simpler, but we're always handling the same mechanics. So let's get back to a very fundamental fundamental here, and let's take a look at this thing called the reactive mind.

Now, I know you're all sitting there burning with questions about other things, but I'm interested in this today, and that is the reactive mind.
The reactive mind is a mind which acts without inspection, on the basis of stimulus. In other words, when this mind is restimulated, it acts without inspection. It's a non-inspection mind. Do you understand?

And it puts into actions, solutions for problems it fancies must exist but which may well never have existed or which haven't existed for billions of years and you put in any part of the old problem and the reactive mind goes into solution. It's a sort of an idiot simplicity. So, it is a mind that solves problems without inspection.

It's taken up pretty well in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health. Only thing much we've changed about that book is the second part of the book, which has to do with how we address this situation.

And heavens, how we addressed this situation in old Dianetics still is raising its ugly head. Lately we've got Presession 38 – which I haven't authorized anybody around here to use. But what is that but Book One? And we've got all kinds of ramifications on the same fundamentals.

So here's this mind without inspection. All right. It's pretty good, you know? It doesn't have to make an inspection. See, that's the first thing that's wrong with the situation. So therefore, it reacts on anything it inspects. Got the idea? So the inspections are kind of accidental. Because it's based to work without inspection.

Of course, everybody knows that this is the safest thing to do. A thetan is trying to survive, who doesn't find any necessity for trying to survive at all – which is the first idiocy.

You couldn't possibly kill a thetan. You could degrade him, submerge him, make him unable and do various things like this, or he could do these things to himself. But he couldn't possibly not survive.

So, the first thing it is doing is trying to solve a problem which doesn't exist: the survival of a thetan. Doesn't exist!

So therefore, it immediately relegates itself to the survival of form or the perpetuity of an existing state. If you can't keep a thetan from surviving, you certainly, however, could keep a form surviving, couldn't you? But if you kept a form surviving, what you would have is a perpetuation of existing state – which would, of course, take out all the time, all the matter, all the energy and all the space in a sensible arrangement and garblize them. Why?

All right. The reactive mind is the accumulated goals of survival of the individual – for forms. And that is exactly what the reactive mind is. That's – it's no more complicated than that. Its goal is survival in each case, you see?

Now, the reason it destroys is because it's trying to get something to survive. You got the idea? See? Trying to get self to survive so it destroys other, see? But it's still survival. It creates something in order to get a form to survive.

Even though you've got create and destroy, and even though you have a cycle of action, the reactive mind is that part of the cycle of action which is never going to move, and never has, according to any understanding or activity in which man has engaged, in all the time he has been on this planet. Why?
Because the keynote of it is survive – survival of a form. There's no question about the survival of a thetan.

Oh, there's a question of the survival of his capabilities. There's a question of survival of his happiness. There's a question of survival of whether or not he's interested. There's a question of all these things, but these are significances.

As far as his actual survival is concerned, he'll be here till the universe fades out, even though he's only a crumb of a Sullivan – I mean sand! Got to be careful of who I have overts on here!

Anyhow. Now, here then is this enigma. You have a mind that is trying to make something survive which is already dead. It's gone, man, it's gone! The body you had back there on the galaxy of Gee Whizzes, that, that hadn't been... that form hasn't been around for a long time. Go back and look. Dig up the old scrap heap where they threw the factory workers and you won't find anything there anymore, except a memory. Touching, isn't it? [laughter]

But the reactive mind, because it was trying desperately, you see, to make that form survive once, has never forgotten the impulse. That's pretty good. Because the impulse is survive, then the reactive mind's impulse regarding that action is surviving, you see? And it hasn't any more use to you. You could remember this, don't you see, if you didn't have to make it survive. But by remembering it, because of the impulse of survival being so great in that particular area, you get a restimulation as though you're still in the period, as though you're still there. Why? Because all the impulse of survival is trapped into that period and area, but it has been riding on up to the present time.

Here's the great game of make-believe. The form has lived forever and is still here. What a game of pretense, you see?

Well, the accumulation of these pretenses, with all of their attendant recordings and nostalgia, wind up in present time having nothing to do with the situation anywhere. But in order to guarantee the survival of this doll you lost back in the galaxy of Gee Whizzes, it is perfectly obvious that you have to do something about gorillas.

Well, this is difficult, because there just don't happen to be but about 450 of them left. They're the United Nations officials now. Anyway... [laughter] they – that's something on that order. There are very few gorillas left and so the reactive mind has a great starvation for gorillas, which can make this thing survive. So a woman walks down the street with a fur coat and a fellow has a feeling in his head of small machinery going around. Only, because it's all by no inspection – . You see, the safe thing to do is to act without thinking, because you never know what's going to happen to a form. The surprises have been multitudinous. So if you just act quick enough, the datum is, if you just act quick enough, why, the form goes on surviving.

But if you, well, if you could just duck bullets, give you an idea, see, an ambition of this character. Every time somebody fired a bullet at you, in a war or something like that, if you acted quickly enough, of course, you would never be hit. I know that's idiotic, but so is the reactive mind.

Yet sometime or another, you've had an ambition of that character. You've said, "I wouldn't ever have airplanes run into me if I ducked every time I thought there might be an
airplane in my vicinity." Well, this gets embarrassing, particularly when you're in basements. [laughter]

See, it's a – if you're going to get a form to survive, you mustn't wait until you look over the name, rank and serial number of the aircraft, you see. The thing to do is duck.

Actually, I knew a naval officer, he has only one creditable action in his whole existence and that was, he actually did identify an American fightercraft that was coming back in over the fleet. And it had been mauled up and it was making it all right. It was trailing smoke. And he did identify it, and he did restrain at the last instant, his people from firing at that aircraft. He did restrain them.

The aircraft was shot down by the next ship in line. But that was a creditable action, and I – I wish to assign it to him. It shows you that not all men are all bad. [laughter]

But this was very unusual for him to do such a thing, which is why it stands out in my mind. It's almost incredible for the man to ever have inspected anything, yet he did in this particular case. But the safe thing, reactively, to do is of course, shoot at an aircraft without inspection.

Well, when fellows get all gingered up by war, they're liable to do things like this. Actually, the only thing wrong with wars is, you put weapons in the hands of men and get them marching around, some of those guns will go off and somebody's liable to get hurt. And that's the only thing wrong with war. Otherwise, they're fine.

So, there was a little Dutch corvette, and it had escaped from Java when it was abandoned by the Associated Allied Admirals Union and – they had to work overtime, so they abandoned it. Anyway, this little corvette escaped.

Well, I myself was in a sort of a gingery frame of mind and had very often gone clang when, in approaching American harbors, the local fighter command or torpedo boats would use you for target practice and they all were under orders, that in view of the fact there were no ships around of the enemy, that they should fight ours.

And they would take practice dummy runs on every ship that was coming in and they were under orders to do this. It was almost enough for a ship to be coming down the fairway for the fighter command to leap into their cockpits, tie their girl's stockings – or was that another war [laughter] – and go screaming off down the runway and go dummy runs on you, you know?

And you'd have to hold your cap on, on the bridge, you see and the funnel would go eeueengh! and so on. And I used to object to this rather considerably, because I'd been over in – in the South Pacific, early in the war and it made me nervous. And I was getting reactive on the subject, you see?

Not as reactive as a bunch of officers I went down to meet one day, who had just come in from that area. An aircraft passed over their landed aircraft on the airport – and, they were on American soil, you see – and every one of them threw himself face down on the concrete alongside of the airplane. Of course, there were – all the people at the airport thought this was
silly, which it was because it was in the wrong time and place. But it was just a reaction, you see.

Well, anyway, this little Dutch corvette comes steaming up the line in Miami and a whole squadron of American torpedo bombers say, "Well, that's what we're supposed to do." And they jump in their cockpits and tie their girl's stockings around their necks, or whatever it is and go screaming down the runway, up into the sky and start a practice run on this Dutch corvette. And of course, they got met right in the teeth with everything the Dutch corvette had. [laughter] Well, at least part of the Air Force had a baptism of fire.

By the way, the United States government couldn't do anything about it at all. They spoke to the Dutch corvette and the Dutch corvette said – captain said, "Ve have jus' come out of a war. Uns you go running against us, you gonna get shot at. That's it!" [laughs]

And the corvette was provided with air cover all the way up the Atlantic seaboard, clear to New York, to warn off torpedo bombers and things that might make runs on it. They kept it spotted, much more carefully than they were looking for the "Deutschland". It was dangerous!

Now their reactivity of course has come up to a total insistence. It's come up to a total identification of all aircraft with enemy aircraft, you see? Because the safe thing to do is not inspect.

Obviously, if you sat around in enemy waters, you know, and the lookout, he sees an aircraft in the distance and he walks back to the phone and he picks up the phone and he said, "Give me the Captain's orderly." And the orderly comes to the phone. He said, "I'd like to speak to the Captain if he isn't busy."

"Captain, I don't wish to disturb you, but I have spotted something up in the sky. I'm not sure what it is. Would you like to come out and have a look?"

Captain says, "Well, I'm going to finish a cup of tea here and I'll be up." Of course, they would have been dead by that time. Never would have had a chance.

So instead of that, they jam time. You get the idea? And the jam of the time finally results in a no-inspection. See what happens?

So any aircraft in the distance gets shot at, until ... I think I was the first one across the Pacific after the declaration of war in WW II, in an unarmed merchantman and we were running like a hare before the wolves. And one day – one day there was a terrible alarm and we'd managed to haul some antitank guns out of the hold and mount them in sandbags. And I don't know what they could have done, but it was very interesting anyway and kept the morale up and we had a couple of Lewis guns that I'd put in action. Nobody on board knew how to operate the things and it was quite – it was quite good.

And all of a sudden, there was a tremendous, screaming rush up on the boat deck and everybody was gesticulating at the sky, and the Lewis gun goes off with a low snarl and antitank guns start banging. [laughter]

So I went up to find out what was happening, and they point up at the sky and the bridge, meantime, is madly trying to communicate with the boat deck – out of communication
totally. Nobody would listen to the bridge and finally, I spot this thing. I couldn't figure out what they were shooting at!

They knew. They were shooting at an enemy aircraft and they'd seen it circle and it was circling. The only difficulty was, in the tropics, Venus is totally visible in daylight. And they were shooting madly at the planet Venus! [laughter]

And the bridge had already figured out what they were doing and was trying to tell them madly that that was Venus. Being seamen, they have their own goddesses. Here was a totally reactive situation. Of course, the safe thing to do was shoot, obviously.

Well, that's how far off it can go.

So one day, this part of the reactive mind which has been trying to keep a doll surviving on the Galaxy Gee Whizzes, from being destroyed by gorillas, gets a whiff of a fur coat and goes into total action. Takes over, right as out of that moment. You've got an emergency situation, instantly. You've got gorillas in the vicinity and it's better not to inspect, even. People who turn around and really inspect things are very often amongst the wounded and dead. So what – what are you going to do?

It means, that when you speed up things in the universe to too great a degree, on the false basis that you are "prone to nonsurvival", but in the interest of keeping something surviving, you are then going to run into this timeless reactivity of action without inspection. Infinite dedications to the survival of forms and patterns.

This is why Goals SOP works so beautifully and why, when you start to take goals off somebody, they start nulling You think offhand, "Well, gee whiz, I'm taking all this fellow's goals away from him", you see, or something of that sort. Well, you're auditing the wrong target. You're auditing the guy.

Now, of course, you're actually auditing toward the guy in order to free him up from reactivity. So there – actually your auditing target is the reactive mind. That is your auditing target, not the pc.

And as long as you go on busily auditing a thetan, called a pc, exclusively – as the thing which monitors what you're doing – you're going to continue to make mistakes and not clear people. That's all.

Because you never look at what's wrong with him. You're only auditing what he knows. The only thing wrong with him is what he doesn't know and what he doesn't know is totally contained in the reactive mind and there is no inspection involved. So he can't see what is wrong with him and if he could see what was wrong with him, it wouldn't be wrong, would it?

All right. A lot of things stem out of this. First and foremost, you think that a reaction, probably, to your question may take place in the next several minutes. You sit and look at an E-Meter and wait for it to react. And, of course, the reaction which you have to wait for is something the pc knows. And the reaction which you get instantly is in the reactive mind. And it'll occur in something on the order of a tenth or even a hundredth of a second.
It starts to occur instantly that you enunciate it. Because you're more in control and more able to restimulate the reactive mind than the thetan whose reactive mind it is. Why? Because every time it's restimulated, it blanks something out. The no-inspection factor arises.

Well, you're not being blanked out by his reactive mind. So therefore, you can think on these subjects, and he can't. Unless you have a total case duplicate between the auditor and the pc, the auditor can always see more of what is going on than the pc can.

You take in a pc's adjudication or what a pc thinks about something as any indicator of what you ought to do – at any time – and you, of course, are always going to waste auditing time and you're always going to do the wrong thing. Inevitably and invariably, it'll be the wrong thing.

If you want to do all the wrong things, then listen to the pc. Because he's under a tyrannical dictatorship, known as the reactive mind, which knows best because it now has in it all the individualities which he has tried to make survive and all of them know best. So one of his basic goals, although he knows it's very bad for him, is to make his reactive mind survive.

So even though this fellow will sit down and be audited, this is peculiar and the peculiarity which resolves around this. He won't let you near any part of the reactive mind that ought to be audited – gluah-gluah-gluahgluah – because those parts are the survivals. So it dictates that he let them survive. So, he'll always throw you red herring.

And after you've accumulated several warehouses full of red herring, you have also wasted an enormous amount of auditing time, because you've never audited anything that should have been audited on the case and you've permitted to survive everything that should have been audited out of the case, don't you see?

You listen to the pc, you listen to the pc, about what's flat or what should be run, or what he thinks about the situation and that's just – write it over here in the loss column of auditing, for you. Got nothing to do with the case. Nothing!

You can almost go on the basis, if he says this is what the score is, your immediate reaction can be that is certainly what it isn't, aside from this basis of goals and checks against the E-Meter.

Now, the E-Meter can read the case. Why? Because everything that is surviving madly, to be computed and go into action without inspection, even though it doesn't apply anymore ... You see, things like this can go into action: If you go around and inspect things and turn around and look when you're running from a stricken field, you normally get speared. So therefore, it's very, very bad to look at the things that are pursuing you. So you mustn't look at the things which are pursuing you. So you had better prevent the auditor from equally getting in danger by looking at the things that are pursuing you. Something of that sort comes up. There are all sorts of crisscross computations involved here.

But you're going on avoiding what is wrong with the pc quite unintentionally. What's wrong with him registers on the meter, but not on the person. It'll register on him secondarily.

Now, you can actually get something to register on the meter, which then the person finds out about. And then you get another reaction on the machine.
Have you seen this happen? You say "gooseberries", and the machine says "tick", and then you get a surge of some kind or another. What's that all about? Well, the tick; you found it in the reactive mind. The surge; the pc found out about it.

Well, you go on assessing for surges and running surges, of course, you're just going on auditing what's already known. See, you're just wasting time.

Now, if the pc doesn't find out about it after the tick, you better audit it. Got it?

Now, there's another thing which makes this difficult and which has obscured your clear view of it and that is just this one little terrible factor. Withholdingness is important in auditing today because it happens to be the comm bridge between the reactive mind and the pc. And when a withhold comes out of the reactive mind, the pc momentarily – or rather continuously – withholds, too.

In other words, he does what the reactive mind tells him to do. So therefore, if the reactive mind is withholding something, it comes to the surface, the pc will instantly withhold it.

So you ask somebody, "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" And the thing goes "tick". Only you didn't really see the first tick to amount to anything and then it goes wha-a-m!

And then you say, "Well, did you ever steal any chickens?" and it now goes wha-a-m, and will continue going wham. He's now under orders from the reactive mind to withhold.

Well now, withholdingness is part and parcel of survival. All agencies of the law, everybody else, dramatize this rather astonishing fact. What is the fellow doing when he is trying to protect himself by running from a stricken field? He is withholding a body from the enemy, isn't he? He's withholding a form.

Now, the withhold of the form, the withhold of the form, the withhold of the form, from destruction, don't you see, is a nonduplication. You kill somebody, they're dead, but the form you've got isn't dead. So therefore, you have to withhold the form you've got from duplicating the form that is dead, don't you see?

So, similarly, somebody threatens to kill you, you are very likely to threaten to kill them. Duplication is quite active, you see? But if somebody tried to kill you and you killed them, during that whole period of your killing them, you'd have to hold your form from being killed – do you see this? – which, of course, sets the mechanics going for survival. And that, actually, is prior to the actual idea of surviving, is withholding a form. Or you could say surviving is coincident with it – whichever way you want to figure it out. But withholding a form and surviving are blood brothers. So withhold a form – you find the pc then withholding thought.

And the common denominator of the actions of the reactive mind are withhold, which we see as only-one, chronic individuation. There are just factors, factors, factors, factors that we've added up through Scientology. All of which amount to withholding oneself, withholding one's thoughts, withholding one's actions, and all of these things add up. Why?
Because they're a dictate from the matter of survival and are probably – they're probably prior to survival and with survival and after survival. And there's that little comm bridge and the comm bridge between the reactive mind and the pc is withhold. So what the reactive mind is withholding, if you click it, the pc now withholds. He dramatizes the reactive mind.

When he decides to give this up, he has conquered the reactive mind to that degree in that he's not following its orders. He ceases to be controlled by the reactive mind and starts to be controlled by a living being. So therefore, he feels better when he gets withholds off. This is the mechanics of it, don't you see. Because the withholds add up to keeping him separated from the human race and when he gets the withhold off, he rejoins it to that degree. See how it stacks up?

So, the pc can always be counted upon to dramatize the withhold after it's been dredged out of the reactive mind. Even for an instant, if only for an instant, he'll still dramatize it. So you get a click and then you get a fall. And if you're not being terribly observant, you will see only the hard, large fall. That's when the pc knew about it, don't you see? Actually, the click was there instantly. But now the pc knows about it.

Well, the secondary action is not to get the withhold off the pc but to keep the pc from dramatizing his reactive mind. So we say, "What was that?" and if he doesn't tell us, why, he just is going on dramatizing this "withhold it, withhold it, withhold it." And eventually he says, "Well, maybe I'll take a very adventurous step and not do what I am always told to do and I will tell this auditor what it is", and pow, then it goes clean on the meter.

So at the state of withhold, you've got a pc who is reactive. The pc himself, as an analytical being, is being reactive. But that is the crossroads and that's the only point where he is being. You got that? Otherwise, he's talking to you fairly straight, or at the dictates of the reactive mind.

Early in a case, particularly, if you kept on auditing the pc, you would be something like auditing a light bulb because you wanted to fix the generators in a power station.

Now, you can go on auditing this light bulb and it'll blink and flicker, and you'll say, "Gee, look what all I'm doing." Then all of a sudden there's a horrendous crash someplace, and it goes out; and you say, "Well, I failed."

Well, naturally, you're going to fail. You're auditing a light bulb and you're trying to fix the generators in the main power plant. Well, the thing to do is to go down to the main power plant and fix the generators. And this tells you the name and address, not only of the power plant, but it also tells you very distinctly which generator and it tells you every part on the generator and its means of propulsion.

As long as you fly with your E-Meter flat, you're all right and if you start flying with the pc flat, you're just going on auditing light bulbs. So, it's just going to take forever to clear somebody. That's all.

I'll give you an example. Now, all of this is highly theoretical up to this point, but let me give you a very practical example.
Now, we're running this Prehav Scale assessment. All right. I'll show you how to waste time in auditing, see, real good. This is the way you can burn it up and audit those light bulbs and everything is wonderful. See?

And you say, "Well, do you have faith in things? ... [long break of more than 10 seconds, audience laughs] Thank you."

You get how much time that consumes, just watching the E-Meter, just watching the E-Meter, watching the E-Meter? What are you looking for? Are you waiting for it to play "Dixie?" Because there isn't anything else going to happen.

No. You look here at your list, and you see "Faith." You don't say "Faith." You take your eyeballs and you fix them on the needle [laughter], very closely, because it's going to happen fast.

And you say, not "Is the square root of the common denominator of the differential of faith?" You don't waste all that time. You say, "Now, I'm going to say some lines here, some levels. And maybe ask you some questions about them and you don't have to answer me. You don't have to say a thing. Just sit there and be comfortable. All right. That's fine. Thank you very much. Now we're going ahead with this assessment. Okay."

"Faith. Cause. No Effect. Effect. Obsessive can't-have. Create. Think. Peculiar interest." [LRH lets approximately 1 second pass between reading off the individual levels.]

Now look, if you're sitting here doing this: "Uh – Faith – ." [laughter] Well, you remind me of a small boy the day after the race, waiting for the horses to go by, you know.

It's not only that. It's – I'm not talking to you just about missing the flick on the needle. I'm talking to you about expecting a significant flick on the needle after you've asked the thing, a half a second later. If there's not going to be any flick on the needle, there is...

Now you're going to see this kind of a thing occasionally. There's a flick on the needle and then – clong! – there's a drop. Well, the flick on the needle is the reactivity, that's what you're looking for. So there's a clong. Okay.

In a Joburg Security Check, you'd better say, "What was that?" Because you've got another activity going now. You're not doing an assessment by the Joburg. You've got that – "Have you ever stolen chickens?"

And you ask them, "Have you ever stolen chickens?" And nothing happens. And you say, "Well, okay, have you ever stolen chickens?" You suspected maybe there was a flick there, the first time. Maybe it was – couldn't see it, maybe. You ask him a second time, you get click and then, surge! And you say, "What was that?" He knows about it now. The click-surge routine has put it from the reactivity into the analytical sphere.

Now, to keep the pc himself from dramatizing reactivity, you've got to get him to tell it to you. But it hasn't anything to do with the assessment of the question as to whether or not the question's hot.

Now, you get something that's actively being withheld from you and it doesn't wait after you say, "What was that?" to go click again. You say, "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" Wham! "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" Wham! "Have you ever stolen any
chickens?" Wham! "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" Wham! And you say, "Brother, you'd better tell me about that." Of course, you are actually assuming that, by this time, he knows about it. Well, really, he does.

Of course, I conduct Security Checks much differently than you do. You're very happy to go along and buy garbage. You ask a guy a question. You say to him, "Have you ever raped any chickens?" And – whatever the question is.

And he says, "Well.... ", and you notice there's a flick on the meter, and all of a sudden it does a surge. You say, "What was that?" See, he knows by now; the surge says he does.

You're no longer assessing the reactivity of the question. Now you're assessing the knowingness of the pc. But you've got to get it off. It's another operation. Now that you've got it out of the reactive mind to him, now you've got to get it from him to you.

So you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, I remember my father killing chickens when I was a little boy."

And you say, "All right. All right." You say, "Have you ever raped any chickens?"

But I don't say that. That's your notion. I believe these things. I believe these meters, see. I've used them long enough to be made very, very tame by the whole thing, you know? I know what to say, and when to say so.

I say, "Well, did you ever rape any chickens?" Click. Boom. I say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, my father – uh – my father uh – uh – used to kill a lot of chickens – used to kill a lot of chickens."

I say, "No, no." I'd say, "You didn't hear the question. Did you – you – ever rape any chickens?"

"Oh, well", he says, "Yes. If you put it that way, yes. I used to when I was a little boy."

You don't do it that way. you haven't been doing it that way at all. you say, "Did you ever rape any chickens?"

He says, "My father killed some chickens one time."

"Well, good, did you ever rape any chickens?" and the meter falls and you say, "Well, what was that?"

And he says, "Well, I was just thinking about chickens hanging up in the market and that was what that was."

In other words, you keep buying this, buying this, buying this, buying this, buying this. You get the idea? You're actually building the pc's belief up that he can withhold things from you.

So I say – I say very meanly – I don't necessarily advise you to do this because you can get into a lot of trouble this way. You've got to have terrific control of the pc in order to do this kind of thing. He's really got to be grooved in. Otherwise, you create ARC breaks, and
the rest of the session is all messed up and you get nothing done anyplace, anywhere, at any
time.

So that's your adjudicative idea. How much control have you got of this pc and how
much control have you got of the session? And if your control is terrific, and your ARC with
the pc is very good and the pc knows what you're trying to do and he knows he can't fool you,
you eventually get a Security Check going like this:

You've started in this way, you said, "Well, did you ever rape any chickens?"
And he said, "Well, no. My father killed some once. And uh – well, I saw a dog jump
on a chicken."

The next time you ask him, you know, "Did you ever kill any chickens?"
And he says, "Well, I – I – no."
"Did you ever rape any chickens?"
And "Where – wuh – I dunno. Uh, yes. Uh, yes, I remember something about chick-
ens. It was little boys talking about chickens one time."

And you say, "Good. Good. Fine. Good. Did you ever rape any chickens?"
And he says, "Well, I thought about it once."
And you say, "Good. Thank you. Fine." Your meter's falling, falling, falling. You're
just wasting time, wasting time, wasting time.

Well, if you're real good, you don't go at it this way at all. You say, "Did you ever rape
any chickens?" And you get a click-fall! Surge!

And you say, "What was that?"
And he says, "Well, I was just thinking about, uh – mmmm – I was just thinking about
– uh – I was thinking about my father used to kill some chickens."
You say, "No, no, no, no. I asked you, 'Did you ever rape any chickens?'"
"Well, actually, my little sister – ."
"No, no, come on, come on, come on, come on, did you, you, you ever rape any chick-
ens? That's what I'm trying to find out here."

He says, "Yeah, yes. I used to when I was a little boy."
You say, "Good. Did you ever rape any chickens? All right, it's clear now. Good. Next question." Get the idea?

And he all of a sudden has got the horrifying notion that there – you just aren't going
to buy dodges, that's all. Coo! He has met a tartar and the reactive mind after that is no longer
as powerful.

The reactive mind says, "Protect it." Says, "It's a withhold. It's valuable. You're in
danger. Give him an equivocation." Got the idea? "Feed him some muck over here, and throw
him a red herring and protect me."
So I just say, "It says here that rape of chickens – ." I think – I think even Suzie has heard me say questions like this. "It says here that rape of chickens has occurred. Now supposing you tell me about it, huh?" "Yes."

That's the end of that security question. Got the idea?

So it goes off: Boom! Question – bang! Question – bang! Question – bang! You see? Get the idea? You ask the question, see the fall. You notice there's a secondary surge. Now you do the other thing. Say, "Tell me."

The reactive mind says, "Under no circumstances tell him. Withhold, withhold, withhold, withhold." And I say – I say, "All right, but you can tell me."

And all of a sudden, the pc says, "He believes in me, one way or the other and I'll tell him right here, right now." Bang! And he tells you and the needle clears. And you ask the question again just to make sure. And then you ask the next question and then you're sailing, you understand?

Goals – you don't ask a goal ... "I want to pick gooseberries" is the goal that you're checking. You come down the line, find this thing and you say, "Well, now I'm going to ask you about a goal here." (You've already run through 200 goals, see.) "I'm going to ask you about a goal here and I don't want you to think I'm terribly personal, [laughter] but I want to know if this goal is – I want to know if this goal is still active. The goal is – is it all right if I read it to you? All right – uh, okay. Well, I'm going to read it to you now. 'You want to pick gooseberries'. How's that? Now, let's see. Now let's see what it's saying over here on the meter..." [long break]

Boy, that's the way to burn auditing time man. You're going down the list. No preliminaries. No nothing. You just say, "I want to pick gooseberries. I want to ride horses." You got the idea? You got the list over here. You've got the meter in front of you. What you really do is you look at the goals list. It says, "I want to pick gooseberries." You don't read it there. You delay your own read of it. You look over here at the meter and you say, "I want to pick gooseberries," and it goes flamp.


"I want to ride horses." Nothing there. "I want to ride horses." Nothing there. No. Next goal. Got the idea?

If you watched me doing this stuff, you'd think you were looking at a sausage grinder. You just chew right up, see, right on down the line.

Well, the longer you suppose that a pc is going to be adjudicative – it... about it at all or his adjudicativity proves only that he reacts according to the dictates of a tyrant known as the reactive mind in order to protect and not disclose the valences in other activities which exist without his inspection, so that he, as a form, can survive and it doesn't work out. You can't go at it that way at all.
No, I – I talk with the E-Meter about the fellow's circuits and if he wants to chip in once in a while, that's all right with me. That's – it's okay – I won't chop him. He'll say, "Well, I just – I just remembered something. I just remembered about riding a horse across a field as a little boy, and the horse picked up a stone – ." And I say, well, here we go and I say, "Gee, is that so? Thank you."

And at first he begins to believe I couldn't possibly be auditing him. Well, I'm not. I'm finding out what's – what's holding the show up here. I'm finding out what he's reacting to. I'm finding out what is there to react in terms of matter, energy, space, time and thoughts – which are all crisscrossed in one way or the other and suspended in time – so that a thought two billion years old is still being violently thought in this person's mind. Why?

This person is perfectly capable of inspecting. This person can't do otherwise than survive. This person is capable of being totally able. This person can get the show on the road. This person can actually make form survive. But because he's got all these dependent mechanisms and goo-gahs and things of this character and a reactive mind to help him out and pat him on the back and make it unnecessary; he acts like a nut and he destroys everything he lays his hands on. Well, don't you think it's about time you straightened it out?

Well, all right. It'd be easy to straighten it out. All you have to do is validate the pc. That's for sure. After you've cut him to ribbons, why, look up and say, "Well, you're doing all right. Thank you very much," you know?

But you can saw into these assessments with a whir and a clank, with your eye pinned right there to the needle and away you go; and you go right on down the line, bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang – It's like telegraph poles passing by when you're riding in a train, you know?

And it isn't, "Well, here we are. Well, well. Isn't this unusual? Now I'm going to consult with you all about your reactive mind. Now what do you think you possibly might be having to run now? What do you think that might be?" Well, you're talking to the wrong telephone line. You've got it hooked into the wrong... you might have it in the right switchboard, but you sure got it in the wrong corner of the building.

Now, there's an example in this bulletin of a – of an assessment that could have been bought, merely because the pc believed it and you were getting cognition curves – surges off of it, see? It could have been bought. I didn't say that the auditor would have bought it or anything of the sort. But there was another one that was alive. And these were "order", "command" and "conquer", and that "conquer" was alive, man; and that's what I was looking for on the case. I said, we've missed something here, someplace. Somewhere along the line we have missed one and that's why I wanted to assess the case.

And this person was perfectly agreeable and knew completely that it was "order" or "command." But these were the little red tabs that were hanging out and they cleared up. And it was one the pc didn't mention.

Now the pc did report – because he's in pretty good shape – as I was doing the assessment (which I was still taking just the E-Meter). He said, "I just keep thinking about control. I keep thinking about control."
I said, "That's fine. That's fine." That's cooperative data. You're being helped by the pc, but I bought the E-Meter. I went over everything and settled everything down and it was "Control" so I bought it. You got the idea? I didn't buy it because he said so. But he helped me out by saying that.

He could just as easily have been throwing a great big red herring across the path, too. It – it – he might have said, "My – you know, sort of down deep someplace, the one thing I don't want to have anything to do with is Failed Importance."

See, a reactivity, you know? So, he just as likely would have said, "Well, it's 'Connect.' I'm sure it's 'Connect.'" Got the idea? "If I can just tell him convincingly enough that it's 'Connect' ..."

You don't find pcs doing this when they're in better condition, but when they're in worse condition, they will do this continually. "It's 'Connect'! It obviously is 'Connect'!" He's trying desperately, reactively, not to get anywhere near Failed Importance.

When a pc starts getting too insistent that it is something and is practically screaming that it is something, I know very well what's happening. The mechanics and the – all of the various little wheels and so forth, that are going around are adding up just this: There is something here that we had better not put our number-tens in, because it's quicksand, and it'll go straight through.

Somebody tells me, "Well, I don't want to run this level anymore. This level's boring and I don't want anything more to do with this level" and – and all of that kind of thing. I say, "How interesting! Isn't that fascinating!"

Of course, I'm perfectly reasonable about it. I don't get militant on the subject. I say, "Has the pc got a withhold?" which is very likely running these things these days. As I told you the withhold is the bridge between the reactive mind and the analytical mind. So of course, pc picks up a withhold; half an hour later, you find the pc with an ARC break.

That's, by the way, the way it goes. They get the withhold on the auditor and the auditor misses it and then they'll pick up an ARC break; and then the auditor will try to cure up the ARC break when in fact, it's this withhold back here half an hour earlier.

All ARC breaks, by the way, for your information, usually occur a half an hour before they're expressed by the pc. If you're sharp, you can always see that an ARC break has occurred.

But earlier than that, if you're very sharp, you can see that a withhold occurs and you just bust into your auditing command and say, "Now how are you doing? How's it going? How's it going now? All right. Haven't got any ARC breaks?" (You're not looking for an ARC break, see?) "Withholding anything?" Clang!

You say, "What was that?"

"Well, I haven't answered the auditing question for ten commands."

"Oh", you say, "all right. Give me ten answers." [laughter] You don't necessarily say that, but you sure as hell could and I've been known to do things like that. Anyhow.
What you're trying to do is keep the pc from being fooled about himself and if you are in a continuous, consecutive, forever and ever avoidance of the reactive mind, you're just Q-and-A-ing with the pc.

You'll eventually wind up doing something like this; and this is the ne plus ultra of Q-and-A: You're doing a Joburg All right. You say, "Now, have you ever thrown any rings around chimneys?" And the pc says – you've gotten your click and then your surge.

See, very often on an assessment you get a good read, which then disappears. Well, actually it was just the cognition surge. When the energy released, you know, that was withholding it from the pc and the pc found out about it and so on, of course, you get a needle response. But it's usually after the fact of the needle reaction on the reactive mind. That "after the fact" is the pc finding out, see? So these latent surges that you get on the E-Meter are analytical, ordinarily.

All right. He says, "Well, yes, yes. Mm-hm, I've thrown some rings around chimneys. I threw a ring around a chimney when I was a little girl. Uhm – I – I did. I – I did that. And um – my grandmother was very cross with me about it."

I'm showing you a Q-and-A now, see? And you say, "Good. Why exactly was your grandmother cross with you?"

And she says, "Well, I'd been very bad and I treated my grandmother very badly", or something like this.

And the auditor says, "Well, just where was that? Where did you live at the time?"

What the hell does this have to do with a Joburg, see? It's got nothing to do with a Joburg. It's trying to run an incident with using the excuse of the Joburg. The Joburg is totally dedicated to withholds. And that's everything it's dedicated to. And there isn't anything else it's dedicated to. And you want to know if he threw any rings around chimneys.

And he finally – you – you said, "You throw any ring around chimneys?" You get a clink, surge! You say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, I – as a matter of fact I did. I – I did. I did, yes. I – I just remembered. I – I did. I threw some rings around chimneys when I was a little boy."

And you say, "Good. Throw any other rings around chimneys?" Clang! And you say, "Good. Well, what was that?"

"Well, when I was a young man I used to do it all the time."

And you say, "Good. Now, did you ever throw any rings around chimneys?" Clink. Just a little clink on it that time and then a surge. And you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Wheww! Well, I actually didn't mean to get down to this, but every night about midnight I have to go up and throw a ring around the chimney. And I – that's it."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Good. Now, did you ever throw any rings around chimneys?" Deader than mackerel. Next question.

See, you're just interested in withholds and you're just interested in that question.
Now, you'll get some oddball ramifications on questions. You get some oddball ones where he's got everything connected with everything connected with everything. You understand?

If you don't get any instantaneous response, you're not getting a response on that question. Why are you fooling with the question?

Now the order is, clear the E-Meter. But what is the E-Meter and what is the E-Meter doing that you must clear? Well, the E-Meter is responding. What is the E-Meter responding on? The E-Meter is responding on a reactivity. If you haven't got a reactivity, to hell with it. Because the second time you ask the question, if the pc now knows it analytically, you'll have it reactive anyhow. It'll be an instant read.

If you're not getting instant reads, or something – the pc is dawdling around and walking over the hills and so forth – of course, I will go ahead and clean up a meter on a question rather thoroughly. But it isn't necessarily falling on the question, if you're getting a latent surge all the time.

You say, "Did you ever throw any ring around chimneys?" And 2 and 3 and 4 and 5 and 6 and 7 and 8 and 9 and surge. You say, "What was that?"

"Well, I don't know. It's sort of escaped my mind now."

Oh! This is not the time to say, "What has escaped your mind? Did your grandmother spank you that day? What was the color of your brother's hair?"

No, this is not the time. The time to say that is the original question. It turned on and will become kind of a response after a while, so let's ask the original question, whatever it was. "You ever done any illicit diamond buying?"

And watch that meter. And if it doesn't go snap, that isn't – it isn't falling on that. In other words, your E-Meter actions are as instantaneous as the reactive mind is batty. You got it? They're fast! See? They're right now!

Of course, if you get any kind of a fall of any kind whatsoever, even a latent fall, you had better find out what it is by asking, "What was that?" But that is pursued by asking the question again and if you don't get a fall on the question, why are you interested in the latent fall?

You can go ahead and clear it up if you want to – it's a good workmanlike job if you do – but that isn't necessarily what's going on here at all. There's something else going on someplace.

Well, you're doing the thing of trying to read the question to the pc and then trying to clear the rest of the Security Check as a sideline. It clears one question at a time and if it doesn't fall on that question, it doesn't fall on the question.

When is the fall going to occur on that question? Well, it might not occur on your first read, but that's beside the point. It'll certainly occur instantly on your second read. Instantaneous. Within a tenth of a second of your having uttered the question, there will be a reaction on the meter; and if there's not a reaction on the meter, but a latent reaction that is finally going bthooong, after several seconds or something like this, yeah, the pc is withholding something
of some kind or another about something. But look-a-here, it's not necessarily on that question
at all. And that's the mistake you're making. You see?

You can actually read a Joburg off – brrrrrr – right on down through all ten pages,
you see and take instantaneous falls. Plang! "What was that?"

"Nuhhhh, yes, I did."

You say, "Good. Thank you." Repeat the question. No reaction.

Now, if you sat there and waited for the E-Meter to play "Dixie", you might get a fall
on almost anything, see. You might get a fall on the fact that he was getting bored, that he
was getting tired, that he hopes he doesn't find out. He knows the Joburg. He's had it about
four times and he knows there's a question coming right up on the next page that is hotter than
a pistol and he's guilty as sin. [laughter]

Actually, he's never thought of it before, but it just suddenly occurred to him that it
wasn't quite the right thing to do to hit his father and mother on the head with an axe and it's
just occurred to him, like a flash of lightning on the head and the question that has to do with
this is on the next page!

So you've read the question. Now, the pc gets to worrying about the next page and you
get an answer in the meter here, which is reading the surge of the pc. You got the idea? It isn't
on that question.

The law is, if you don't get an instantaneous reaction on the meter, there's something
wrong with the question. It isn't the answer to that question.

If you get any kind of a reaction on the meter at all, you ask the question again, of
course. If you don't get a reaction on the second time, it still isn't it. Don't sit there and wait
for it to play "Dixie". You don't have to hang around on the street corners, leaning up against
the lamppost, hoping something is going to happen! The town you're operating in isn't that
one-horse. If you want things to happen in auditing, do them rapidly so that you do get some-
thing happening and you'll get something happening, with speed.

So your assessments do not take in the zone and area of the pc's analytical mind,
unless, of course the pc is being very resistive. Now, he's being very resistive about a with-
hold; well, that's between you and the pc. You got the idea? That's another operation. Has
nothing to do with finding it on the meter or anything of the sort. It's still on the meter. You've
found it. Now it is reacting on the pc. Well, you just say, "Stand and deliver. What is it?"

And you could go on and clear eighty-nine other questions with the pc, of one charac-
ter or another, but it isn't falling on the one you're asking. You got the idea? So clear what
you're doing.

Now similarly, on an assessment, it requires no cooperation on the part of the pc at all.
Actually, the pc could be walking around the room, if he could do that and hold on to the
electrodes and if you were speaking loud enough, the pc would hear, reactively, what you
were saying, because it's dangerous, and you'd get a reaction on the meter.

And you think you have to wait for the pc to think about it or the pc to rationalize
about it. That's not true. You don't want anything to do with that. It's very – it's a very happy
fact that he can still think. We're glad he's still alive. Cheerio! But that's about all it has anything to do with it and nothing else has anything to do with it.

All right. I've given you a very long lecture today as I am prone to do, and should start them earlier on Fridays. But I've been studying for some time why it takes so long for something to happen and I've now done enough observation that I can tell you, that it isn't a slight thing of speeding you up so that your actions are more coordinated or something. It's gross! You're auditing the wrong target.

See you're auditing the pc's analytical sphere of action and that isn't what you should be auditing at all. You're supposed to be auditing the reactive sphere. As long as you're auditing the reactive sphere, it shows up only on the meter and it shows up instantaneously; and that's what you bite. Right away – pang! And you get the job done.

Now, I'm not asking you to rush. I don't care how leisurely you go about the job of auditing, but just audit the right target, which is the reactive bank of the pc – "Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health", published May 9th, 1950.

Thank you.
Thank you.

Wuff! Well, thank you for giving me an opportunity to have a little rest and relaxation. You know, what – what most people consider work, I don't. And when I get cases running off the rails, far off on administrative lines, trying to prove conclusively that the organization cannot possibly survive, it seems an awful long way to have to audit, and that's just about what it amounts to. Somebody presents me with the fait acompli of "Auditing is absolutely vital and necessary twelve thousand miles away or eight thousand miles away."

That's generally what administrative things break down to, by the way. People do odd things to you. They present you with emergencies; enormous emergencies. And they think I don't know yet that they're just trying to reach me. That's their idea of reaching me. If I appeared on the ground it would be very, very simple to straighten out the thing. It's almost the heroic effort necessary to keep things running wrong. [laughter] It's almost fantastic. It's almost fantastic. I just think the people in these governments just absolutely must be just sweating, just sweating blood, day and night. I mean, how can they manage it, you know?

They just – I can see them up now, at 10, Downing Street, and the State Department, seventeen hundred-and-something Pennsylvania Avenue. I can just see those poor fellows, you know? Trying to hold things in disorder. Because you'd be surprised the ease with which things will snap into order. It isn't an automaticity, particularly, but order is always easier to achieve than disorder. You have to work at disorder.

And yet the world at large is so in disagreement with this principle that I wrote a story one time about a fellow who went ashore trying to sin, under a hellfire and brimstone Captain. And he went ashore in China trying to sin and the Captain had given him a big lecture about the ease it was, you know, to drift into the ways of wrong and all of that; and how easy this was and how simple this was for a young man to have all this happen, you know. And the fellow goes ashore, and he just overtly, you see, tries desperately to get into some trouble or have some excitement, you see, and it's all a complete flop. [laughter]

Well, what is this? This is Junio the 12th? Sesenta y uno. All right. If any student has any question he cannot live without being answered, speak up. ...You mean all of your questions have been answered?

Female voice: No. They aren't coming up till I start auditing.

What was that again? Got one coming up?
Female voice: I said mine are going to come up when I start auditing.

Oh, I see. All right. Yes, Mike?

Male voice: I don't know if it's off the point, but one of the questions we were asked was "PHD." I have no idea what that is.

Hm?

Male voice: "PHD"!

You don't know what "PHD" is? Well, now let's see, who was here when Mary Sue gave the very adequate demonstration of that. All right, Madge, would you be good enough to show him how, conclusively, you can demonstrate that the cat has PDHed him? Will you do that for him? That'll tell you all about it. That's the easiest one. That's easier to demonstrate than talk about. Nobody would believe it until they see it. you see, everybody has been PDHed according to the meter, if you don't know how to ask questions. It's a wonderful example in how to get wrong information.

I want to repeat something, speaking about a meter, just mentioning it in passing. Now, are you having better luck using instant read than latent read?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Is there anybody still in a flat one about this? Whether you use – . Yes?

Male voice: I have a problem, Ron. Uh, when the pc answers, say, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" you don't get any motion on the meter, whether the pc says no or yes. And then – say he says yes – and then you get a drop after he says yes. This is the latent read that you're referring to?

That's a latent read.

Male voice: Latent read.

That is a latent read. A meter reading on the pc's reply or response is a latent read.

Male voice: Do you exploit it?

Hm?

Male voice: Do you exploit this one? Try to find out what it is?

Brother, I'd drop that one so hard it goes plop. you know, I'd just pay no attention to it.

Male voice: Okay. Now, that's what I want to know.

Just no attention to it. He didn't know from nothing Your meter knew. So he says it isn't all right. Now, I won't act on it, but I'm still in two-way communication with the pc. You see, it's a code break not to be. So I handle this thing two ways. (1) I'm not going to handle it, and (2) I make the pc feel all right about it.

I usually handle these things somewhat on this order: "Is it all right to audit in this room?" Pc: long comm lag, looks around. Nothing's happening, you know. Meter dead calm at the instant I asked the question.

Pc says, "No, I'm not so sure."
And I say, "Well, we'll probably get more used to it as we go on. Thank you." [laughter]

Doesn't create an ARC break, the pc kind of perks up, and says, "Well, all right, you're gonna be overbearing." [laughter]

Now, this latent read is licking a lot of organizations right now, and a lot of auditors in the field. It's licking them. They don't dig this one and their Security Checks are going up toward the hundred-hour mark. We had been very successful in handling people in Johannesburg in the course and we had a terrific course and it was fine. And when Peter Williams went back down to Australia, he was utterly stunned at the length of time it was going to take to do anything in the way of an assessment or a Security Check or anything else.

Now, this was the dog datum that had slid in unnoticed. It had just crept in under the door. Everybody was reading latent reads. See, that was the difference. Nobody was getting the show on the road, and he hadn't actually noticed this essential fact. I didn't notice it myself until I'd been sitting around here for about a month watching what you were doing. And it suddenly occurred to me, "They're doing something wrong, but I can't put my finger on it", and Mary Sue, in watching what you were doing and in giving checks and that sort of thing and trying to demonstrate it, suddenly came up with the datum. She said, "Auditors are reading an E-Meter that falls after the fact." She didn't say it that precisely, but that was it. She had a lot of other things to say about it, but... [laughter] this is the way this thing goes, you see?

If you don't get a response on the E-Meter within something on the order of a tenth of a second of your question, everything thereafter is a no-response. You got it? It's a no-response now. We don't care if it whistles Dixie. It's a no-response.

In the first place, you are not auditing the analytical mind. And if all that was wrong with people was the analytical mind then you'd have it made, you see, because a guy could think his way straight so fast it'd make his head swim. He is responding to the reactivity of the reactive mind, and therefore all the auditor is interested in is the reactive mind. And the only thing which responds instantly on the meter is the reactive mind. That's all. Anything else – his blood pressure's responding or his sudden memory that he didn't put out the cat (oh, my God!) and there's the cat home all day in the apartment. This kind of thing, you see, gets in.

Now, we have another order of read of this character and these two things are similar. We have to give this other one a name, now. We got several orders of magnitude of read that are really high school E-Meter reading. One of those is the rise. You don't pay any attention to a rise.

Now, we have some new students here and I'm very happy with you and you're all welcome and nobody is going to be cross with you. We'll try to teach you everything we know how to teach you until you report to us that somebody's needle rose. Why don't you report that there is air on Earth? Or some other astonishing fact? Why not send a telegram to the prime minister concerning the fact that farms in Sussex are covered with dirt? I mean, it's just the same thing. So it rose!
Well, why do you ignore this phenomenon of a rising needle and say nothing about it? You cannot establish what started it rising because the preclear did not observe what it was, started it rising, and you might have had five words in your sentence, and any one of them may have started it rising. Or the fact that a bee just buzzed past the window could start it rising. It's anything the pc would be unwilling to confront.

But to establish what it was would require perhaps fifteen minutes to a half an hour search of going over every possible element. All to what event? To find out that the pc can't confront. Well man, everybody knows that! If he could confront everything, he wouldn't in the least bit be having any trouble in existence anywhere at all. So all the rising needle has said is that the pc is not Clear. And you know that and I know that, so why should we re-search it? See?

What triggers the rise of the needle? And there's some old nursery rhymes and so forth that go along with this thing that I don't remember very well, but they have a ... oh, yeah, I think there's some character by the name of Chaucer, wrote one about it. So what? I mean, you're not announcing a knowable factor. See, you're announcing an unknowable factor, so there's no point in it.

Now, what stops a needle from rising you can establish. This fellow is able to confront cats, and something, Lord knows what – an electronic circuit going off at the North Pole causing a difference in the variation of the intensity of Earth – could start a needle rising. So what? He can confront cats, so we say to him, "cats" and the needle stops rising. And we stop saying "cats", the needle keeps on rising. So we know "cats" stops the needle.

Now similarly, in giving a Security Check, if you ask a question and the fellow has a rising needle, you're not reading the rising needle, you're reading a change of characteristic. And you ask him, "Have you ever illicitly diamond-bought?" you say, and the needle stops. Ah, but that's a change of characteristic. It didn't fall, it didn't theta bop, it didn't rock slam. But if you've got an instant read on "Did you ever illicit-diamonds-bought?" you press it.

You see, the instant read is, instantly it stops – if just for a second, see? It's going up very nicely and all of a sudden you say, "Did you ever illicitly diamond-bought?" Man, that's a change of characteristic. Get your jackrabbit ears flapping. That means he has illicitly diamonds-bought at some time or another. Probably in this lifetime. Probably got them in his pocket right now.

But you'll find a pc who is having a very rough time, who reads on a very, very high sensitivity knob here, will very often just rise and rise, and rise and rise, and rise and rise, and up goes the needle. And you'd just ask them Security Checks. And you know that they've done practically every question in the Security Check, they have a major crime on for which they're being looked for by Interpol, see? And you sit there in fascinated amazement!

Irresponsibility on all dynamics is so low that they have no reality on an overt or a withhold. So you of course get no needle reaction of any kind whatsoever, because the indi-
Individual must to some degree connect with the reactive mind to spark it off, you see? There must be a connection between the individual and that area of the reactive mind.

That's why you can't take somebody who has a bad neck, and all of a sudden say, "Well I'm going to cure your bad neck," and you work on him for days, and then you happen accidentally to ask the question of "How's your neck?"

And he says, "How would I know?"

And you say, "Well, isn't your bad neck getting any better?"

He says, "Well, it's never been bad." See, his head's always over this way, you see. "Never been bad. There's nothing wrong with my neck!" It's a fact! I mean, the guy has no reality on it. It's out of his reach.

So you can only reach those things in the reactive mind that the individual himself is capable at that time of becoming responsible for or aware of. And the E-Meter tells you what he is capable of becoming responsible for or aware of. It spots this responsibility factor for you, which gives you a reality factor. Therefore, you can audit, find, exploit things that appear on the E-Meter. But you cannot audit, find or exploit things that won't appear on the E-Meter because they're beyond the zone of responsibility of the pc. Completely beyond it.

Do you – if you were to go down here to Dartmoor Scrubs and fish out the warden or somebody else and put him on the E-Meter, and you say, "Well have you ever beaten up any prisoners? Have you ever been mean to any prisoners?" and so forth.

And he'd say, "No, we just do the best in this best of all possible worlds." And so help me, look at his knuckles, you know, and they're bleeding!

Well, you say, "How about those knuckles bleeding? Well, what about that? Have you done anything with any prisoner lately?"

"Oh, well, no, no. Fellow got in my road coming up here to see you, but of course, he was in my road and he shouldn't have been there, you see. It was his fault, and I didn't do anything to him at all."

This becomes utterly, pluperfectly fascinating There's the evidence. The evidence is right there, and the fellow has no reality on it. So don't be dismayed, because it's this responsibility factor. He's incapable of taking responsibility for the action, even potentially. The E-Meter only reads on what an individual is responsible of taking the reaction for, and that's all. That – it'll only read on that. If he's potentially responsible for taking responsibility – if he's potentially responsible – then and only then, you're going to get an action on the meter.

So it doesn't, you see, read a catalog of crime like an IBM machine. You know, every crime he has on the whole track between now and the beginning of track are not all cataloged, and will not all fall out with certain degrees of read. If you have an idea that an E-Meter is going to do that kind of thing, then disabuse yourself of it. The E-Meter will eventually do it, but just as the E-Meter reads the reactive mind, and reads reactivity and nothing but reactivity, so it also, ergo, perforce, must read what the individual can be potentially responsible for.

Therefore, when you give repetitively a Security Check of an individual, when you potentially have that individual capable of being responsible for certain of the crimes on the Se-
So this is an instant and immediate test of whether or not you are advancing the responsibility factor of the pc by auditing. If the pc has become more capable of taking responsibility, then and only then are you making progress in auditing, and then and only then will you get new withholds.

So don't be surprised when the meter starts reacting on a Security Check that you just finished giving. Ten hours of auditing before you finished a Security Check. Now you've been auditing a person and now all of a sudden he's got a whole new set of withholds. And you say, "Well, what a fool I am that I didn't catch these in the first place." This might be an amateur's response. "Why didn't I catch all those withholds in the first place?"

Well, you know the guy has to be potentially responsible for withholding on those exact things before they register. See, he doesn't even consider them an overt. And as you process a preclear who is going motivator, motivator, motivator, "How mean they all were to me," "How mean they all were to me," motivator, motivator, motivator – when they're going along this line, don't be amazed that they have never done anything to anybody, and that you can't find it on the E-Meter that they ever have done anything to anybody anywhere ever. Don't be surprised. See?

It's simply an index of the responsibility of the pc, and it's terribly bad. You process him for a little while on the Prehav Scale, one way or the other, and what happens when you process him? He gains in responsibility and as soon as his responsibility is up, any way, shape or form, all of a sudden it isn't motivator, motivator, motivator. The pc did something. Amazing! You don't hear about the husband beating them day and night, just standing there wearing his arm out. The pc at least comes up to the point of where "Well, it must be very tiring. I must have worn the man out", [laughter] and so forth. They've come up that high. And eventually – after you've been auditing them for hours and hours, and running general Prehav levels or SOP Goals or something – you give them another Security Check of one kind or another, and you find the astonishing fact that the way these fights start is she usually takes a hot iron and takes his best shirt or any of his clothes, and starts pressing them and then leaves the iron on, you see. And that's usually the way these fights start.

Now, we get it going a little further, and we – there's more hours of auditing, and we give a Security Check, and we find this astonishing development: that the person calculatedly plotted to make the husband mad! It wasn't an accident. The person has become aware of the mechanical processes and is taking responsibility for the mechanical processes which make them turn an iron on and put it on a new shirt, or something like that, and burn straight through it. They're getting even with him, and now they will begin to wonder what's wrong with them that they're doing something like this.

And there you're really seeing a case start operating. And when you don't see a case start operating at least that much, watch out, because you're not making progress.

If somebody is going motivator, motivator, motivator – fifty hours of processing later, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator; no good. You're not making any advance. Now if a case, for instance, is given a Security Check, and then given a general run,
just Routine 2, and then given another Security Check and you don't now find new withholds on the Security Check, watch it, because something happened there. You goofed. There's something wrong with that general run. The case didn't make advance. That means you're running the pc with the rudiments out. That's what it means.

There's something you can do about it. Yeah, well, run through your Security Check on the basis of instant read and when you get to the end of the run it's just, you know, give it a lick and a promise. Look for instant reads; that's about it. It's almost as fast as you can read a Security Check, by the way. You aren't going to find very much on it. When you get an instant read, clear it up and go on to the next question.

Get right back to auditing. And now, what is the present time problem? What is the ARC break? What external activity is the pc engaging in that is countering the auditing? Let's get real curious. You know these great big fruit horns, that they sometimes display. You know, there's one up in the Monkey Room, by the way. There's a monkey sitting there with a Mexican hat on with one of these horns of plenty.

Well, it's just like turning one of those things upside down, only the fruit squashes all over the floor. Crash! Yeah, well, outside of the fact they've been getting drunk every night before they came in to auditing sessions, and outside of the fact they've been trying to ruin your reputation while you're auditing them, and outside of the fact that they had already had a bet with somebody that they wouldn't get any gain in processing, the case is good. The case is making progress, see, aside from that! And it's gross! Don't look for little, tiny things. It will be a gross error.

All auditing errors which can suspend a case today are gross. And what do I mean by gross auditing error? Complete, stupid, stumbling, unfamiliarity with the TRs and Model Session and the E-Meter. It really has to be bad.

Next – complete and utter disregard of the rudiments. Just whole hog. Not paying any attention whatsoever to tone arm reads when the person leaves the session and tone arm reads when they come back into the session. Not – not even being vaguely curious about it.

Assessing the Prehav Scale, for instance, by only assessing the level for "Compete." Well, they read in a bulletin that when you assess the level on the Primary Scale, why then you go over into the Secondary Scale and that is one level. So you just – what you do of course is just take every word in the Secondary Scale. And not only that; if a person would do that that stupidly, they would also do this: Well, you just run one leg of the bracket. Like, "What has your husband done to you? Thank you. What has your husband done to you? Thank you. What has your husband done to you? Thank you." And it's gross! Don't look for little, tiny things. It will be a gross error.

Now, when you get errors of auditing adding up like that you get no gain. And I'm telling you, and you're going to learn it, and you're going to get a subjective reality on it, just like I had: the blunders which prevent cases from advancing are so gross as to stagger you. They are so gross that you won't believe them; therefore, you don't look for them when you're training auditors or something. You just don't look, in an HGC or something like that, for errors this gross!
You're taking it for granted that the errors are minor. That the pc had a little ARC break at the beginning of session with the auditor and therefore didn't advance in the session, and that's what this is all about.

No. You ask about this, and you try to clean up this little ARC break, and everything is ooooh! somehow or another. Pc doesn't still make any gains. And you go along, and you just flounder and fumble, and you wonder where you're going and what you're doing. No, the error there is the auditor never shows up for sessions. You think I'm kidding, but that's the order of magnitude of error!

It's big, you see. I mean, it'll be big! It'll be something on the order of, well, every night after the auditing day, the auditor has a date with the preclear's wife. See?

You take my tip. You look for gross errors. Just as we're running at ten-thousand-horsepower today, plus, so it takes a ten-thousand-horsepower error to combat it. And don't you go looking – when you're training auditors or supervising processing, or trying to look a – don't you go around trying to find that little, tiny, little thing that would've held it all up. Because you're asking the same silly question as "How can you put a matchstick in front of the Twentieth Century Limited and stop the train?" Well, you can't. It has to be another Twentieth Century Limited. And it will be, too.

But you'd be amazed. I've done some cross-checking of this character that is – just would stoney you. Just gone over it and over it and over it, trying to find out why we weren't making a gain, why we weren't making gain. And I just got one the other day. We had an auditor who just wasn't getting good results, that's all. Wasn't getting good results. And look: What he learned about running an E-Meter was the totality of running an E-Meter a few days ago, and he thanked me very carefully. Look, the guy's been assessing on the Prehav Scale. He has been running Security Checks. But he didn't know anything about setting up a meter. What he had learned is the third-of-a-dial-drop test. He learned several things about a meter. And he told me what these things were that he'd learned about a meter. He'd learned how to set up a meter. He'd learned to set it up and he knew now that you read by the needle ...

You talk about gross error? I mean, how could the guy have gotten any gains at all running assessments when he couldn't read a meter? You get the idea? So this is as gross as the errors are, that's all. They're just horrendous! I – I see that you really don't probably believe me; you don't have much reality on what I'm saying there, but you will have. You will have. It's grim! And you, sweating your brains out.

You know, the worst thing that a person who is supervising auditing can do is start inventing unusual and gargantuan solutions because the auditor he's giving them to just can't seem to make a gain on the case. So the auditor keeps coming in and saying, "That didn't work." Well actually, this is the old whizzeroo on the California response. There's a thing called the California maturity test, and the California this and California that. Well actually, there's an – in Dianetics there was the California response. Inevitably, if you said something about a new process, when I was working out there, somebody would say, "Oh, yes, that's very interesting, I was using that last year."

Sounds strange, you see. You said, "Well, there's this new scale and there's the ..." "Well, I was using it last year." They always used it last year, you see? Now I listened to this
for over a year before I finally got a proper response to it. And that was – became the California response. And that is "What were you using a year ago?" Well, that's a cooker! They've even forgotten what you said practically, see. They don't remember anything that you said and they come out with some wild rendition and you've just told them about the No-Effect Scale, you see? All right.

And they say, "Well, yes."

"Well, what were you using a year ago? Exactly what was it?"

And they say, "Well, just what you're talking about."

"No, no, no, no. What exactly were you using a year ago?"

And they say, "Well – well, we put these phonograph records on a phonograph, and we clamp the earphones on the pc you see? And we'd say 'Be calm. Be calm. Be calm.' That's what we were doing a year ago, and it was just exactly what you said."

You try to get any sequitur out of this, you see! That's the way to handle those characters.

Anyway. Similarly, the most common failure that you have in managing several cases at the same time is this one: Person comes in and says, "You know that – that you told me to do yesterday?"

And you say, "Yes. Uh – well – uh..." (That was your mistake, right there, you see?)

They say, "Well –" triumphantly, see. "Ah-hah-hah-hah! Well, it didn't work!"

And you say, "Well, I don't know. What is it doing?" And they give you a big rundown. You think up a new and extraordinary solution, you see, and you give them that.

And they go away, and they come back the next day, they say, "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! It didn't work! Oh-ho! No! It didn't work!"

For God sakes, get bright enough sooner or later to say to them, directly and positively, "What didn't work?" And you inevitably get some outpouring of sewage that has nothing to do with anything you have ever been talking about! "Well, I keep standing the pc on his head in the corner, and he – the blood keeps rushing to his head." [laughter] "And it's obvious that he isn't Clear, because he can experience a physical effect." I mean, it'll be some gross nonsense of this character. And you have been pounding your brains out, trying to get this case moving, you see, thinking – putting it on automatic – that your instructions and advices were all going to be followed. And if you get that type of repetitive action, that is one of your gross errors that you must be alert to, that you must wake up to.

Listen, if you've figured out a case from A to Izzard, knowing Scientology, and you ask somebody to run this on the case, I'll sw... I'll promise you something is going to happen. It isn't going to be "Well it didn't work!" See?

So obviously it's a gross error. You keep looking for something that works on the pc when the first order or instruction you gave, which is "Take the pc up to the auditing room," hasn't been followed yet!
I'm not getting 1.5 on the subject of auditors. I'm talking about auditing failures. And auditing failures always stem from gross, very gross, errors. And they are so gross that you will overlook them. And when you start giving extraordinary solutions on top of these gross auditing errors, of course, you're just getting no place at a hell of a rate. The thing for you to do is pick up a bulletin and say, "Now, let's see. It says something here about Routine 1. Now, describe to me in a few words what Routine 1 is."

And the person says, "Well, that's tell a person to be three feet back of his head, isn't it?" Yeah, well, he has never read that bulletin. And you've been telling him to put it into effect; and he's never read it.

I've got a wonderful example of that right now on the administrative lines I was just making a crack about. I have a report through the lines that a certain area was utterly disregarding all bulletins, because they were so busy in the middle of an emergency they couldn't put any of them into an effect, you see, because of the emergency they were having with finances and other things, you see. I got that report through from an independent source, that they just didn't know anything about any bulletins.

And sure enough, about three days later, I get a total 1.1 piece of nonsense about how everything is going broke and it's all a big emergency. It's just a total glee of insanity all the way through this report. How do you like that? Just glee of insanity. Backing up the hearse, telling you how bad it all is and so forth. Well, look, if these characters have never followed any instructions of any kind whatsoever, I can guarantee you they'll be in trouble. See, they'll just be in over their heads. Particularly if they had carefully reversed every instruction they had heard a rumor of. You see how that goes hand in glove?

So it happens on administrative lines, and it's something for a man in business to know. If somebody's department is going all wrong, and you just can't seem to put it right, and you just can't seem to issue orders that put it right, and you just can't seem to do anything to put it right; it's about time you looked for the gross error. Because it's not a little error of he has one too many motions in feeding the stuff to the accounts machine, see. It's not that at all. It's the fact that every time he receives the mail he dumps it in the waste basket. See, it's that kind of an error. And this is – goes hand in glove with he feeds you bad news and he says he can't do the job and there isn't any way possible to get the show on the road, and usually goes along with he needs more appropriation for his department and more help. All these things sort of fit in, in a package, see.

All right. You say, "Well, the poor guy. He's struggling there and maybe he isn't very bright," and you are being very, very kind, patient, and so forth, about this. And so you try to give him help by giving him instructions. And he keeps coming back and telling you the instructions didn't work. And the department doesn't get any better.

Well, the whole thing about it is, you never gave instructions that had anything to do with what was wrong in the department. What you should do about the time something really starts to run real wrong is to go look for the gross error. And just keep looking for the gross error, because you'll find so many minor errors that they will trap your attention. And so you never see the gross error. Get the idea?
You look at these little errors – Naturally, such a person in auditing a case would have all of his rudiments out, or something like this, naturally. But look – look for the gross error. What is the error here, when you've got a case that just doesn't advance, or things just aren't going. What is the error? It – it's big. Be something like the order of he just hasn't a clue. You might discover it by looking at him to find out he holds the E-Meter upside down. I mean, it'll be something weird like this, you know?

And it almost exceeds your imagination. But it also comes out of the impulse to make nothing out of something. They've got to make nothing out of something, and this comes back to a subject known as productivity, which businessmen are very interested in, and which Russia's going to pieces on, and which England can do much better with, and the United States is going down for the third time on.

The effort to produce is one-half of the dichotomy. And all strikes and everything else are on a single button, and the – that is the effort not to produce. And you've got people all over the place who are totally dedicated to non-production, totally dedicated to no results. I'm afraid that's a fact. Totally dedicated to the no-survival of a situation. Well, it comes about naturally. You come – it's half of the dichotomy. You keep telling them "All right, the organization has got to survive." The organization, the state, the nation, the group, mankind, got to survive, got to survive. And it just runs, it gets into a stuck flow, and you develop a bunch of people that quite automatically go on the basis of the organization must not survive and are just thinking day and night how to put it out of business, thinking day and night how to put the government out of business.

There's one department in the United States that just must sit up all night long just trying to figure out ways and means how to stop the United States from surviving. If they just sat back and relaxed or they all went home or all went and played golf or drowned themselves in the Potomac, or something like that, you'd be surprised. Probably United States' international relations would right themselves instantly. Because there's an enormous amount of guys doing business all over the world who probably are far, far more competent than anybody in the State Department.

Similarly, we look down here in the Treasury Department or we look down here at the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and we find him all the time trying to figure out something new, extraordinary and strange and different. And the only time when it really got to going good in the last few years is when I think he got sick or something. And it was just going dandy there for a while. And there were a whole bunch of graphs published showing during the period of minimal restriction that everybody's savings increased, the purchasing power of the country almost doubled and so forth, until they all got active on financial planning. The plan balanced economy thing.

By the way, they get that from Marcab. Marcab always had plan balanced economies. Everybody was broke and starving all the time. And so, what happened? They put on a bunch of restrictions, because all of a sudden everybody got into a panic.

Now Jersey, right now, is a little tiny dot of rock over here, and Jersey had a lot of hot money coming in. It was tax money, and if you had the money in Jersey, you didn't have to pay income tax on it. So here was this flood of hot money coming into Jersey. Jersey's broke,
it's poor, it doesn't have very much to do with, has nothing much to build with. All of a sudden people borrowed this hot money, and started building hotels, and doing other things around, and right away, everybody in Jersey, almost without exception, got around and started to complain, and groups started to form to stop this hot money, because it was somehow or another bad – because the balloon might suddenly be pricked and there might be a tremendous crash.

Now, did they sit around and think how to employ that money? Did they sit around and think how to fix up a community here, with all the available capital they needed, so that everybody had a good show and they were all nicely employed and it was all running off gorgeously? Did they put in a moment of time doing this? They sure didn't! No, they just said, "How can we stop this flow? We've got to make this prosperity stop, man. Or we've had it. We've had it." But what's had it? The ambition not to produce has had it. And that ambition would cease to exist and therefore would die and perish. You see how this could be?

So you get strikes. And never kid yourself much about strikes. Strikes will eventually slaughter free enterprise. Strike in the last half-century has drifted these nations over into greater and greater socialisms. Oh, I'm sure there was a – there was some recourse to low wages and working twenty-four hours a day and all this sort of thing – I'm sure. But I'm equally sure that nobody found the remedy yet. That I'm equally sure of. I'm sure communism isn't the remedy, socialism isn't the remedy, none of these things are. That I'm sure of.

Because all it is, is this button of "no-produce." It is a hot button. It's no production. You will find it there on your Create Scale. If it isn't in your Secondary Scale, which I haven't looked over, finalized yet, or checked against everything, it certainly is a wide hole missing on your Secondary Scale. So you ought to put this button, "produce" in there, and you ought to put "non-produce" right in alongside of it. And that one I know isn't in the scale. I've just been exploring this.

"Non-production. Our goal is non-production. If we can just keep everybody fooled enough, we'll have it." Now, the goal can also be "no results." "If anybody obtains any results around here, it'll be over my dead body, personally. My primary goal and ambition will have utterly ceased, and that will be the end of it if anybody ever makes a gain." You got the idea?

Well, that could be a psychotic state of mind. And when you see errors of gross magnitude, continually occurring – We all make mistakes. I can make mistakes, you can make mistakes, everybody can make mistakes. The trick is to be right a majority of the time. Most of the time, be right. Don't ever try to be 100 percent perfect. Just try to be right most of the time; and boy, you're batting so high above the national average that you really succeed, see.

A lot of people go around with total perfection, you know? They can't get anything done because, well, it wouldn't exactly be right. I had a guy like this on board a yacht one time. And he managed to try to burn the boat down a couple of times and I finally decided I'd better send him ashore. I wasn't around. He was just a boat guard, see. But he would start monkeying around with washing a bulkhead, and he would get into a frantic state about the bulkhead, you know? And you'd go into the yacht and you would find this bulkhead has been washed. And he'd say, "Well, no. No, not yet. I'm not finished with it." And you'd happen to
come back a couple of days later and this bulkhead is still in the process of being washed. And a week later the bulkhead is still in the process of being washed.

And you say, "What in the name of common sense is going on here? You're washing one bulkhead!"

He said, "Yeah, but it's not clean yet." you see, his idea that if he did anything it had to be absolutely perfect. And if it wasn't absolutely perfect, why, then he couldn't just leave it.

You'll find artists down in Greenwich Village – they've got canvases around that are two-inches thick with paint, because they're trying to paint the perfect picture. And they're trying so hard to paint the perfect picture that they never paint a picture!

It's good discipline sometimes for yourself, that after you've done a sketch of something or after you've planned something out – It's actually good discipline – sounds weird, sounds anti any training you have – of just say abruptly, "That's – that's finished and that's complete, and that's the way we're going to do it", and never work out the final details. You know, and say, "Well, we'll do it that way." Just to teach yourself that not everything in the world perishes because you left out one little tiny detail on something.

Now, people get too panic-stricken at making a mistake. And they get so panic-stricken at making a mistake they become unreasonably tense and unreasonably upset about learning the right way to do something and they can't relax. You understand? So if they figure anything is worrying them this hard, then it's very easy for them to go over the borderline and just start insisting nothing get done. And there's a very thin line between total perfectionism and accomplish-nothing. That's a very thin boundary. And it is very, very easily crossed.

I'll tell you that sitting back with a cigar in your mouth, one of you girls, with your feet on the – on the other chair, reading an E-Meter occasionally but perfectly willing to sit there and audit, actually could get results on a pc. Actually! You could actually do it. That's an interesting view of it, isn't it? In view of the fact we're talking about perfection, perfection, you've got to do them absolutely perfect – the TRs and all that sort of thing.

It's only after you can do them all perfect that you can relax and put your feet on a chair and smoke a cigar and get results on the pc, you got the idea? Because your anxiety is no longer present. Your anxiety is no longer present and is no longer communicating to the pc. Les resultats! You are in the clear, so what you say counts.

As a matter of fact I can audit with tremendously precise formality and I can do Tone 40s with great, precise formality. But I can also, with my pen still in my hand, midway toward writing a letter someplace or another, pick an E-Meter up, stand it on its edge, at the desk, make somebody sit down and pick up the cans and do a good job of assessing them. And then turn the E-Meter off and thank them very much and tell them I'm not assessing them, and I'll go back to writing a letter.

But that's because they haven't got any feeling of anxiety about it and I haven't got any feeling of anxiety about it and I can do the job and they know it and there isn't any monkey business about it. Get the idea? But this tremendous strain of to get everything right, get everything absolutely right, "If I can just get this absolutely – If I can just get my little finger held just right as I'm gripping the E-Meter, you see, and I look at the pc just, just right, and I don't
make any mistakes of any kind whatsoever, why, maybe I'll get a result." No, you won't get any result. Because the gross thing about auditing is missing. You don't have any confidence. You don't exude any confidence. And what's the primary thing in Dianetics? The old thing. The one thing that you could always do. You can give people hope and you, with all this tension, have given them no hope at all.

Now, I'm not trying to make a big bunch of nonsense here and build up this idea of gross auditing error and then tell you a lot of minor auditing errors and tell you they're gross. But look, being one of the fundamental purposes in dissemination or one of the fundamental actions which you can undertake to make anybody well, how about omitting it from the sessions, huh?

Now, let's just omit it, totally. Pc comes in, sits down. We don't pay any attention to what he's doing and so forth, and we make sure that our feet are planted right on the floor, and we're getting all set to do TR 0. We aren't even aware of who the pc is or their trouble or anything else. They sit down in the chair and you say, "Is it all right...? Let's see, where's my paper? Yeah, well... Is it all right with you if I begin – uhm – this – uhm – the session? This session? The session! No, no, that's not right ..."

See, the fundamental has been neglected. The fundamental is simply that you are there to make somebody better. In view of the fact that goal is all out, then the results you receive from there on are quite minor. Because you're not trying to do anything for them. See, what you're doing is trying to be perfect.

So if I can teach you how to do all these things perfectly and get you to a point of insouciant confidence, so that you could put your feet on the chair and a cigar in your mouth and balance the E-Meter and wiggle the tone arm with your big toe and still get results and not have the pc feel that this is the least bit strange. You get the difference of frame of mind? The pc wouldn't feel this was strange if you really knew your business. "Why," he'd say, "that's the way he audits."

Of course, now he makes his fatal error. He goes out, he asks you covertly, "What brand of cigars do you smoke?" [laughter] The same old gag, you see?

The fundamental error you can make, of course, is not wanting to help the pc and not helping the pc. That would be the fundamental error, isn't it? Well, you – you can get over worrying at all about your technology, see, worrying at all about Model Session. Just do it standing on your head. You know, TRs – pang! TRs – you can do them. Man when you can confront somebody leaning over a rail on a ferry boat, and do a better job of confronting than anybody else on that ferry boat, you could audit in that position.

See, in order to break the rules you have to be able to be acquainted with all of them. And then you can go ahead and break all the rules you want to. As long as you don't commit any of these fundamental errors like not being present at the auditing session, you see. Or auditing with a dead meter. Or auditing with one that's got one of these grains of dust into its pot so that it does nothing but rock slam, and you just go on auditing the rock slam out of the pc – and of course, the pc hasn't been rock slamming on anything – and then justify it all by saying "Well, Ron says that rock slams persist often ..."
And did you know one of these meters will rock slam if it gets a grain of dust in its pot? Mm-hm. You know, the way to cure it is just to shake the tone arm around a little bit. And if that doesn't cure it, drop a little bit of lighter fluid in it, and shake it around a couple of times, and it won't do it anymore.

All right. I've given you a very random discourse, but I hope I've given you something to operate with.

Instant reads. If right now you can get accustomed to this instant read, that's another brand of confidence. And you'll get this brand of confidence. Sooner or later, you'll get it straight. You right now are, I'm sure, in a slightly leery frame of mind about "Well, let's see, did he say one-tenth of a second? Let's see, was that one-tenth of a second or one-twentieth of a second? Or was it really a half a second? How long did it take the needle to react? Well, we'll - we'll spread it out to three seconds, and we'll call that 'instant', and then we'll be safe." No, you won't.

And then you'll feel very funny about going across a question, and you read this question and there's no reaction on the meter, and you'll feel very funny about leaving the question. You'll say, "Well, that's being very unthorough.", so you read the question again, you get a latent response. Well, maybe your latent response is something on this order: You read the question. This restimulated something in the pc that really isn't on the subject of the question but is a borderline, you got the idea? All right, you restimulate the borderline when you read the question. Now you read the question again just to be sure, because you're unconfident, you see. And the moment you do that – you wait for it for a moment – and all of a sudden it reacts.

You have not got an answer to the question. What you've got is some allied activity of some kind or another. You got it way over in left field. And you'll get that when you get to it. See, your Security Check is thorough enough, now. You'll get it, someplace, on the Security Check, you'll get it as an instant response. Got the idea?

But you could spend hours cleaning off all the fringes of the chicken house without ever getting the chicken to eat. You could! Just spend hours and hours and hours, cleaning off these latent responses. They're all elsewheres.

All right. You just have to give yourself some experience of watching that meter, and if it doesn't go pang, you just skip it. That works with Goals Assessments, too, you know. You read off the goal, and then you say, "And one, and two, and three, and four, and fall!" And you say, "Well, that one is still hot."

I don't know whether that one is hot or China is hot or anything else. It's the same question as "What did the needle start to rise on?" Your latent response is "What did the needle start to fall on?" You cannot answer the question, so therefore you might as well neglect it. You're not sure. You're liable to leave the pc in a total flub and fog. "Why is that needle falling?" he will say. And you'll still get latent responses. If you've got the question, he always gets an instant response.

It works like this: You say, "Well, did you ever illicit diamonds-buy?" and he illicit diamonds-bought. Believe me, you haven't got "buy", out of your mouth "bu – " you got a
fall. "Okay, that's it." And until he gives you that one, on a Joburg, it will just keep falling – instant response. You ask the question, get an instant response. You ask the question, you get an instant response. It won't erase. It'll just stay there. It doesn't matter how many times he thinks of it. He's actively withholding it from you. But you'll get these latent responses on and on and on and on.

Now, I want to point this out as a gross error, not only in auditing generally but in my communication of auditing. And that gross error is simply this and only this: You were auditing the analytical mind and I hadn't noticed it. You weren't auditing the reactive mind; you were auditing the analytical mind. Therefore your auditing target was off. And that all by itself could explain no Clears, see. Instantly.

I don't know how fast you can do an assessment now, how fast you can do an assessment now using only instant responses and erasing only instant responses. You do it the same way, by elimination. I don't know how fast you can do it. But it's probably something on the order of a hundredth of the time you have been using to do it, okay?

That was the main thing I came down to tell you today. Don't immediately think I'm trying to blame you or giving you a bunch of stuff here and saying, "Well, he's proving us all wrong." No, no. It hasn't done any harm to take off all the fringes. It hasn't done any harm. It's advanced the case, sort of the hard way. It hasn't done any harm to assess a case the long way, you understand, and take all the ramifications and all the latent responses off it. That has not done anything at all that is bad. It has wasted less auditing time than you think, because you were trying to run the whole case on the instant response and the latent response. And you were trying to run the reactive mind and the analytical mind. And it's only that time which you devoted to straightening out the analytical mind, which was all right anyhow, that you wasted.

So it hasn't been any vast catastrophe. But on the contrary, has been a considerable win, because I know now what you're trying to do, see. And it was different than what I was trying to do.

I'm trying to knock out of the reactive bank those held-down fives which a person can't think about and which add themselves into every equation. And if you just knock out those held-down fives, the case will get all right fast. See, and if you go on worrying with the pc about why the fives are held down, but never under any circumstances really go looking for a held-down five, of course you're going to get minimal results and minimal recoveries, and minimal profile gains and all the rest of it.

So it's all to the good. I mean, we've speeded up auditing right now a thousand for one again. If we keep doing this, we'll have to watch it because a person will write us a letter, but two days before that, he got Clear.

They know when they were going to write us a letter because they went Clear suddenly! Okay?

All right. I've held you rather overlong. There were some things I wanted to cover with you. I hope you think they were important enough to stay for.

Thank you.
Thank you.

This is what? This is the 13th? Ah, you see? See, unlucky for you, lucky for me. Born on Friday the 13th, you know. That was awful bad luck for the American Psychiatric and the British Medical Associations.

What questions do we have today? Now, I know how bright you are by the number of questions that you find out...

Gee, that's pretty stupid, Suzie. What are we going to do about this?

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, this is for very late in Routine 3. Say a terminal has reached the point where it no longer reacts at all on the Primary Scale.

Mm.

Female voice: Is your next step then just to take it and methodically check off everything on the Secondary Scale before declaring that terminal flat, flat, flat and assessing for a new terminal?

Well, you've got now a very advanced case of something or other. There are several things that are conditional to this.

The question is, "What do you do late in a case about a terminal who no longer reacts on the Primary Scale?" Well, we used to just find another terminal. That was the first answer that was given to this thing – just find another terminal for that goal. And couldn't find another terminal for the goal, why, find another goal. Do another Goals Assessment.

And you're in trouble right about that point, because your Goals Assessments keep running out. And you'll go all the way – you'll find a goal, you'll find a terminal, and it is all dandy, and you've got it all assessed; and you find one level on the Prehav Scale, and that is the end of that whole package. It just took – just a look at the level, and said, "Well, what do you know about that?", and the fellow blows it. It's quite interesting.

So your contest, actually, is not to go into the Secondary Scale, and try to flounder all over the Secondary Scale, and scrape this thing to the bone. The thing to do when you no
longer can get – remember, you can also get a no-assessment because of the rudiments being out. But your Primary Scale – no more reaction, your case well advancing, needle very loose, two-, three-dial drop on a can squeeze test with your sensitivity at zero – got the idea. It's banging against both pins of the can, you know. You just can't close it down.

Well then, what you'd have to do, is do a new Terminal Assessment for the goal you were running. All right. That's fine. Terminal Assessment, all by itself, may very well wind up that goal. The goal'll still be live to some slight degree. Well, you go ahead, however, and try to assess and then – assess on the Prehav Scale and run these terminals for that same goal.

Well, eventually you can't get any reaction on the goal, you can't get any reaction on any more terminals, that's it. You've got to do another Goals Assessment, just like you did originally. And this Goals Assessment will usually go fairly rapidly, and now it is less critical getting a wrong one. You can get a wrong one now and it isn't going to do anybody any harm. You get a wrong one in the beginning, you can really throw somebody in the soup.

So that is the way you handle this. And it's a very precise activity, actually. Once your first terminal that you're running can no longer assess on the Primary Prehav Scale, you do a new Terminal Assessment for the goal you were running. If you \textit{can} assess, you carry on as before with the new terminal. You finally get that goal totally out of the road, you do a new Goals Assessment, a new Terminals Assessment, a new Level Assessment, and now the fun begins. Because you will start doing a new Goals Assessment, a new Terminals Assessment and a new Level Assessment, and five commands and that's the end of that level, that's the end of all levels, that's the end of that terminal, that's the end of that goal – \textit{boom}!

All right. Now it gets more rapid than this. You do a Goals Assessment, and you can find a terminal for it. And the second you've found the terminal, you don't any longer get to the Prehav Scale. It's now evaporated. It's gone utterly.

Now, you have to keep your rudiments in. The only thing that'll fool you – if the rudiments go out on you, because, you see, you can null the whole meter because the person's got a PT problem, his attention is on everything else.

All right. It eventually boils down to where you get the goal, and you get the terminal, and you can't get it over to the scale. The first Clear that was made in South Africa, we were in stitches! Because the poor girl for two days had been trying to find goals and terminals and get them to the scale. She would find them all right and try to get them to the scale, or get them run, or get a command, and they'd just fold up. And then she'd try this again, and then it'd fold up. And she would do it again, and it'd fold up. And \textit{thuuhhh!} And she finally was in a panic, and she came to the Instructors and she said, "Oh, my goodness, I've just ruined this case!" Yes, she had, she sure had ruined that case! [laughs] And then after she'd kept this up for just a few days, actually, all of a sudden the case no longer reacted in any way, shape or form on an E-Meter. There wasn't anything you could do to this case.

Now, that's a complete difference from your bottom-scale case. Bottom-scale case – you can hit a guy over the head and you get no reaction on the E-Meter. But the needle is not a floating needle, and the sensitivity knob is very high, and this case cannot answer questions regarding help or control. So know them by these marks.
Now you get it up at the other end, and it's just a floating situation, and it goes on and on, and there's nothing you can do and you can't get the E-Meter influenced. And that person is Clear.

Now, you go ahead and stabilize a Clear by going on and trying to do this. You understand, it's not good enough just to get a floating needle at the end of the run, you go on trying to find a goal, trying to find a terminal. Your effort to do so blows up the remaining stuck goals and terminals on the track. It isn't that you're conducting a fruitless search, just 'cause you can't find it on the E-Meter. And you have to do this for quite a while. And all of a sudden, why, you're now approaching up to a level of Theta Clear, and you get a stable MEST Clear. This person won't fall downhill.

We've got a Clear right now that is just ruining a whole Central Organization. It's disgraceful. She went down to HASI Joburg to help teach a course and didn't find any people for it. And she found everybody sitting around at their desks not doing very much. So she wound up and started giving a PE Course as well as giving the day course, and found out they weren't writing anybody any letters – that she considered this. And so she started – after her PE Course, apparently in the evening or something, however it goes – she started catching up on their mail for them.

Here's the thing: You've got stuck-valence serenity mixed up with the state of Clear. And you do have, practically until you get to be Clear. And you say, now, a Clear would always be serene and would never be the effect of anything. You get the idea? You've got the Buddhist definition here. And man, that was wrong-end-to. That was an absolute guarantee of plowing somebody in.

Well now, a Clear doesn't act that way. They are rather responsive. Not reactively responsive in that you say good morning to them and they fly through the roof like aberrated people do, but they have another type of response. You say, "Well, it can't be done, and it's all too sad, and isn't this terrible?" And you're liable to get almost anything! It's a grim thing to be around one. Because they are volatile. They react to life, in other words. They are alive. And of course, as everybody knows, that's very dangerous.

They also, however, don't get into irrational arguments with you. That is what's devastating, is that when they say something's wrong, it normally is! It isn't that they think it is wrong. It normally is. That's it.

So what you're looking at is somebody who is alive, and who can react, and so forth. Remember the biggest invalidation that the poor Board of Directors of the Hubbard Dianetic Research Foundation – they had me all mocked up as Clear as near beer – and I got mad at 'em one day for telling me that everybody ought to be run upside down at the end of the corridor, or some perfectly valid thing. And I got mad. And they all went white. Could hardly see them – the walls were white, too. They all rushed out, and went back to their offices and sat there gloomily, and "Well, we thought you must be Clear", you see. So this had invalidated the whole thing.

Ah, brother! That's not true. It wasn't that I was Clear, but been my experience on the thing: A person, when he approaches sanity, reacts very sanely, and they react volatilley on the emotional scale. They're not unpredictable. They're very predictable. You come in and
drag an old dead dog that's been rolled in carrion and throw it in the middle of the rug in the living room, you're going to hear about it, man! They're not repressed concerning what they think about this activity.

So you're not making a bunch of serene beings, you see. You're not trying to put somebody at ninety thousand feet up, flat on his back, looking at the clouds for the rest of his existence! And I think probably the reason Joburg got allergic to developing Clears in the HGC is the Clears kept saying – they got this kind of a notion: When a person gets Clear they tell you, "Let's get the show on the road! Let's get something going! Let's get something doing around here, and let's do this and that. And that big stack of papers you've got there; they're probably not very important. Let's get on to something else here, now", and so on. And the money starts coming in, and things start happening, and people start getting well and everybody starts getting happy and enjoying life, and you just can't have that kind of thing.

So the way to keep from having that kind of thing, of course, is to cut back clearing. That's the normal answer. Yes, I know I'm branding an organization on tape that'll go to other organizations, but this one needs branding. I left it in perfectly marvelous condition ten weeks ago. It only took them ten weeks to pull the rug out; to get it in a State of Emergency. Only they're unlucky right at the present moment, because they've got a Clear in their midst. Horrible.

So clearing them up, don't leave them just because the needle only floats. Clear them up all the way. You audit them as far as you can audit them, and after a while it'll even look foolish to you to audit them. They're exterior. They blow by inspection. Everything is blowing by inspection. Everything rationalizes by inspection. You could keep up this process, but after a while it is senseless to have the person on a meter, because the meter hasn't reacted for about ten or fifteen hours of processing, don't you see? So you'd run them without a meter.

But you could keep up the same process and probably arrive at much higher states. You'd probably arrive at Theta Clear with this same thing I've just given you, see. You'd probably arrive at OT with the same thing I've just given you. There isn't any reason why you really have to shift gears into something else. Only trouble is after a while they cease to have answers to these things, because they think of them and they evaporate. Now, there are other processes that you can do.

Now on the final thing – I'm just thinking just off the club, here, what I'd finally do to somebody before I actually released them: I would read to them, probably, the whole of the Secondary Scale, from one end to the other, still on a meter, you see, and ask them to look over their consideration about these things. And you'd probably blow the latent and remaining reactive locks.

All right, that's how it is done, okay?

By the way, there's something on – pertinent to Clears, I must make a remark. Every once in a while when the little red brothers are amongst us, they have a ball waving their hand over somebody and getting them Clear. And you get rumors all over the place about how this is occurring now. This is occurring. All you have to do is spit in somebody's direction or something like that and they're Clear. And they have this marvelous new technique.
What they actually do: They have this marvelous new technique that kills somebody, or something like that, you see. Hasn't anything to do with the price of fish. It's very, very interesting that this always gets afloat any time the organization is successful and is clearing people. You always pick up these "Instantaneous Clear" rumors. And they are not true, and don't fall for them. Because I'm telling you, I have had cases over the jumps now for, man and boy now, these fourteen year or better, and there is no thought process – no thought, single-button process – I tell you this advisedly – that will produce a Clear. There is no single button. Nor is there any shot in the arm that'll produce a Clear.

The fellow has got to get out of the trap the same way he came in. He's got to walk out the labyrinth the same way he walked into the labyrinth, which was overwhelming and getting overwhelmed. And if you don't over and under – if you don't underwhelm him in reverse to all of the overwhelms, you've got a guy who simply goes into one of these superserene valences and sits on Buddha's navel or something and regards his cloud nine. You got the idea? That's just a bunch of balderdash.

When you think of the amount of overwhumping that has been going on in the last two hundred trillion years, it is no wonder a few people get in the wrong valences. Particularly since we continue to overwhump valences that are not desirable valences. And then we have no mechanism – had no mechanism – to un-overwhelm having overwhelmed. Got the idea? Scientology is the first mechanism which does both. And that is why it is good and valid. And if it didn't do both it wouldn't be valid.

In other words, after you've overwhemed something, the penalty for having overwhemed or eradicated this badness, you see, can itself be erased. You see how this is? So it's the first thing that ever did it both ways. And when you hear about somebody picking up the magic needle and by giving somebody a shot in the arm concerning this, and the person went Clear as near beer, why, yawn for me, will you? If there had been such a thing, I'm pretty sure I would have found it.

This is a very odd remark for me to make, but I would have found it in the last fourteen years. Because there isn't any thought combination or direction of combinations that we haven't been into. There isn't one left. I've even calculated it – calculated it totally out: How many possible potentials of thought combinations are there? The mere fact that flows exist defeats at once a single button. Just the fact that flows exist. Immediately you've got two buttons – you've got them doing it to you and you doing it to them. There's some kind of a wild rumor going on that the phrase – this single phrase – is clearing people like mad around in England, and it runs like this – let me see, what is it now – "What would you be pleased to accept?"

Oh, that's a wonderful way to plow somebody in! Just look at it. And the flow's gonna stick. And I'll tell you something: It was run to its ragged bottom in 1954. Look it up in the records if you don't believe me. That subject has been covered and covered and re-covered, and there wasn't anybody Clear, and as a matter of fact, one poor little girl from Canada was walking around – she couldn't enter a room without walking around and hitting each wall on the process, on practically that exact process.
You have in this case, by the way, somebody who has picked up an old record list. They're picking up all these old processes that produce a rapid result for a few minutes. And I can give you lists of them. If you want to prove Scientology works to somebody by spinning him, I can give you a long list of how to do this. Exact phrases. One of them is: "Look around here and find something you can go out of ARC with." This is what the fellow's trying to do! And all he's got to do is spot this a few times.

And if he just spots it just a very few times, this is okay. He'll feel fine. He feels marvelous. And then, of course, he walks out and falls on the sidewalk flat on his face. Because you've said, "What in the physical universe could you go out of communication with?" with the connotation of, "What could you go out of affinity with?" and "What in the physical universe could you consider unreal?"

These old-time cults like psychiatry, university-ism, any one of these old cults, has its button. And they are formed up, normally, on a single button – a monomania on a single button. And if you smoke out what this button is and run a reverse process on it, you will make that kind of a person out of the pc.

Find out what the button is that would bring about a soldier. Just figure it out: What would a soldier be most monomanic about? Probably wanting to get out. Probably wanting to get out of the army, or trying to get people out of the army, or not destroying anything, or whatever it is that you work out, finally. Work it out. You get a few dozen soldiers and just run each one of them – professionals, you see – and run each one of these things, a bunch of tests; you'd finally find a common denominator that'd make a soldier.

Now, all right. Now, fix that up so it's nontherapeutic, you see, so it busts him out of communication with things, sticks the flow as a single button, and run that process; and the guy will all of a sudden look at you very fixedly and says, "I think I will go join the army." And don't think this hasn't been known on the whole track. This is how they got recruits for space opera, for the State Department, [laughter] for all kinds of places. Got the idea?

Actually, universities run these single buttons on people. One of the ways they do it in engineering schools is to continue to tell people that engineers are not wanted anymore. That is usually stabilized and standard. And the fellow comes up and tries to be a better engineer so that he'll be one of the few select that are wanted, and all these little mechanisms. See?

In the Christian church they get you stuck in God by running the line "blasphemy." "Thou must not talk to God." See? You mustn't say anything bad about God. You mustn't be in communication with God. You mustn't – God isn't there. You can't talk to him. You mustn't communicate with God. All right, if you set somebody down, and say, "All right. Get the idea of not communicating with God. Good. Get the idea of not communicating with God. Good. Get the idea of not communicating with God. Good. Get the idea. . ." and ARC broke him while you were running it, and get your rudiments out, and have somebody ring him on the phone in the middle of the session and tell him his wife has just left him, or something like this. In other words, get ARC breaks and present time problems good and restimulated, and go on and run this, "Go out of communication with God. Go out of communication with God." All of a sudden the fellow gets a starry-eyed look on his face; he actually could be walked right straight out and join a nunnery, or whatever it is they join. You got the idea?
In other words, you can take the whole track fixations of a person and restimulate them selectively and bring about momentary resurgences in certain goals directions. And you can do it. It can be done.

So any time we start cleaning people up, always somebody's going to step forward and remember one of these old – you know, reactively, they get the way they got trapped, see. And then they decide that if they run that on everybody, then they'll all be all right. You see, just that one thing. In other words, they're auditing their own case on somebody else.

You hear these rumors every time. I had to put that in, by the way, as a footnote because it's rather unusual to have two continents go crazy at once. But it is also equally unusual to not have any continent crazy at one time.

Wing, you had a question.

Male voice: Oh yes, pertaining to what you said about Jane's question. You remember that list of Ultimate Processes?

Hm?

Male voice: Remember that list of Ultimate Processes?

Yeah. Outlawed processes, right.

Male voice: Fit them in for me, please.

Huh?

Male voice: Fit them in for me, please.

Well, now do I remember the same list? These processes are the reverse processes that are nontherapeutic? Is that . . . ?

Male voice: No, no, no, no, please! Uh . . . !

Female voice: The Ultimate Processes.

Male voice: Ultimate Processes.

Oh, the Ultimate Processes!

Male voice: The Ultimate Processes. Uh . . .

Those are OT processes.

Male voice: Right. Now . . .

You flatten them. Way after you've done everything I've just talked to you about.

Male voice: That's all I wanted to know.

Yeah. Then you'd flatten those. Make sure you however, you had a free-floating needle, that you'd exhausted every ramification of SOP Goals, there was nothing left, because only then will those other processes function.

Male voice: Thank you.

Good. Okay, any more questions? Yes?
Female voice: Yeah. Uh, I've been kind of surprised that on SOP Goals, nobody that I know of has had a sixth dynamic terminal turn up and get audited on it yet. Certainly, Theory 67 we're sure is pretty correct because of all the good results running stuff like . . .

That's right.

Female voice: . . . motion and objects and . . .

Uh-huh.

Female voice: . . . things. It just is surprising. What I was wondering is, are they likely to turn up – would there be any objection whatsoever if somebody's got a box or a sphere or something representing the goal and go ahead and run it?

Oh well, you want to know why no sixth dynamic terminals are turning up on Goals Assessments. Well, that's just the peculiarities of the game. They're totally allowed for in the assessment, nobody's steering them in it. But actually, you're talking to the person normally as a human being and this in itself tends to throw the assessment. Uh ... 

Female voice: We had a woman in South Africa, had a spacecraft.

Thank you. Thank you. I can tell you how this sixth dynamic thing works: When the person can no longer be a beingness, they, you might say, extrovert into and permanently permeate some object or housing or familiar thing around a beingness. And it's just like the fellow gets hanged and he goes and becomes the headsman's blocks or something, because that was less painful, you know. That's – he's been overwhelmed. Or he's been a headsman for several lifetimes, and all of a sudden somebody makes the mistake of hanging him and this isn't right and it upsets him. It throws his beingness way out, and he ceases to become a person, and then he goes into an object.

You could very well have a case that you would miss on because it couldn't be assessed with SOP Goals; apparently it just was having an awful time being assessed with SOP Goals. And you go along happily trying to do something for this person and you just can't seem to find a terminal, well, you should inspect your interrogation for a terminal as to whether or not it is totally throwing the question into a live beingness. Such as, well, "Who would be a person who would want to create a mathematical scale? Now, what person would want to commit a mathematical scale, see? What person? What person?" And your question might actually be putting nothing but beingness on the line, in terms of livingness. And it might totally exceed the needs and necessities of the case. Whereas the case would respond very easily on "What would invent a mathematical scale?" you see?

So you can throw an assessment off of the sixth when it should be on the sixth. And I'd say if nobody is doing that at all – nobody ever finds a sixth at all – I would say there's possibly something awry with the patter, which tends to sling it over onto the other dynamics and keep it off the sixth. Because it's very true. People make terrific gains, terrific gains with sixth dynamic terminals. As a matter of fact, lots and lots of cases run most easily on sixth dynamic terminals.

For instance, I know I myself probably could do something about the beingness of a typewriter or something like that. When you've pounded – just thinking of it offhand, of a
beingness: When you've knocked, oh, I don't know, twenty, thirty, forty million words through a machine, why, it's a cinch that now and then you begin to wonder if your ribbons aren't unwound! You get the idea. But just the fact that I would know about it would probably preclude anything very desperate being there.

You take – Well now, there was one case in an ACC one time. In the first fifteen minutes of play, this fellow was gonna leave and go back to Chicago. And he was all very upset and so forth, and I grabbed hold of him for fifteen minutes. I traced back his last life, by the way. He'd been killed at the battle of Jutland on a British destroyer. And this was over in Arizona. Shows you how far you'll run sometimes from a battle. Get to – a total water to no water, you know? And this boy had been killed on the foredeck of a destroyer. And in this lifetime had been a machinist. And the bug of the factor – you know, the guy didn't know, and what he didn't know was that it wasn't machinery or that sort of thing that was upsetting him, it was a ship's metal. And I picked this up, wham-bam, just investigating this kind of a havingness thing. Made him mock up a few destroyers and shove them into his body, and that was the end of the case. The case made terrific case progress afterwards. The case was just totally stuck in that incident, in other words.

All right, there was a case where the resolution of the case depended on the discovery of a sixth dynamic terminal, but rapidly, because he was busy being destroyed. Another case that was a total hang-up on the Third South African came back to battery fast – I remember Suzie telling me, with what disgust, that she had finally found this fellow's terminal. She herself was having a little trouble with space opera at the time she was doing this. And she told me with enormous disgust that she'd found this fellow's terminal. And she said it so disgustedly that I said, "Well, all right. What's the matter? Is it the right terminal?"

"Oh, yes, it's the right terminal."
"Well, did he refuse to run it?"
"Oh, no, no."
"Was he interested in it?"
"Oh, yes, yes, he was very interested in it."
"Well, how did it go in the first little period of auditing?"
"Well, it went fine, went fine. We found his level, just easy", you know.
And I said, "Well, what's wrong with this terminal?"

Well, she said, "It's a spacecraft. I can't imagine anybody having a terminal like that!"
Auditor's response to the pc's terminal. Very amusing.

Anyway, that's the gist of it. Sixth dynamic terminals will turn up, and if you can't find any kind of a terminal to fit something or other, look – inspect your question. You know, you're saying, "Well, who would shoot kings? Who would shoot kings? Who? Who? Who? Who? Who? Who? That's maybe what you're using And you probably should ask the question, "What would shoot a king?" And somebody says, "A gun, of course!" Bang! There it is! There's your terminal. Terminal is a gun. Yes?
Male voice: Ron, when you have exhausted a great number of terminals and – I mean goals, rather – and run terminals flat for that – for a particular goal on a whole big list, we'll say . . .

Hm.

Male voice: . . . now, what happens when you have to assess for a new goal, let's say? Do they go back over those same goals ...

Oh, no, no. I don't – I wouldn't waste time on the original list, you know, most of them, but some of them are going to come back.

Male voice: Well, that's what I mean.

You're going to get some of those goals back.

Male voice: Mm.

But I'd say the fastest way to do it is to go make a new goals list. I'd say that was the fastest way to do it, rather than to plow through a bunch of other stuff. But if I was unable to find a goals list, only then would I go back and dig up the fellow's first goals lists. And now I would go over this goals list again and see if anything is live now, you see? I'd try to do it the easy way, and get away with it often enough to have saved time, you see, which is just make a new goals list, and so on.

You realize of course that if, at the end of clearing, a person is blowing by inspection or blowing by repeater technique, which is constant repetitive inspection – if a fellow is blowing at that end of it – don't be so surprised, or don't be amazed, that it takes a long while to do Goals Assessment. What you're doing is running SOP Goals.

And a comment came the other day from the area that's under a curse just now – they'll probably have plagues there any minute [laughter] – was that the Assoc Sec told the D of P, "Well, this pc isn't getting many gains!" (or vice versa) and the Assoc Sec says, "Well, what's happening with the case?" and so on. And the D of P said, "Well, he's just had twelve hours of assessment. That's why there's no change." And the Assoc Sec said, "Well, all right, that – then that explains it."

Please tell me what this explains? I don't get this. You see it just would not explain anything. You mean, you can assess somebody for twelve hours and get no gain on the case at all? Well, that's silly. You're actually running the end process of SOP Goals at the beginning! And you're cleaning this case up in all directions, so obviously the case is being run in an auditing room he can't tolerate, with a PT problem, with a big ARC break, in an improper assessment with an auditor who is invalidating him and who is doing the other remaining clauses of the Auditor's Code backwards. And I would say offhand, that would probably account for no gain whatsoever in twelve hours of Goals Assessment. But only that would account for it, see.

So they said, "Well, that explains it." Yeah, well, the devil it does! I was talking to you yesterday about – watch it now, if you're getting no gain then the error is gross, not little. The error is big. So it wasn't the Goals Assessment at all that was the trouble with the case, there was something very wild about this case. You do get gains along this line. If you do a Goals
Assessment right, every hour of it is auditing. If you do a Joburg right, every hour of it is auditing. And man, you should see those needles loosen up!

What are you trying to do in the last run? You're trying to loosen up the needle, bring down the sensitivity knob and straighten up the reading of the tone arm, right? Well, the Goals Assessment does all those things, so it must be getting somewhere. Furthermore, it improves profiles and does other things. Otherwise, there is no advantage in an assessment.

But you shouldn't develop the notion that it's because it's taking you so long to assess that you're not getting anywhere, or you shouldn't feel disappointed because your assessment is not getting anywhere. Yes, your assessment is getting someplace, all the way. If your rudiments are in and if you're doing it by the Auditor's Code in Model Session, you are doing more for the case for every hour of assessment than was done in twenty-five hours just two years ago. See, that's hour for hour, we're speeding it up, speeding it up, speeding it up. And it's damn good auditing.

One of the reasons it might prove to be untherapeutic is the person didn't think it was auditing, and didn't think it should improve the case, and therefore became very careless on how he did it or how he handled the pc. I've seen a case of that. I have a case of that, yeah, where the auditor finally said, "Well, it isn't as if we're running a session!", and having invalidated a lot of the pc's goals, and so forth. Of course, the pc practically folded up. Right in the middle of session he's told that they're not having a session. That was when all Goals Assessment went instantly into Model Session – the history of that.

Okay, any other questions? ... All right. Well, I understand that you're making progress, I trust. I trust.

Now, let me ask this. Let me ask a couple of questions here before we wind up this lecture. Is there anything you don't know? [laughter] And the other question is: Any of you think you're totally hung up and making no progress of any kind whatsoever? ... Any case think it's in that kind of condition? All right. Okay. Good enough.

We do have some equipment to be installed down the hall here in the old wine vat. You look down the hallway, you'll find the old wine vat, and it actually already has its lead door. We've had the lead door installed and so forth. So if your cases don't make any progress, why, it isn't the last resort. [laughter]

Okay. Thank you very much.
Thank you.

All right. This is the 14th of June 1961. I have to be careful with these dates, you see. I get stuck on Cause, you see, on the Prehav Scale, and I would say it was the 15th of June, you see, it might become the 15th of June. And it'd cost everybody a day's pay, you see? But for a certain fee from some large corporation ... Okay. [laughs] Very good.

I'm sure that you have a lot of very highly integrated questions of one kind or another that are springing full-armed, ready to shed light in all directions. In short, any questions?

Female voice: Yes.

Yes.

Female voice: What would happen if you are giving a Security Check to a preclear and you tell him that you will destroy the paper afterwards with the – with his answers on it. And does he get benefit solely from having been made free to talk to the auditor...

All right.

Female voice: ... or are you taking away from him ... ?

All right. Here we are. You've asked whether or not if we destroyed the paper, or told the pc ... If we destroyed the paper of a Security Check immediately after we gave him the Security Check, we would destroy the value of the Security Check, period. We have told him at the same moment and the same instant that we are going to withhold for him. And all we've done is just do a vague, little, one-stage Release.

You will see a difference – if you care to make the experiment some time, waste some time: assure somebody that you will never tell a soul that wild horses would never drag any part of these withholds away from you, that you will destroy all record of it and get brain-washed immediately after you've given the session. And watch the fact that he doesn't even get tone arm reaction. Got it?

You see, there are eight dynamics. And in auditing you are actually only concentrating on the third dynamic. Auditing is a third dynamic activity.

Now, the third dynamic is good enough because his withholds are mainly on the third dynamic. But someday you're going to run into somebody who is a real loop, who is busy withholding from God. And oddly enough, he will tell you about the withholds, perhaps, in
some kind of a *sotto voce* that is designed not to be overheard by the gods lurking in the various chairs and furniture, you see, or on the naked pedestal or something of that sort. Or he won't tell you at all because God might overhear him, and God, as we all know, is everyplace including the sewer pipes. Well, it's true. If God was everywhere, he'd also be in the sewer pipes.

And – I'm sorry to make nothing out of this situation, but I'm afraid somebody beat me to the draw. I think a couple of thousand years ago somebody made nothing out of religion in a grand way. They invented a totally invisible religion. And it's very interesting. Everybody, of course, has had trouble with it ever since. The general point about a Security Check is the fact that you have not stressed this.

Now, you should understand that when you are doing a Joburg Security Check, you are not doing failed withhold – you're not running failed withhold on the person at all. You should understand what the character is. As long as you've opened up this whole subject, I'll give you a digression, okay? I've answered the other question. The answer is "Ixnay."

The fellow says, "Well, I don't dare tell you because you might tell somebody else."

You say, "That's so. I might."

"Uuuuuudududududududu. Well, I can't tell you then." And you would just instantly see the fact that it is withhold on more than one dynamic.

All right. Let's go into this. Why are you giving Security Checks? What is the exact process you are running in giving Security Checks? It probably occurred to you before now that you were running failed withhold on the pc. That would be your first conclusion, that you were actually running a failed withhold.

Actually, these – the individual is withholding these things, isn't he? So making him give them up, of course, would give him a failed withhold, right? Well, you could look at it this way.

That isn't the process you're running at all. The process you're running is the old, old, old, Native State, not-know-know cycle. We have achieved, as I was telling Peter a little while ago, the level of complexity and the level of simplicity necessary to resolve a case.

Now, I'm not telling you it's perfect. Absolutes are unobtainable. But I think you'll find it'll move all cases. I don't think you'll have any real difficulty with it. You won't go home sweating over some pc all night long. You'll know very well that when you audit him the next morning on whatever you're doing, you'll get whatever it is. That type of confidence and relaxation has already moved in on me.

You see, I've been straining for eleven years trying to achieve some sort of a – something that auditors could and would do. And we were never short on theory, and we were never short on what was wrong with the preclears. I brought you up with a dull yank the other day. I told you we were addressing the reactive mind, and you better not go on auditing analytical minds because there's nothing wrong with them. Nothing wrong with them, except they can be influenced by the reactive mind. Well, you say, "Well, you can short-circuit this and fix the guy up so he can't be influenced at all by the reactive mind."
Well, that's fine. Get your pc in a state of no-effect. And that is how the lamaists and so forth achieve serenity. You put the pc in a no-effect; total no-effect, total serenity. Jam those two levels up and you have a lama – not the kind that's bleating back and forth over the Andes and causing so much trouble to the authorities down there, and the sanitation authorities, but the other type.

Now, here is your – your plow-in on the basis: The individual must be able – the individual must be able – to get some kind of response. He must be able to experience. If a person cannot experience, a person cannot live. And that's why you look at these abbots of monasteries and they look like dried up mummies. This is why, when you finally collide with the Pope Pius and so forth of this world, they have myopia. See, they're educated into a total no analytical effect from the appetites and horrors of the soul. Huh-huh-huh. See?

Now, this is the generality. It is possible to plow somebody in on a level and make them look good. Don't desert that datum. Know that datum well. It is possible to plow somebody in, absolutely fix them on a level and make them look good. Do you understand? You could plow some radio announcer in on communication so that he would never do anything but communicate. You know, narrow the whole Prehav Scale down to one thing: communicate. He's got to communicate – talk – communicate, and he'd be a good radio announcer until he dropped dead, which would be in a short period of time. But that's all right. People are expendable. That's the way they've looked at it, don't you see? It's what's known as education – education by fixation.

On the other hand, the fellow actually couldn't communicate if you did that. Why? Because his communication, thereafter, would be harmful because it's too fixated. He's too concentrated on this one thing. No. He has to be able to do everything on the Prehav Scale. You're not trying to fix him up so he can do nothing on the Prehav Scale. You're trying to fix him up so that he could do anything on the Prehav Scale.

Now, the fact that his ethic repairs by reason of processing: you, of course, have done away with the impulses to do very vicious things on the other eight dynamics, you see? And having done away with these vicious things, he nevertheless can relax on the whole situation. In other words, you have restored fluidity and action as a result of inspection, not action as a result of inhibition. The whole world right now is running on action as a result of inhibition, and you've got crime and wars and religion. You got all kinds of things going on.

All right. Now, action as a result of inspection by a person who is ethical gives you an entirely new view – completely, entirely new view of human conduct; because it's no longer human conduct. It's more the conduct of a – of an able being. That's what you're doing when you get up to the level of Clear. And oddly enough, what you're doing with a Security Check does not appear, as such, anywhere on the Prehav Scale – except "want to know", but that is the closest shadow to it and it really is not the same thing at all, because that's curiosity.

All right. Therefore, there is some kind of rationale or theory which stands out and beyond the Prehav Scale. And we have run it ragged and we have done everything necessary to resolve the case with it. And we have put it in the hands of auditors and they have gotten nowhere with it. It is a level of simplicity which cannot be achieved in the practical world.
It is a perfect theory. There's nothing wrong with the theory of Native State. There are four stages. There's a lot of literature on this, by the... When is it? 1958, isn't it? Fifty?

Male voice: Two.

Female voice: Nineteen fifty-three, fifty-two.

Well, that's way – fifty-two, fifty-three. It's back that far.

Male voice: Yes, sir.

Well, we were practicing it like mad and did an awful lot of processing with it in 57 and 58, if I remember rightly. And we did a lot of work with that. We ran it on an awful lot of cases and so forth, and it was over here in England, probably in 57, 58. You remember it. The Native State is a total knowingness. And the Native State deteriorates by the person postulating that he won't know. And then this becomes a necessity to know. In other words, he has to know, because, well, he's postulated that he doesn't know. You got the idea?

There are actually about four stages. They harmonic. "Forget" is part of this harmonic scale, see. That's a don't-know. That's a can't-know, see. That's a withhold from self – "Forget" is. So all... And remember, by the way, is a know. And now you're down on the harmonics. And I think their levels – I've forgotten what they are – five or six or something like this.

Anyway, these are the Native State harmonics, and we ... There's a terrific simplicity to all this.

But look-a-here. We have simplicities that nobody has been able to make work because they were so simple and their generality was so expansive, that as long as they were in this terribly simple state, they were nonfunctional. Do you realize all you have to do is run on a preclear, theoretically, "Tell me an intention that failed." "Tell me an intention that succeeded." "Thank you." "Tell me an intention that failed." "Tell me an intention that succeeded." "Thank you." And theoretically, you'd clear him all the way along the line. So much for your one-buttons. Theoretically.

I told you yesterday there was no such thing as a one-button. Well, that's as close as there is to it, because it's right up there at the top of the Axioms, see? And it is! It is. If a person could run this, he runs like a startled gazelle. But it's something like an OT process, you see?

It is too complicated for anybody to plumb the reactive mind with. It is something like trying to take a wand of light and stir a mud pool. And you put the wand of light... Where did it go? No. It takes a certain level of complexity to do anything with the case at all.

Now, we have been resolving cases since the end of January 1961 with considerable ease. But we had to attain a necessary level of complexity, and I have been trying to attain a level of complexity that is acceptable ever since January of 1961. In other words, you have to attain the optimum simplicity and the optimum complexity at the same time. You see that? The complexity is a very necessary part of the entire operation.

So there's no sense in going off, swinging into the high theory of it all and running on nothing but total high theory. Because we've been there, we have lived there, we furnished a
house there, and we sure didn't collect any rent. And we didn't pay any and nothing happened. Why?

It is a level of simplicity which exceeds the difficulties of the individual. You'll find a person – the worse off a person is or the more Clear they are – you know, the bottom harmonic or the top, see – the more you have to go into the Secondary Scale. And in the middle band, you can just run the Primary Scale. A person is getting along fine and his needle is pretty loose – good, Secondary Scale: the hell with it. Just take it straight, you see? But if they're having a bad time in any way about anything, you better assess the Secondary, or if they're coming Clear you'd certainly better assess the Secondary, because these little particularities are still hung up. And do you know how many buttons there are?

Well, there's all the buttons of beingness, which are infinite. There's every verb that man has ever used or any being has ever used on the whole track – that's your doingness. And that's pretty near an infinity. That's lots.

And then there's anything anybody could have or not have. Now, that's how many buttons there are, and if you want to get yourself ... If I had that calculator, I'd probably be able to rack up enough numbers to represent it by saying that they were binary digits and by saying that they were powers. They were this many binary digit powers of 10, or powers of a billion or something, see? And there'd be that many buttons. Now, that's a lot of buttons.

In other words, they're in three categories: beingness, doingness and havingness. And each one of those categories has a near infinity. When an individual gets fixated on one of these things, there isn't anything else; there isn't anything else anyplace. There is nothing else to be inspected. So you try to tell him that this is part of a generality called intention. So therefore you say, "Well, you silly fool. You say you want to make your wife happy. You keep saying this. Or you want to make your cat eat more cream. Now, you – you just keep saying this. All right. Now, we're just going to run 'When has one of your intentions failed to influence your wife?' 'When has one of your intentions failed to influence your cat?' And we'll just run this up, and of course it'll straighten up the whole track because you're obviously fixated on it."

And he'll say to you, "All right. Seems reasonable."

Trouble with it is, it's reasonable. It isn't. It isn't in the reactive mind that way. It doesn't stack up that way.

Intention doesn't stack up anyplace in the reactive mind, but the cat doesn't even stack up to cream. The cat stacks up to gateposts. And that's why the mind is reactive. All horses sleep in beds, you see? Now, you're trying to force an association upon the fellow that he cannot grasp reactively even though he can grasp it intellectually, and so it doesn't do anything for the case at all. So analytically we can say, "Well, that's very easy. All I have to do is run intentions on this fellow – run failed intentions, successful intentions, and that sort of thing; even run brackets of intention and he'd be Clear. There's nothing to it. One button. And Ron's all wrong, and that's it, blehbleh-bleh." Oh, man, we've been there.

The trouble with mental research from this point on is sort of this way: Every time you get to a brand-new frontier, you find our footprints all over the place. It's like members of the
Explorer's Club have occasionally remarked on this. They get in the darkest reaches of Borneo, you see, at the end of a most horrendous trek that was surrounded with heroic deeds in all directions. And when they finally get to this little-known hamlet in the middle of the extinct and forbidden volcano where there's -- headhunters still abound, and so forth, a Chinese merchant comes out and offers to sell them some coffee. I'm afraid we're now in the category of the Chinese merchant because, boy, we sure covered some ground here in the -- in the last -- well, actually the last thirty years, and certainly in the last eleven.

And this is one of the conclusions about it: that there is a certain complexity necessary to a process. And if that complexity doesn't exist in the process, it becomes nonfunctional at a reactive level even though it might be theoretically feasible at an analytical level. Understand that? So the process must be complicated enough to work on the reactive mind and simple enough to be administered. And that you can describe the optimum state of a necessary routine or a regimen. And you've got them in Routine 1, Routine 2 and Routine 3. And you've got the whole package. There is nothing outstanding from that.

That's how complicated you've got to get and that's how simple you can become. And it's just hung right there in space at that level of complexity or that level of simplicity. Of course, it looks terribly simple compared to somebody that had to know a thousand processes, to only have to know about eight different operations. And pooh, you can do that.

And if he's using the right one of the operations to match the case, his judgment isn't too much assaulted these days because it's done by graph. It doesn't even have to be done by E-Meter. You don't even have to judge the case by it. You can pick up a graph and say, "Well, that case has to be run on so-and-so." You'll be right. And furthermore, it leaves a margin for error.

You can use all three routines on all types of cases with only the difference that they -- some work faster than others. So this is quite a remarkable piece of complexity that we've achieved here. Do you see that? Now, do you see why it is that way?

The CCHs: We made the CCHs much more complex. You'll find old lists of processes called the CCHs and you'll find -- oh, I don't know how many there were of them. And there were A, B, C, D versions of each CCH, and so forth. An unnecessary complexity. CCHs ceased to work when they got that complicated. But the original CCHs -- 1, 2, 3, 4 -- with the exact method of application which is by Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code: Don't run a process that is not producing change and run a process as long as it produces change. And as long as you've got that one in and run the CCHs like that in sequence -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4 -- it'll always work.

You'll find some cases, by the way, run this way in the CCHs: They apparently are flat, all of them; none of them apparently working because the change is so microscopic; you're not getting any change. Remember the beginning of the process on the tone arm. At the beginning of a process on the tone arm in a case that's stuck up a bit -- sticky on the needle and so on at the beginning of the case -- you get no tone arm motion. And if you leave the thing, saying, "Well, it's twenty minutes; it hasn't moved." Hadn't moved? Hell! It hadn't started. But it started a little bit. And it started so slightly, you don't even notice the difference. But it has started slightly. And now all of a sudden you can expect this case, probably,
somewhere up the line to be terribly unflat and uneven on the CCHs. You see that? They'd go from apparently nothing happening at the beginning of the CCHs, as you run through the line. They run to more happening and more happening and more happening and more happening, and then they – you get up to a point where they all bite – 1, 2, 3 and 4 – although they are flattening more rapidly; they're all biting now and they're biting hard. And then gradually they'll start dropping out again, and then you'll suddenly notice an entirely different aspect in the pc.

It's just like an E-Meter. You see, you flatten them. They can go from a no-change, to a change, to a no-change, and that is the cycle of motion that you ordinarily run into. You see this, by the way, on every level that you start. Be a moment or two, even if it's only a tenth of a second, when there's no change of the process, and then it starts to change, you see? Well, that tenth of a second could also be ten hours. See, it's the right level and you're running it. And you know it's the right level and it's producing no great shift of the tone arm. You'll notice, however, that the tone arm is – shifts slightly more and more and more, even though it apparently isn't really shifting very much at all.

Then all of a sudden it shifts more and more and more and more and more. And now you've got really what you'd consider good tone arm motion. And then that gradually fades out less and less and less and less and less and less and ... stop. Now it's flat. To run it any longer than this produces no change on the case.

All right. Now, I'm talking about these simplicities, I'm talking about these complexities, for the reason that I notice a tendency in general in the world – not necessarily – not with you, to chase after an identification which peculiarly fits an individual case. They want a total identification of everything to one button.

Well, look on it as an identification. As close as you can get to an identification is Axioms 1 and 2. You go to a little less dense an identification, you get 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, because that's a total agreement. We all agree on those things, so it must be a hell of a roaring identification, you see? So we all agree on those things; it's quite normal, you know, like gravity. Gravity – gravity is normal. Well, gravity to somebody that didn't have the thing wrong with him called gravity, and wasn't having any trouble with gravity and wasn't flying off planets either, would think that your ideas of gravity were quite psychotic.

You can take somebody who is in fairly good shape, he'd have looked at even Einstein and said the man is a raving lunatic. Look at the things this fellow believes in. Well, just look him over. He believes water runs downhill. It's not necessarily true, but everybody agrees, you see. Even the water does.

The most fantastic things happen, by the way, to MEST when you violate its laws. I'm not now talking about find some way where it will do something different. No. Water is trying to run downhill and you say, "What's this?" you know? Pthooh! The water does the funniest thing – it becomes solidly gluey, becomes plop. It looks like big globs of gelatin suddenly. You get the idea? I mean, you've violated any basics on which it was running, and it changes the characteristic of the mass, because it believes that it is no longer it, although there is no ability to believe in it. But the basic intentions that are built into it have been invalidated. And the second they are, it changes characteristic. Quite interesting
All right. Now, what are we getting at here. We're still talking about the security, even if circuitously, but this data is necessary to you. Very.

The Security Check is running the not-know off the case that it has run on everybody and everything for God knows how long And when you're doing a Security Check, you're running the Native State cycle of sequences. You're not running withholds at all.

You're saying to this character, "Hey, bud, let's find the overt acts you have committed in inhibiting other people's knowingsness."

Let's look at a typical withhold: The guy says, "Well, I robbed a store once." He admits to this. Do you know what lies behind that? It isn't that he stole something or disobeyed the law or did something like this – has nothing to do with it, whatsoever. The overt act consists of putting a not-know, a violent and vicious not-know, into the third dynamic. Clank!

All right. He says he robbed the store. Let's see what happened. Let's see what really happened. Let's forget about the pc now. Let's find out what happened on the third dynamic. The next morning the storekeeper comes in and finds his premises knocked apart. Now, he doesn't really know what happened, and he tries to scout it out, and he looks for the jimmy marks on the door and a few things of this character, but he can't really make it out because he's no expert. And he doesn't know what's happened, and he's kind of in a state of shock about all this. Furthermore, his survival has been threatened, and so forth, but he doesn't know what has happened. That's the thing. He doesn't know what has happened to his store. And also, another thing has been entered in on it. He doesn't know when it's going to happen again! There's the third dynamic overt, see?

All right. In addition to that, he goes and he calls up the police, and he says, "Is this Sergeant Doakes? All right. Very good, Sergeant Doakes. I have a robbery down – I'm – what did you say? Well, yeah. Oh, you were yawning there. We have a robbery down here."

And the police say, "Oh, God, and we have to get up and we'll lose our swivel-chair spread and..." And they say, "Well, the taxpayer." And they come down, and they don't care anything about it just now. They've been leading a perfectly good, smooth police existence, you know? Do nothing, see nothing, you know, be ineffective, to hell with the crime. They've been doing all right. And they get down to the store and now they get a not-know run on them.

Instantly, they say to the shopkeeper, "What happened?"

And the shopkeeper says, "I don't know."

So the police go tearing around looking all over by rules of evidence for the jimmy marks, and measuring the footprints and taking the hired girl's plaster casts of her finger marks, or whatever they do. And they accumulate this vast store of useless bric-a-brac called evidence. And then they don't know either. And it goes into the police files that somewhere in the third dynamic in this particular area there is somebody who robs stores, but we don't know who it is. And an invented not-know, you see, has occurred in that particular area. And these accumulate, and they eventually wind up to become the aberration of a society which can't trust each other, which can't produce, which can't do anything. And there's where it's broken down. It's broken down on vicious, violent and dangerous not-knows. Do you see that?
All right. So you got this pc sitting in the chair, and the first time you go over this – you go over this Security Check – he'll get to all these realizations eventually, see – and the first time you go over the Security Check, you say, "Well, have you ever stolen anything? Have you ever burgled and entered?" At first, he'd stolen anything? – he didn't get anything on it. Burgled and entered – all of a sudden, about the third Security Check you give him, this thing goes tick!

You say, "Well, what was that?"
"Uhrrr... I robbed a store once."
"All right. Well now, have you ever burgled and entered?"
"No, that's it. I robbed a store once."

In some mysterious way he can't account for, he feels better. Why does he feel better? He's gotten off an overt known as creating ignorance. So as he goes up the line ...

You're not through with that question yet. No, no. Several Security Checks later, if your processing is really biting like mad, you hit this thing and you say, "Have you ever burgled and entered anything?" And you get plong! And you say, "Where on earth did this come from? Now, let's see. He's told me about robbing the store." And you – so you say, "Well, what was that?"

"Yeah, I probably worried those people. Yeah. That probably wasn't so good, you know."

All of a sudden, what's he finally come up to? He's finally coming up to realize that he entered a not-know into the society. But he expresses it now as worrying somebody.

Well, time goes on and in the process of processing, other things happen, and you come to this question again somewhere up the line in a new Security Check, and you say to the individual, "Have you ever burgled and entered anything?"

You say, "Well, he's told me about robbing the store and he's told me about worrying people. There certainly can be nothing left on this. You know, this man is getting to be near Clear."

Right about that time, "You know, I've just been preventing people from finding anything out for years. They never did catch up on me. I bet that's still down in those police records. Yeah, I guess they just wouldn't know."

He will tell you at the same time that his memory is improving. Isn't that an odd thing? You give a man a Security Check and his memory improves. Well, naturally it improves because you've got the overts of running don't-know, can't-know off. And you've run the overts of him making people stupid, so eventually he got to be stupid. So his IQ goes up and his memory gets better, because forget is an harmonic of not-know. You get how this thing works out?

All right. You say, well, why don't you just run on the fellow directly, "What could you not know?" "Thank you." "What could you not know?" "Thank you." "What could you not know?" We have people by the ton who have been run on this and never got any better.
See? Empirically, it has actually worked out. It's a matter of record. They didn't get any better. Their graphs didn't shift around enough. And yet we run a Security Check, and all of a sudden the needle loosens up and the person starts feeling better and wham!

I remember an Air Force major who all of a sudden turned up on my front doorstep and wouldn't tell me his name. It was very weird. I did – I went along with this just as a gag almost. But I processed him every afternoon for an hour, and at the end of the hour – because he couldn't give me his name and address, you see, and it was all not-know anyhow, and everybody – why, he'd hand me a fifty-dollar bill. Which is kind of – very amusing – handing me money anyhow – because I don't – normally will take the money, because it's curious and wondering what the reactions are with regard to giving and separating the money.

For instance, I charged somebody one time – I told somebody I'd cure his stuttering. And he was buggering around, boggling and yapping about curing it, and so forth. So I said, well, it would cost him five hundred dollars. Well, this made it worthwhile, but he couldn't possibly give me five hundred dollars. You see, how this thing works out? This was – he was incapable of doing this. So to cure his stuttering, five hundred dollars ... You see, if I'd cured his stuttering, he knew he would feel obligated to pay me something even though I didn't ask for anything. You got the idea? This was the way it added up in his mind, anyway.

So I charged him five hundred dollars, but now he couldn't have any processing, because the next item on the agenda was that he couldn't separate from five hundred dollars. He had five hundred dollars. He had lots of five-hundred-dollars, but he couldn't separate from this. So what I did was process him, and I cured his inability to have or give money. And then he – then he paid me the five hundred dollars, and I cured his stammering and then gave him the five hundred dollars back again. (I never told anybody this whole story.) And he started to stammer instantly. I didn't care about the five hundred dollars, you see? Very amusing.

Same guy, I pulled the same gag – another gag on him. I hypnotized him – this was early in research – and turned his stuttering off like that. Hypnotists do this rather well. The guy goes around in a total fog after this, you see, but he can talk just fine. Of course, he can't think of anything to say, but... [laughter] And I said he would cease to stutter until I said the word boggleboo or something to him. It was very funny. I called him up on the phone. And he was at work; he worked in a shipyard. And I called him up on the phone, and he answered the phone. And cheerily, cheerily, he was saying, "Well, well, well. How are you today, Ron? Yes. Oh, I'm getting along fine. Everything is going along fine."

I said, "Boggleboo."


Interesting. Ideas of posthypnotic suggestion, and so forth. Actually, he felt much better after he didn't have to not stutter. There's no telling what he might say if he had to go on talking. It's very interesting. And later on, this five hundred dollar gag came up. Anyway, he got along fine. He won in the long run.

But this Air Force major with his fifty dollars at the end of every session – not knowing the man's name, not knowing anything about him, who had been sent in from someplace
or another – I'd give him an hour's session. All of a sudden, I pulled off this tremendous overt. He was talking motivator, motivator, father, motivator. And all of a sudden, I pulled this tremendous, fantastic overt. He had come in, and his old man evidently had had a couple of drinks, and he had just ... This had been just a few years before. He had just rolled up his sleeves and beaten the old guy to a pulp. Just plastered the blood all over the walls. And at the moment he did this, why, it was just phessseew. Boy, the relief just fell off of him and lay in pools in the auditing room, you know? You could just feel it. Wow, man. And that was the end of that.

I'd really done something. He knew that. And he gave me this fifty dollar bill. I used to throw them in an ash tray along there. And I added it to the pile. And he disappeared. And I never saw him. Interesting thing.

That was the first time, although we'd been working with overts rather continuously, that I actually got into a case that experienced a 100 percent total recovery on having gotten rid of one overt. These cases are rare, but they happen often enough to make the Freuds of the world and the Roman Catholic Church hopeful. So anytime you do anything wrong, you can always go whisper it into a secret confessional which guarantees to destroy the confession.

You know, they have these little private boxes. And the priest sits in the middle box, actually, and the person sits on one box and the other person sits on the other box, and they both talk in. And they don't know whether the priest is listening or not. You get the not-know? You get how the church has Qed-and-Aed with the not-know of the withhold of the confessional. Got the idea? So it's very easy to Q-and-A with the not-know of a not-know. See, it's very easy.

He says – he's right away thinking, "Look at all the not-know I've run on everybody. I want everybody to not-know this." So he'll ask you to destroy it or hold it secret or something. He's saying not-know. And you're saying, all right, not-know. Now he tells you. Of course, you haven't run a not-know, because you've still got a not-know. That's the end of that. There isn't any – any argument further.

But there is your levels of simplicity, your levels of complexity, and there is your basic purpose and rationale lying behind the Johannesburg Security Check. I have found by experience that auditors could not and do not run Presession 37 as a whole effectively. They do not run it. They try. Their hearts are in it, but bless them, there is one thing they won't do: they just won't imagine there's that much evil in the world. And you actually have to tailor up the questions, and that's all it amounts to. So Presession 37 is put into the complexity called a Johannesburg Security Check or a Processing Check. Now auditors will run those like a dream. They're fine. You understand?

In the first place, it's much better to run it on a list of questions because you're not-knowing a not-know on yourself all the time. You're sitting looking at the pc and you're saying, "Well, let's see. What do I not know about this person?" You have to keep creating the not-knows that you not know about the person. Now, why do that to everybody? Give them a list of all of the mean, nasty, vicious not-knows that they ever could possibly have run on the world at large, and let's go down that list with a horrdrdrdr on the idea and leave nothing left
to the imagination. Therefore, you're not running a not-know on the auditor, because he knows what he's going to ask, you see?

Now, he doesn't immediately know what he's going to find out. But he can sure guess, but he doesn't have to worry about it, don't you see? So he can audit, then, something like Presession 37 in its virgin simplicity, he can actually audit in a more complex form, which is far easier for him to do. And he will do this, and they do a good job of this. So there is your Security Check.

Now, I don't guarantee that I won't add some questions to this check or change the form of the check. I don't guarantee that at all. But I also guarantee I'm not going to change the existence of the check or the type of question in it. And you're liable to get short Security Checks in processing. How short they should be for optimum, I don't know, but it'd be something like a page, and on that page there is a sample rundown which would also include each time ... You see, actually, it's the ten-page Joburg in ten pages, but each one has a few more questions added on to it that gives you the generalities – like the end questions of the Joburg are on every one of these pages, don't you see?

Now, you've got a stack of Security Check Form 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. And you could give a person one or two of them. And if you were covering the lot, which you would have to do – you'd have to cover the lot eventually – you nevertheless can give them a section of the lot. So, actually, these would be put out in little booklets of all pages, and you mark the pc's name on your mimeograph or your booklet, and then you could give them a page of it at a crack. And this is very good for CCHs, see? You flatten a CCH and you give them a page of Security Check, and you flatten a CCH and give them a page of the Security Check, and you flatten a CCH and give them a page of the Security Check. You see, it speeds up the amount.

But in not knowing right now what the optimum administering factor is – not knowing exactly what is the optimum of the situation – you haven't got the form yet. And you probably won't have until I've done enough experimentation with it to find out what is an optimum or average situation between processing and the other ... You also might eventually get the complexity of different kinds of Security Checks for different routines, so that you might have a Security Check for Routine 2, and a different Security Check for Routine 3, and a Security Check for Routine 1.

We are already running into trouble because we haven't got them. The Security Check for Routine 3 is finding entirely different withholds as the person runs on a goals terminal – entirely different types of withholds – than you will pull off somebody who is running on Routine 1. They're entirely different types. And if you don't, somewhere halfway up through running SOP Goals, start asking for – somebody for full track withholds, the case just absolutely goes berserk. He just practically goes out of his mind. Because he remembers clearly, mysteriously, in his little lonely self, going into an enemy town and setting the torch to the whole thing, and nobody ever knew who did it. He remembers this all of a sudden. And he can't tell the auditor about it because it's a withhold. So you ask him, and then you keep saying, "Well, is it in this lifetime?" "All right. What withhold have you got in this lifetime?" "In this lifetime? Have you ever burned anything down in this lifetime?"
"No", he says rather doggedly, "but there was this town, and it was about two or three thousand years ago, and we were camped outside this town, and I went in and thought it'd be a good idea ..."

And you say, "Now, was that in this lifetime?"

And the fellow says, "Nope. Huihuiahuai!" So what have you done to him? You've made it impossible for him to get off his whole track withholds at a time he starts remembering them, so his memory on the whole track then becomes occluded. And it's only the not-know he has run on everybody by picking up bodies and by murder, rape, arson and sudden death back along the whole track that has got his whole track shut off. This is the answer to a whole track memory. Whole track memory depends upon some gradient scale of whole track Security Checking. Got it? So it'd be another kind of Security Check coming out. But it'd be administered the same way; the directions on it would be what type of Security Check it was and when you gave it, and that sort of thing; under what conditions, so that you'd probably wind up with a little battery of tests of one character or another, you see, that fits the immediate occasion. And so you gave the wrong one. All right. No damage is done. Got the notion now?

And you see what this Security Check is all about. You're not running failed withhold; you're running the not-knows off of the case. And these are the ones that matter.

This also should answer the mystery which will come up sooner or later to you – this other mystery: why when they give you some withholds they feel better, and why when they give you others, they don't. And what is a withhold?

Well, a withhold is running a don't-know or can't-know on others or on oneself, see? On some dynamic, you've run a don't-know, can't-know, mustn't-know. And those withholds, when they come off – when the overt act has been overtly a can't-know or don't-know on anybody else, don't you see, – boy, that thing hangs up like fire drill! And when it comes off, the case does a terrific resurge.

You see, it wasn't that this Air Force major beat up his father that caused the Air Force major to be aberrated. His father didn't know why he was being beaten up. The Air Force major never informed any of the neighbors or any in the family why the old man was in this kind of condition. The old man was so ashamed of the thing that he never told anybody who beat him up. You get the idea?

This thing was sown from one end to the other with can't-know. So when it released, it released like a Conger rocket. And yet you got this fellow in wartime, maiming, shooting, killing, burning, having a ball, getting medals in wartime for what he would have gone to jail for in a second in peacetime.

It's so funny. It's no wonder people get confused. You know, there are times when things are noble and times when the same action is a crime and ignoble. So you get mixed up in the good and bad of it all, and the individual is liable to be so plowed in about the good and bad of all of his actions, that when you ask him this, you'll get this mystery hitting you in the face, unless you know the basic answer to it: Why, when they are released, do some withholds cause a case to improve so markedly, and why do other withholds, when released, don't – why
they don't do a thing for the case? And the answer is, is really not who is he withholding it from? The answer is, who is he not-knowing with it? You see? It's not even really a withhold. He's doing something quite overt. He's making a not-know occur in his vicinity, and as he's making a not-know occur in his vicinity, he of course gets damned stupid about it.

Now, you get your other phenomenon of new questions appearing all the time. Of course, as the person can take more responsibility for things, he is less unwilling to prevent everybody from knowing. So as he comes up the line he includes himself in the dynamics, so he finds out about the things he has done. And you get whole track memory being recovered. But as his responsibility comes up, then, he of course begins to realize something about what not-knows he's run on everybody.

And there is your machinery that whirs and clanks back of the Joburg Security Check, which is apparently at first glance merely a police interrogation of some kind or another. And it's very, very complex machinery. And it's based on this terrible simplicity that doesn't work – as a simplicity. That doesn't work. Audited on people, they never fall through on it at all. In the first place, they never get off their don't-knows and can't-knows and all that sort of thing. They just won't audit that way, that's all. I know. We've tried it – no case gains.

Okay. So much for that. That make any sense to you?

Audience voices: Yes. Sure does.

All right. We haven't got any time for it, but give me one more question. Yes?

Male voice: The guy – the guy that puts in substitute false knowingness like me – you know, one of the world's worst liars.

Yeah, yeah, well, that isn't the same breed of cat.

Male voice: What happens to him?

That is only making time mess up. You're only messing up time. Some editor one time said I was a professional liar – as a writer, you know? Perfectly true, perfectly true. When one is writing fiction stories, one is lying, if you want to look at it that way.

But let's take a look at this strained situation. That editor was rather bad off, by the way. Let's take a look at it. You weren't at all; you were creating. And that would make all of life a lie if it were wrong to tell a romanticized episode. [laughter] Do you see that?

Male voice: I feel better already.

Yeah. But all life would instantly be a lie because what is it but an invented, romanticized episode. Your whole life is an invented episode. You're sitting way back there somewhere with some little gears going one kind or another: "Now I will invent the next chapter in the history of George."


Male voice: Well, I arrived at that, but it's small comfort to me.

Yeah. Actually, I suppose to some degree – to some degree an individual – I'm sure our aesthetics are ordinarily dismayed because he does such a terribly bad job of writing
sometimes. The script through which he is walking is so soap opera that it just offends our aesthetics. And if you looked at auditing – if auditing is an overt act, it is really just a literary criticism of the life this fellow was authoring for himself day by day. And he's just going to get worse and worse as a writer. We know that, too. So this we cannot contemplate, you see? So the literary quality of it is what's under the gun. Of course, speaking very, very facetiously, but you could look at it with this idiotic sidepanel.

No, I looked this over when he told – this man told me I was a professional liar. I looked this over. Years afterwards I remembered this one way or the other. And I wondered what button here was awry? Was time being messed up? Or was what being messed up? Or was anything being messed up? Was there anything wrong, in other words, with writing a fiction story? Well, let's get the intentions behind it.

The intention is to amuse and to inform. It doesn't look to me like that's very aberrative. And it isn't. And it isn't. And the only thing you could find in it that is slightly awry, in writing a fiction story, is you're preventing the reader, to intrigue him, from knowing the end of the story throughout it – whereas you do. And that is the only not-know that you are running on a situation. But the intention is so far from being vicious that the aberrative quality of it is zero. Is there anything wrong, then, with romanticizing in writing? Well, if there's anything wrong at all, it's because you're creating. And the action of creating sometimes can wind you up a bit in the soup. You see? Your – the effort to create, the effort to produce, and – sometimes can be traced back along the create line to being aberrative, just like people apparently can't run Step 6.

But I call something to your attention. I must, myself, have had no idea whatsoever that there was any difficulties with creation on the part of anybody. Yet you find people who were sitting square at create on the Prehav Scale – the very few of them – made it necessary to withdraw all of Step 6. It is not inevitable that the person goes into the soup because he makes something. If it were, why would hobby therapy make people so happy? You got the idea?

And why is it that you're so miserable when you aren't doing something or making something. You see? All these things add up to a different key. But it does mean that people can have the create button on the Prehav Scale badly out and actually get terrible masses accumulating in their vicinity the second they get the idea of creating, you see? And this is not necessarily true that this happens to everybody.

You can – think of the number of people on whom Creative Processing – mock-up processing – was run, and think of the remarkable results that you can get with the stuff. We've cured alcoholism with it, and we've done all kinds of weird things with it. Do you understand?

But there are enough people around who just go mnuuuuh. You know, their whole bank gets tough. Now, you can actually make a bank pretty up, and you can make a bank get tough, and you can do it wrong, and you can give the tests of the thing, and you can do various things with it to move it in. But it isn't necessarily wrong.

If you tell a lie to obscure your own guilt – ahh – we're talking about something else now. Now we're talking about running one catastrophic not-know: not only do we rob the
store but we tell people that somebody else did it. So a not-know is compounded with a false knowingness, and the individual who has done this particular type of operation eventually winds up with a horrible feeling of unreality. He feels he's a fraud or he feels he's – he feels he's in a pretense. He feels "All life is really a pretense, isn't it?" And what he's tried to do – the only thing he's tried to do – is deny his own responsibility, don't you see, by... First, he's run a big not-know on everybody so they couldn't find out what it is, and then he's compounded this and gone right in on top of it by giving them a false knowingness that assigns a piece of knowingness that doesn't exist which obscures the other knowingness. And boy, is he getting complicated by this time. And when you pull that on the Security Check, you'll get a whoooooool! Wow!

[The tape ends abruptly as does the original master recording.]
Okay. Here we go. What's the date? Fifteen? Gee whiz, 16th of June.

Well, it's like this. I think I better disabuse you of something that at least one auditor was worried about today. And that is the fantastic boil-off ability of pcs. They just boil off. I mean, it's really bad. What is boil-off? Now, I can tell you what it is on the mechanical side of it. Now, I can tell you what it is on the thought side of it. And between the two, you will now see that you shouldn't worry about it. There's no reason to worry about boil-off. The situation is that you are very prone to worry occasionally when the pc suddenly conks out and you think you're doing something wrong or something of this character. I know this because you always comment on it in your auditing reports.

Well now, if a pc was to boil off for a half an hour at a crack, and you were to get in no auditing, I would be very happy to know about that. See, if they were to boil off and you didn't get in any auditing, I would be happy to know about that. But otherwise, forget it, huh?

It's like this rising needle. I found one auditor in an HGC who was practically hysterical on the subject. I mean, "God almighty! The n-n-n-n – the needle rose! And ohh, de-e-e-ear!" Somewhere in the world it is raining. Somewhere in the world it is raining. This is the same order of importance. And listen, I got special, screaming, urgent, telex despatches on it now. "This pc's needle is rising." So it's a matter of something to worry about. Well, it was along about this stage of the time…

And now, actually, the whole thing has come up again. The auditor in this particular case, we now discover, wouldn't run anything on the pc if it made his needle rise, because it made his tone arm go up, and that was bad. How do you think you're going to get somebody over any bump without their tone arm going up?

Do you know that your case may be behaving so beautifully, and not changing any, and the thing going up a whole tone and down a whole tone, up and down from 2 or 3? And you say you're just getting along fine. And their graph doesn't change and the pc doesn't change and nothing happens to amount to anything. Now, that would be a very severe circumstance, but would be true on a sort of a dead-thetan case. You could get some sort of wobble on the tone arm. You could get a wobble on the tone arm, and it never went up to any extremity, and it never went down to any extremity, and the person just went on being calm and serene forever. You could.
But gee, on these new processes, you'd really have to work at it. You know, I don't know quite how you'd do this. You might – I don't know, you might plug in the ashtray instead of the E-Meter. It'd be pretty hard to do. I don't mean to be sarcastic, but it'd really be pretty hard to do. But nevertheless, it could be done.

Look, that pc's tone arm is going to go to 7, to 1, to 5. And now you're really going to see something happening. I mean, over a course of three or four sessions you're liable to see reads like this. Wham, wham, wham. Wild and weird reads. The tone arm starts around the dial, don't you see.

Because as responsibility increases, the tone arm falls from the dead-body Clear read of the thetan – dead – through 1, down through 7, which your tone arm won't register. Down through 6.5, down through 5, down through 4, down through 3, down to 2, down to 1, down to 7, down to 6.5, down to 5, down to 4, down to 3, down to 2, down to 1.5.

And it could be expected to do all those things in the course of clearing from a case who was on the extreme bottom when you picked him up. You got it?

Now look, if you get worried about a rising needle, look what happens: You're going to say at once, "Well, the tone arm mustn't change position." Because they're hooked together. Let me point this out: that for the tone arm to change position, the needle must rise, at some time or another. It's also got to fall at some time or another, right?

So trying to restrain the action of the tone arm or trying to restrain the action of the needle, on the part of the auditor, is actually an effort to restrain the pc from recovering. And yet we hear of it every once in a while.

Now, boil-off is not in this serious a consideration. Out of your kindness of your hearts – you know, sometimes you are too kind. A lot of you are suffering from an overdose of kindness.

Kindness goes an awful long ways, and I couldn't live without it, and I think it'd be wonderful, and there's been far too much violence. And all these things we understand. But kindness can be overvalued. You can be kind to somebody – so kind to him that you'll kill him.

Supposing you started running a pc and the pc objected one way or the other because the pc had a somatic. And you said to the pc, "Oh, well, we'd better not run that because it's hurting you," and we changed it and ran another process.

And then, we ran a process, and it turned on a somatic. And then we said to the pc, "I'm not going to audit you through that because it's hurting you." You got the idea?

And by the time we'd done that about the third time, the pc would spin straight in. And you would have been kind to him; you would have helped him to death. You see? So there is a fact.

Actually, you sometimes get a very kind manager or a very kind officer who simply winds up getting everybody court-martialed, shot, murdered and burned, you see? They manage it, one way or the other. Because it's just a totality of kindness with no idea of effective-
ness. See? Effectiveness gets laid aside, and only kindness stands in its stead. And when that kind of a condition exists…

Some bird's doing a bad job, you see? Somebody's doing a bad job, and he's kind and he doesn't mention it. And the guy's doing a bad job, and he's kind and he doesn't mention it.

And then, one of two things happens. Either this fellow's accumulated ineffectiveness costs the lives of a dozen men, or the jobs of a dozen men, or quite unaccountably, the fellow who's being so kind finally gets absolutely outraged when he finds the consequences and shoots the guy in his tracks.

In other words, they're kind right up to the point where they pull out the pistol and drill him in the heart. You got the idea? And very often you'll see kindness under this particular stress. And you'll see somebody being shot down in flames because they're being kind.

I try not to do that. I mean, an organization a short time ago had a warning, had a warning and then got shot.

And now they're convinced, and I have a cable on my desk, and all is well. And they all of a sudden, mysteriously, have produced out of the blue, students, pcs, see? It's very mysterious. The Academy suddenly got full. I mean, it just happened within forty-eight hours after they received the cable.

I don't know what they did! Maybe they went out in the street and found natives. [laughter] It wasn't running this way just forty-eight hours ago. But here was kindness.

Now, what would have been the right thing to do, from a "kind" viewpoint, was just to have not said anything about it because it would hurt somebody's feelings, and let the organization collapse, and let the fellow have a big lose, and let everybody in the area that's dependent on the organization all of a sudden, go without service or interest or hope or anything else. And you could have just been kind until you would have killed the whole, lousy, cotton-picking lot. You see that?

Well, this shows up in auditing as never before. If you haul off of a process because somebody boils off on it, you are hauling off of the process which is running off their overts.

Now, what's the matter with a pc? It's his overts, that's what!

All right. Now, theoretically, it's a stuck flow – on the mechanical side. Mechanical side – stuck flow. Flow flows too long in one direction, it gets stuck. When you trigger that flow or try to flow it a little bit longer in the same direction, the pc boils off. Boil-off is a stuck flow. You can make anybody go unconscious by making them stick flow long enough, mechanically. But why is this?

That's an interesting thing, that you can merely make a guy get a stuck flow and boil him off. You can boil off almost anybody.

Some guy who was quite alert, and so forth, you can actually say, "All right. Now you put the ashtray on the table. Thank you. You put the ashtray on the table. Thank you. You put the ashtray on the table. Thank you. You put the ashtray on the table…"
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It isn't going to show up that way quite as fast as this command: "All right. Get the idea of somebody putting the ashtray in your lap. Get the idea of somebody putting the ashtray in your lap. Get the idea of somebody putting the ashtray in your…" *Thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-thu-*.

It doesn't seem right, you know? Well, he'll do it. "Get the idea of putting the ashtray in your lap. Get the idea of putting…" *Zub-zub-zub-zub-zub-zub-zub…*

We've got a little red character running around England right now who is running a one-way-flow process, and it's making everybody nice and unconscious. And she's very happy about it, because she's never had any other target in her life but to make people unconscious. You get the idea?

She's found out if you run a stuck flow, they konk out. But there's nothing, nothing, you see, of any importance about this. You can't ruin a pc.

But look, where did all these stuck flows get parked? Are they over at Graftie Manor? No. Are they in East Grinstead? Probably. Just where did they all get parked?

And as you audit a pc, don't you suppose this pc has ever had stuck flows on the track? Well, where are they going to go when you audit them off? Or are they supposed to be delicately taken apart so it doesn't boil off? Well, you're not taking the case apart that delicately, so the fellow gets a stuck flow – running off. And when he gets a stuck flow running off, he tends to go *woag*. You got the idea?

There are stuck flows in the bank. And when those stuck flows start coming off, your pc *woags*. And that is all you can say about it. Got it?

Now, it happens to be a very curious thing, but most of the time, if a pc were to go unconscious, apparently, and you were to continue to give the auditing command, without any acknowledgment on the part of the pc that he was doing it or had done it, the pc would do the auditing command if given at about the same frequency or a little slower than he was getting it when he was awake.

Because the pc doesn't go unconscious. Like the little pea in the seven mattresses of the princess, he is sitting down underneath all the layers of what-not, being quite alert. But he can't keep his eyes open, see? Got the idea? And he actually will obey auditing commands. Why should you stop giving the auditing commands? If he doesn't hear you, he won't obey them, and what have you done? Nothing.

But if he did hear them and he did obey them, he will come out of the boil-off with great rapidity. And I've audited many pcs straight out of a boil-off. Now, I found in about 56, something like that, that you could do this. You could audit a pc through a boil-off by continuing to give the auditing command while he was boiling off. And it is not an implant situation, although it looks like it to you. He comes right on out through the boil-off. Of course, very often he won't remember having done it. And this brings us to "What is boil-off?"

Boil-off is the accumulated not-know that the pc has run on everybody. That's on the mental, not mechanical – the thought-postulate level.
And if the pc has gone around – well, let's say he's been a university professor. And let's say that he has insisted, absolutely, in teaching nothing but the theories of Hegel. And he has held the fort against all comers on the theory of Hegel. Even to the point where, when they discover an eighth planet, he proves conclusively that it is utterly impossible for there to be an eighth planet, because the perfect number is seven.

Do you know that the discovery of the eighth planet by telescope was utterly and completely denied for a long while and the evidence was thrown away of its discovery? Because, according to Hegel, there could only be seven planets because seven is a perfect number.

Now, supposing this university professor teaching this also insists that nobody ever look for any truth anywhere. Oh, klow! You get this bird, a million years after the fact or twenty days after the fact or something like that, and you audit him, and what's he going to do?

He is going to boil off. And I don't care how many ways you try to run the flow, he's going to boil off. That is all. Because what is unconsciousness but the intensification of unknowingness? And that is all that unconsciousness is, is the intensification of unknowingness. It is the final mechanism of how not to know.

Unconsciousness is well below death, because a person very often gets knocked off and goes right on knowing all about it. What gives with an anesthetist? Don't you suppose – here's a more direct Q and A that's more easily understood. How about this anesthetist? You start auditing this anesthetist and she goes blooeea-bong! Why? She's running a not-know about the operation, not-know about the operation. They roll in another patient, she puts the mask over their face and shoots them the juice, or whatever they do these days. I think they feed them the needle and the whiff all at the same time, and then slap the ether on top of it. They're being thorough these days. If they aren't permitted to kill them, they can certainly put them out.

So you start running this girl and she says – you say, "Well, we've got a little process here which is ARC Straightwire. And we're going to run this process, ARC Straightwire." And we say, "All right. Now recall a time you were in communicati –" She's gone!

And you say, [whistles] "Hey! Tsk! Tsk!" Kick her in the soles of the feet or something like that, the way used – we used to do Dianetically. That's all right; it works.

And say, "I didn't even get to finish the auditing command. Now come on, let's get the auditing command here."

She says, "Auditing command?" Fumph!

And you practically will have to hold her up in the auditing chair with broomsticks, you know? Go get the broom and prop them under her head and prop her so she'll sit there. Why? She's been running not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know. You understand? Day and night, she's been dramatizing not-know with velocity.
So there we are. There is an excess of kindness that winds somebody up in the thorough soup. Because, of course, every time she anesthetizes somebody, she lets them be less familiar with pain, and they will recover much more slowly.

"Oh," you say, "pain is a good thing?"

Yeah, I suppose any remedy is a good thing after a guy has gone completely off – completely over the rolly coaster and completely off the end of track, and he's lying there in the bushes, and there's no way to audit him at all, and he is suffering. Well, by all means, whip out your morphine and give him a shot in the *gluteus maximus*.

But there isn't any point in doing that if you could be effective, you see? But it's only a symptom of ineffectiveness. If you can't be effective, you can be kind. And I suppose that should appear on the tombstone of practically every movement, organization, government and great man that has bit the dust and seen his goals in flinders. "If you can't be effective, be kind." And he didn't try to be effective, he just tried to be kind. And there he went. As a matter of fact, probably all that happened to the Romans and Christianity is they were kind. I've, incidentally, gone over a lot of these court records about the early Christians and the martyrs, and it's quite interesting, quite interesting.

The courts were trying to be fair and trying to be nice about it. And they'd be sitting there in session, and all of a sudden some wild, whirling dervish would scream into the court-room and say, "I'm a martyr! Execute me!"

And the judge would say, "Well now, boy, bailiff, would you please find out what the man wants there?"

And this guy'd come screaming up to the front of the room, throwing his arms around, saying, "I'm a Christian! And it's on the imperial tablets that I am to be executed for being a Christian. Now, I am a martyr, so execute me! Because then I will go to heaven and eat pie in the sky from here on out."

The guy never thought twice; he's probably lousy with a harp. But it's been his whole unaesthetic career that he only does those things he's lousy at.

And they frankly would refuse to do a thing to him. And they'd kick him out in the street and go on with whatever trial they were going on with, and all would calm down.

And a few minutes later, the fellow would be bursting into the room and say, "You are not doing your duty! I am a Christian; execute me!" So they executed thirty.

And in one year in Alexandria, the Homoiousian sect of the Christians fighting with the Homoousian sect of the Christians – and we can only find one difference in their creeds, is one spelled its name with an *i*, and one spelled its name without one. And in one year, they killed one hundred thousand Christians. Quite interesting what might pursue immediately after this.

The Romans were very kind; the early Christian was very, very cruel. So now we find out the Romans were very cruel and the early Christians were very kind. But the records don't bear this out.
Now, as far as survival is concerned, if you want to survive, I guess, be cruel. I suppose that's the most short-term method of survival. But it's not any long-term method of survival.

But being kind and being ineffective, of course, is a fast way to the electric chair; it is a fast way to insolvency; it's a fast way to bankruptcy of all kinds and descriptions; it's a fast way to the death chamber and the cemetery. And more important to us, it is a fast way to oblivion on the whole track – being very kind.

"Well, we understand that you're having difficulties, Mr. Jones. We understand you're having difficulties, and we will try to help you out, Mr. Jones. You say we're going to have this fence down here, and we'll build this fence for you a little bit better so it keeps your cattle in."

And the more you're kind to Mr. Jones, the more things Mr. Jones realizes he can now get away with. And all of a sudden he moves over too far. And you suddenly say to Mr. Jones, "That pasture, you can no longer pasture your cattle in. And yes, I know that means bankruptcy for you, Mr. Jones, but you've had it." And I think this is a rather cruel operation.

We've just done it here at Saint Hill. Just done it. Of course, we haven't made the man bankrupt, but the staff has gotten so impatient and so screamingly angry at this fellow who always wants favors, that nobody has ever said to him, "Mr. Jones, why don't you pull up your socks?" Nobody has ever said this, you see?

And as a result, we've got a kind of a not-know running in the middle of kindness, don't you see? Because the guy is left unwitting of the fact that he's actually making enemies. You see?

So these people that have been going around saying "Love, love, love thy neighbor, love, love, love" – I think there have been a lot of songs written about it, a lot of hymns written about it. A fellow by the name of Bach wrote some music about it one time. He was an organ player. Played in some cathedral someplace. He couldn't hire musicians, so he had to train all of his kids into an orchestra.

And anyway, this fellow used to write boogie-woogie, very complicated boogie-woogie, that sounds something like a spiritual orgasm from New Orleans, you know. And he called it "Loving Sheep" or something. [laughter]

And of course, I figure the abbots of that day were all tone deaf. So they'd look at this music, and it says, "Sheep Amongst the Meadow Worshiping the Lord" you see, as the title of the script.

And he'd say, "You'd better give me my ten bob," or whatever they gave him to write a song.

And they'd say, "Well, that's very nice." And they would buy it, you see, and didn't know what they were listening to afterwards.

Now, you listen to this music, and if you don't listen to the titles, you know, you say, "Boy, those guys – those hepcats get a little more speeded up, they'll almost get a Dixieland, you know?"
I know this is sacrilege. Sacrilege. It's sacrilege against the worship of music.

But let's take a look here at the anaten factor that stems from all of these various philosophies, all of these oddities. Until we finally get a philosophy that is so gargantuan in its unknowingness, that it is its principal philosophy. And when that philosophy arose amongst this particular race, it stopped philosophy. So that today, doing what we are doing, we seem odd.

We are thinking and we're not supposed to think. And if we do anything in the field of philosophy, you see, what we're supposed to do is read Immanuel Kant. And he said everything there was to know on the subject of philosophy.

You see, he writes a book to prove that you are immediately disciplined anyway and that the overt-motivator sequence really does exist. And then he writes another book immediately afterwards and says you're paid for it, you see? He writes one book to say that... You know, that's his two main books.

And I just noticed the other day, there hasn't been a philosopher since. It's quite interesting. What did he introduce into philosophy?

They call him "The Great Chinaman of Koenigsberg." Well, I don't know, I don't call him that. [laughs]

The only thing I've got against this runt, this intellectual pygmy, is just this – is just this – this one little thing: He invented the fact that the highest level of knowingness is to be totally ignorant and you could never find out about it. It's called transcendentalism.

And he says, "Anything that is really going on, you will never know about. So go ahead, little, stupid blinkety-blanks, my children, and you will realize that anything that you begin to know about, you can't know about it. So there's nothing you can know about anything anyway, so you might as well quit."

Now, it is said in much different language. But the reason it has to be said in such polysyllabic, German compound-felony language is that in bare terms, and in a bare statement of fact such as I've just stated, it's totally unpalatable. And yet you want to read all there is to know about transcendentalism and you will find out that that is it. It is the great philosophy of not-know.

It says, "No matter how much you study the physical universe, you jerks, you ain't going to know anything. You're just a bunch of ignorant bums, because all of that is unknowable."

How do you like that! It's all unknowable.

And you know why the mind has not kept pace – technology in it – along with the pace of physics is because it was stopped on the track by the basic theory that you can't know about it anyway. It's impossible to know about, so therefore, you can't know about it. So ever since that time, all they've been doing is quoting Greek philosophers.

Man, I had a few too many Greek tutors to go around quote 'em! Aw, come off of that! You mean, you go upwards to twenty-three hundred years later, you've still got to have these guys haunting you? No, no thank you. No thank you.
A Greek tutor – that's something you get rid of in very early childhood. And you certainly don't keep it through adulthood. And you certainly don't keep it for twenty-three hundred years. Because the Greek philosophies are very fine, and we're glad that man thought. But the last time I was down in Athens, I found out what the Greek philosophies were all about: if you couldn't lick 'em, you could confuse 'em. [laughs] And they did it with two things – philosophy and entertainment.

And I have seen better nightclub operation in a perfectly lousy hole-in-the-wall, nobody-ever-heard-of-it nightclub in Athens than you would find in the finest theaters of New York City. Guys just operating for buttons. They were really good. They were very, very good. They were very good at it. They have saved this all through the centuries. They are the original cabaret owners.

After you get the enemy there and he's conquered you and so forth, you show him conclusively that he can be out-created by turning loose a bunch of dancing girls on him that really get his eyes popping. And he forgets to conquer. They did it to the – they did it to race after race. They did it to Persians, and they've done it to Egyptians and they've done it to Romans. And they're still on top. Pretty interesting. It's a modus operandi for conquest.

And so is philosophy. If you want a complete catalog of the Greek philosophies, take something on the order of the Prehav Scale and figure out each one totally dramatized, and write a total philosophy around that level of the Prehav Scale. And say that is it, and there is only this, and you've got one of the Greek philosophies – or one of the Persian philosophies, or one of the Egyptian philosophies.

Try it some time. Just try and look at the level of the Prehav Scale and figure out what would be a philosophy that obscured everything under the sun except this one thing – what kind of a philosophy it'd be. After you've thought about it for a while, it'll suddenly dawn on you that you are looking at the philosophy of something like Rosicrucianism. That is it, you see? Or you're looking at the philosophy that was practiced in Egypt, or you're looking at Stoicism.

Just look at No Effect. There's No Effect on the Prehav Scale. Now just figure out what kind of a philosophy would you work out that would totally bar out any slightest effect of any character. And you wind up with Greek Stoicism. And similarly, you can do this with every level of the Prehav Scale. It is a reactive scale. So, of course, there's a broad appeal.

Any time you're too broke, your case has gone to pieces, and you've become utterly unprincipled, somewhere up the track, and you land amongst the wogs, always remember that you can dig up a piece of the Prehav Scale and get in a marble palace with a gold roof.

Just figure out where they sit on the Prehav Scale and dream up a philosophy to prove it. And if you prove it conclusively that that's where they sit on the Prehav Scale and this is the very best thing to do – ahhh, they'll make you the governor of the joint as well as the high priest.

You see, most philosophy has deteriorated to some kind of a yip-yap agreement with what they have already got. This is a natural impulse, because all you had to do was open a book of the compound philosophies of the ages that is in the library. And you take it down
from the library shelf and look for a copy of it where book markers have been at work. And you will find the most fantastic banalities underscored.

Here's a perfect gem of wisdom sitting there. But do they underscore that, you see? Oh, no, they will underscore something heavily, you see, with marks in the margins and notes over here, "God is love." [laughter]

And you say, "Come off of it, man!"

And you read on both sides of this, it proves conclusively that the guy, actually, is talking about the fact that religion divides itself up into love and hate. And the phrase "God is love" has gotten into a compound sentence. And it says, "In most countries, the more inane religions subscribed to by the very weak pronounce the theory 'God is love.' Whereas, anybody on a casual inspection could demonstrate that if a god is love and yet keeps hitting people with lightning bolts, it couldn't possibly be a mono-theoristic religion."

And this book marker has read that whole thing, and he's gone right into the middle of it, and he's underscored "God is love." And then he's put over in the margin, "This is certainly true!"

Man, I'm telling you, ladies and gentlemen, your postulates and operations on the whole track really stick in the philosophic line! It's a great compliment to your ability to make a postulate stick.

Well anyhow, as you come up the line and look all this over, you get into an interesting frame of mind about this sort of thing. You're liable to get into this kind of frame of mind: The truth is a subjective phenomenon and only exists as a subjective phenomenon, and there is no broad or agreed-upon truth or anything. You have the philosophy of the only-one: general semantics. See? General semantics.

They've gotten it down to the fact, not only is there no truth, but there is no meaning. And nobody can talk to anybody because everybody means something different by everything that is said.

Well, they might have trouble talking to people, but I tell you, I don't! So there must be something wrong with their theory. All you've got to find is one wild variable on their theory, of course, and it blows up, and that's me. [laughter]

I don't have any trouble talking to people. I don't have any trouble getting them to find out what I mean, either. And I don't have the least bit of trouble finding out what they mean. I may ask them three times, and they may practically blow their stacks and figure out that I must be the most stupid guy they have ever met, but I eventually find out what they mean. See? And I'm not out of communication, even if general semanticists are, see? There are all these levels. Failed communicate – we've got it with us.

We have one philosophy on the Tone Scale, totally built out of one level on the Tone Scale: 1.1-ism. It's – was brought forward by the fellow of the name of Dale Carnegie. It's how to be a successful 1.1. Read him if you don't think so.
Man, you never saw such stuff. And you meet most salesmen that have been super-trained in this, and you wind up dodging, never answering your phone, going nowhere near your mailbox, just for fear these people will appear. [laughter]

So I think Carnegie, having accomplished his goal, pleasantly kicked the bucket and went on to happier rewards. But I think his effort was to stop all selling everywhere! Must have been, because you just try and monkey around with this 1.1 type of selling. Try to communicate with a no-reality. Try to talk to people by never uttering what you think.

You can't communicate with people by never uttering what you think. They'll get this odd feeling of the unreality of it all. Now, why do they get this feeling of an unreality of it all? Because you're running a not-know on them, aren't you?

See, you're talking to them, and you think this guy ought to be thrown down the nearest well, see. You think his product would not even make a good bonfire. And yet, you say, "Well yes, Mr. Jones, yes, we're very interested in – product," and so on. "Why don't you call later or talk to our general manager about it?" and so forth.

What are you doing? You're just making yourself more stupid, that's all. Why? Because you've got a not-know overt.

But believe me, he will sense this. Somehow or another he'll sense this. It sort of comes out of the atmosphere, somehow or another. It sort of drips off the walls that there is no sincerity being accomplished around here. So the communication doesn't occur.

And we get our old ARC triangle. And where reality is not present, a not-know is substituted for it. Tsk! Tsk! Tsk! So you have a definition of unreality. God, I never thought I'd get to that! And the definition of unreality is a substitution of a known for an unknown. If you want to create a big unreality, all you have to do is just substitute an unknown for a known.

The Russians do this rather well with communism. Everybody knew it was cold in Russia and that Russians were hard to govern, and a whole bunch of things like this. And so they put a bunch of unknowns in the line. They even got an iron curtain. You can't even communicate about, with or around the country. And people have an odd, odd feeling about Russia.

And yet Russia is working like mad trying to communicate to everybody. Well, that's interesting, isn't it? They must be running a vast not-know on all of us. Maybe there's some good things in Russia, who knows? Maybe there's some bad things. Maybe there's something workable in communism, who knows?

Because you know desperately, in the final analysis, that the reading of an entire Russian exposition of what the Russian is doing is the substitution of a series of unknowns for a series of knowns. They know what their production figures are. And you get the weird idea that you don't know.

You've read them, see. "Eight-hundred billion pairs of shoes a minute are produced in Russia," you see, "under our great system, and with our great dictator," and so forth.
And you read that figure and some feeling comes over you that somebody has tampered with the statistics. [laughter] So this winds you up, actually, not just believing that this is false; it winds you up with a whole series of speculations, most of them bad.

You try to figure out how many pairs of shoes would really be produced in Russia per minute. "Let's see, there are three Russians working, and I'm sure they're not making shoes." And you wind up this way. And you finally say, "Well, you know, there's..." You conclude only one thing in the face of commie propaganda – eventually, anybody who can think at all – eventually concludes one thing: that you don't know anything about it. They spread this as a big unreality. They are the kings of mystery on this planet at the present time. They have taken over from religion as being the czars of mystery. And that's how they do it.

You can actually get pretty annoyed with a person after a while if every time you asked them how they are, they say they're fine. And you know damn well that they've got a backache and a headache and they feel like hell.

And you say, "How are you?"

And the person says, "I am fine."

You do several things. Amongst them is go down the Tone Scale with regard to this person. The person is substituting a nonfact for an observable fact, you see?

And you keep getting this unreality thrown at you. And eventually, the person starts to kind of disappear. And this very curious phenomena will occur around a person who is doing this to other people. One man, eventually, could not see his wife when she was in the same room. He'd look straight through her and would see nothing but the wall on the other side. Now, that is one – an interesting phenomena. It is reproducible in hypnotism. You can hypnotize somebody and tell him the table isn't there, and he'll see straight through the table and see the carpet on the other side of it, which was of great mystery and interest, and probably formed one of the primary bulks of research of people like Charcot and Mesmer – these boys. They did an awful lot of interesting things. They'd make people sense things at a distance and do all kinds of things.

Now, what is this factor of reality and communication and not-know? They just add up to a tremendous woag, you see? And it'll demonstrate itself mechanically with boil-off, so that everybody gets more and more stupid.

Now, in the field of philosophy, a fellow comes along and with great authority says everybody, if they achieved it to the ne plus ultra, would finally find out that they couldn't know. And oddly enough, it had enough effect on this society that I think there are people right here who used to buy it. Or you've certainly heard it, but you didn't buy it very hard. But you know a lot of people who have bought it.

"You shouldn't research into the mind, and you shouldn't do this, and you shouldn't do that. And you shouldn't think about it, because you couldn't know anything about it anyway."

Oh, wow, what is this? See? I mean, well, the least you could do is put some invented knowingness there, the way the Christians did.
But to say that it is totally unknowable – all of the secrets of the existence are totally unknowable. Oh, my contempt. I spit! What fabulous conceit the man had, to know that it was all unknowable. What a conceited dog!

Now, if there's a tremendous not-know associated with a person, he tends to persist like mad. And you get all sorts of oddball aberrations going in the society. For instance, the monk Dharma who existed ten thousand years ago in India has formed the basis of most Indian religions. And not a thing is known about him or what he said. Isn't that fascinating?

I mean, Indian religions are based to a marked degree upon the sayings, findings and so forth of Dharma. Chinese religions are based on Dharma. We think it means "fate." That's how far it goes. You look up in the dictionary and you'll find Dharma has something to do with fate or something of the sort. Doesn't tell you what it is.

And you look up in one of these textbooks of one of these Johnny-come-lately Indian hoaxes that they call the great revelations and – Suba-bubaba-boo-ba-booba I think is their last one. [laughter] You look up for the – you look up in this textbook on this and you'll find Dharma described in a very fantastic definition which is long and drawn out.

Actually, everything in that textbook, by the way, is incorrect. You read over the – all the definitions of the various missions and words and so forth, of past philosophies in this new gu-gug and you'll find they're all defined with a big zzzzz curve, see?

Actually, Dharma was the name of a monk and that is it. And of course, he had a fantastic influence upon Indian philosophy, so they began to regard him as fate itself. But he is actually a loftier name in the philosophies of the East than Buddha. But nothing is known about him. Nothing. So here you have a fabulous not-know, don't you? And you get a terrific persistence of this not-know, don't you?

Well now, look, if it can ride so thoroughly in the philosophies of a country or a people, how do you think it rides along in somebody's reactive mind? Hm?

You might say the least known philosopher on the whole track Earth – immediate track Earth – current, present-time Earth – is a fellow that we don't even know what his name is. We don't even know it's a fellow. Got the idea? It's a fate.

No, it wasn't a fate. It was probably somebody who washed his feet in a brook and put his begging bowl out where it belonged and laid down the law, and said what he thought was right and so forth. And yet, this fellow's been totally devoured in time.

I happen to know something about this particular character myself. But if he can ride that unknown up the track and be the influential background to somebody that we know rather well – Lao-tse, see? Confucius. A Buddha. They all go back to this fellow. And we don't know anything about it. Why is he still there? It's because we don't know anything about him. He's held in place by the not-know. Not-knowingness does not result in an obscurcation, but is known to you as not-isness, you see?

So there he is riding on the track like mad, expressed in everybody's mind through India, through China. He's the background of the most broadspread religion of peace that this planet has had. And yet, we call the background of this planet "Buddha," see, the Eastern re-
ligions. We say, well, Buddha or Confucius or Lao-tse, or – see? But, actually, sitting right back of their shoulders is this Dharma and we don't even know it's a man; it's fate. You got the idea? Do you see the alter-isness, so forth?

Well now, just take that as an example of what happens in somebody's reactive mind when you get a not-know riding along the line to this degree. What happens? He boils it off, that's what happens! He runs into the Dharma on his track. The total not-know that is still totally in place. And he starts to go clog, woag, thud.

Not-know is the extreme manifestation – in its most extreme manifestation is unconsciousness. Not-know in a lesser manifestation is death. The most extreme manifestation is when a person cannot go unconscious. And we call that insanity. And insanity lies on that band. You have death, which is simply a state of beingness rather than an action. It means the fellow is no longer inhabiting a body. But we can't say what his condition was in at the time he left. He normally wasn't unconscious.

And we go down into unconsciousness and we're below the ramifications of death. And now we go down in below the ramifications of unconsciousness and we find insanity and at that level a person is unable completely, totally and utterly to not-know it. But what is he trying to not-know? By this time he's trying to not-know about the fifteenth substitute. And you get a delusory state that the person cannot not-know.

And you'll find people who are incipiently insane are going around all the time a little bit worried about something that might be just around the corner. They – "Let's see, thuhhh…"

You listen to them. Just get the common denominator of all of their conversation. It's the inability to not-know a substitute. Or it's the inability to not tolerate not-knowing a substitute.

It's the ability – their sole ability left is just to recognize that there are intolerable not-knowingnesses that they cannot escape – and that they lie in wait for them. They lie in wait everywhere, everywhere.

And they walk down the street, and just outside the circle of the lamplight… They don't even dare articulate it, you see? Just outside the circle that the lamp is – street lamp is making on the pavement there…

And you find them all in a – always in a constant, inarticulate terror about something. Or you find them in immediate and terrible combat against something that is undesignatable. And you find them in a state where they have collapsed before the not-knowingness of what assails them. And you'll get them running the whole Tone Scale about a not-knowingness.

But that Tone Scale occurs after unconsciousness. And it's a Tone Scale – is not-knowingness. They go from an inseni – serenity about a notknowingness. You can find a total nut who's going around saying – he's just entering the field of nuttiness, but it'll be something like this:

"Well, I don't know, but it doesn't matter. Nothing matters, really, that I don't know. And I don't know really, but it doesn't matter! It doesn't matter and I'm being very serene."
best thing to do is to be calm about it all. And I will just go on being calm about all this, and so forth. And what happens happens and uh, so forth. And uh, I just won't think about it anymore. I'm going to stop thinking about it now. That's right. And what happens, happens. And uh, I just don't know anything about it, so there isn't any reason to perturb myself about it at all. Because I don't know anything about it, you see? And therefore, I have forgotten it all.

"And I'm in that pleasant state, right now, of not even being – not dwelling on it for a moment. And I just don't give it another thought, so that is the state I am in. And that is very nice and I am being very happy. And it's a sensible state to be in, you see, because there isn't any knowing about it, you see? So you just might as well be serene about the whole thing.

"And that's why I'm so serene. I never worry. You think for a moment I am worrying, you're very mistaken. Because it doesn't matter anything to me that I don't know about this. Never enters my mind that I don't know about it. In fact, I don't even know what I don't know about!"

You run into this person. They usually pass for a sane person. They're pretty sane compared to the rest of them.

Now you go on down Tone Scale from that and you get each point of the Tone Scale about a not-know. The person is angry about a not-knowingness. But remember, it – this – in insanity it is always a not-knowingness about an unknown. They don't know what they don't know about. You got the idea? They have no target.

It's interesting. You get a classification of this. Don't hang this appellation around somebody because he's simply upset because he can't find his car keys! This boy is all right. He knows he doesn't know where his car keys are. Not only that, but he also knows that it's car keys that he doesn't know about. See?

Well, that's sane as can be. And he can be very misemotional about this thing on the misemotional scale without being insane. He might be frantic, but he's not insane. No, no, you're looking at an entirely different phenomenon.

This person does not know what he is in – frantically looking for. You got the idea? If you can envision somebody who has lost his car keys but doesn't know that he has lost his car keys and is looking for his car keys but doesn't know it's his car keys that he's looking for, but is just going around, just going around, looking, looking in a terrible frantic state of mind, looking, looking, looking, looking

You see them in asylums. You'll say, "What are you looking for, bud?"

And he'll say, "Don't disturb me! Don't disturb me! I might forget what it is."

Well, forget what it is! He doesn't know what it is.

Everybody – of course, people like Freud immediately go kling-klonk, and try to find out what the man is looking for. Well, of course, the man is looking for nothing. It's simply a phenomenon of looking. You understand?

It's franticness about it. He'll be in grief. You'll see somebody sitting there crying and crying and crying. You say, "What are you crying about?"
Well, they can't articulate what they're crying about. They don't know what they're crying about. They haven't a clue what they're crying about. But if you stated it one way or the other, they're crying because they, of course, haven't been able to find out about what they don't know about.

And that is the way the reactive bank stacks up. Just *ting-ting-ting-ting-ting*. Right there, *bing-bing-bing-bing-bing*! They're crying about not being able to know what they're crying about. You see, it's a total reactive-thought device. You'll find them all up and down the Tone Scale and characterize every one of them.

If you want to put together a new scale of insanity and make a name for yourself amongst psychiatrists, go ahead. Because you just describe the Tone Scale and describe each one of these states. But describe the person being unable to conceive what it is that is in this state that he is upset about, envisioning what he would do in those mental reactions, you of course wind up with a hundred percent and only just this one thing, totally fixed on that misemotional state, because he can't know or mustn't know or is curious about knowing or mustn't let anybody else know about what he doesn't know about. And there's where your knowingness doubles up and there's where you get the guy totally fixed on the track.

If you've ever worried about whether or not you're potty and going around the bend, up the chimney or something of the sort, just ask yourself this question: do you know what you're going up the chimney about? Just ask yourself that question, you know? "Why am I unhappy tonight? What don't I know about tonight?" Well, if you can find out about what you don't know about tonight, why, you're very far from insane.

Insanity is the manifestation of *not* being able to. A fellow can't even find out that he is in grief because he can't find out about what he can't find out about. See? And of course, that – the mere fact that you are able to speculate, moves you out of the total-dramatize category. Just the fact that you'd say, "Let's see, what am I unhappy about tonight?" – just the fact that you could say that – you're not nuts. It's just as easy as that.

But of course, there isn't anything when a person gets into that state. There is nothing there – anyhow. If you understand these various mechanisms, when you look at somebody then they won't baffle you. Because your bafflement is simply a Q&A with their not-knowingness. And the reason you get concerned about insanity and that sort of thing, and the reason you very often find an auditor going puppy to the root on an insane case, and not being able to stop auditing the insane case, is because the auditor starts Q&Aing, trying to find out what the insane case doesn't know. And the auditor gets to try to find out what it is that the insane case doesn't know and the hideousness about it is, is factually, the insane case doesn't know about a don't-know, which of course adds up to the double-compound felony of it all.

So when you don't know about a not-know, you don't know whether not-know, and what it is, and whether or not you not-know it and you don't even know what it is that you don't not-know, you're a candidate – you're a candidate for the spinbin, you see.

There are two things that move it out. One of these things is the fact that you can speculate as to what you don't know. If you can do that, that's sane.
By the way, it's very interesting: you can introduce to a person who is even feeling spiny, you know, a sudden feeling of sanity by just asking them to think of one person who doesn't think they're insane. Did you know that? It's one of the most interesting tricks I ever dreamed up. You just say, "Well, think of one person that doesn't think you're crazy." Person will eventually think of his dog or something and turn sane just like that. Why? You've introduced a knowingness into his unknowingness. And you can introduce just one knowingness into an insane person's perimeter and you'll turn them sane. You just say, "Look around this room and find something that is really real to you." And this person will look all around the room and they may take a half an hour to do it and they eventually pick up a silver tea pot or something of the sort and say, "Boy, this is really real." And you'll just see them go sane.

It's good for one command. That's why it sort of tends to drop out of the lineup. But that's a terrific trick. That's a terrific trick. Both of those. Both of those. You get somebody who's going to blow his brains out and commit suicide and they're so terrified of all the terrifying things that they don't know what's terrifying about them, which is what makes them terrifying. If you were to say to them, "Think of one person who thinks you're sane." That's evidently a total non-sequitur to them, but they'll think about it at once. They're almost incapable of not thinking about it. And you don't hear any more about suicide. So you see, it's an interesting little trick to have in your war bag. Hm?

Now, so much for all that. I've given you a very long, rambling discourse here today and I haven't answered any of your questions, and I can see that I have slugged you to some degree. You look a little overwhumped. So I'll tell you how to unwhump yourself – unwhump yourself. We're going to start to give the students Security Check practice. We'll start giving them a Security Check, insofar as possible, along with their auditing. In other words, you have to learn how to do Security Checks and you better learn how to do lots of them of various kinds. So if you just spend an hour or something like that a day or one page of the Joburg a day, security checking somebody, then you can be supervised as to how you're doing the Security Check. And you can be looked over about what you're doing, at the same time you're catalyzing the auditing which is going on.

And those auditors that are running CCHs on somebody shouldn't, actually, be doing a Security Check on them also. That Security Checking should be relegated to this other program. And then you will see faster case gains. It's almost a double-auditor situation.

But you need experience in doing Security Checking. And you need to do enough Security Checks that you become familiar with doing Security Checks. And with your familiarity, there may suddenly pop up something you feel you don't know about doing Security Checks and this is the place to find out you don't know. Because the information is all over the place. Got it?

Okay. Sound like a good program to you?

Audience: Yes, very good.

All right. So that's my contribution to unwhumping you.

In addition to that, I think you're making pretty good progress. I just looked over all of your case reports. There doesn't seem to be anybody hanging up here particularly badly – ex-
cept you, of course! You seem to be doing all right. I'm actually very pleased with the way things are going on the thing.

But if you don't think that should be the state of affairs, don't get into a frame of mind that you mustn't tell Ron because it'll hurt his feelings. Realize you're just running a don't-know on Ron. Okay?

If you don't think things are running all right for you or your training or something like that and you can't nerve yourself up to say it to an Instructor or something – you think I ought to know about it, something like that – why, by all means just put a despatch on my lines. Okay?

And if you do miraculously find out there's something you don't know that you should know while you are here, and so forth, and you don't find it out, I'll think you're stupid!

Thank you.
Thank you.

All right. This is the 17th of something or other. Sixteenth? Sixteenth of June. Thank you. I depend on these lectures to find me on the time track. [laughter]

Well, you have reached the end of a week, and I hope that hasn't made you reach the end of your tether. You look younger. All except Reg. [laughter]

Okay. And undoubtedly this week you've accumulated enormous numbers of questions. ...I'm waiting. Yes, Kay?

*Female voice:* When you're running SOP Goals with the Have and Confront Process, as you run, do your Have and Confront Processes change?

Yes. Thank you. I should put you straight on this. When you're running SOP Goals using the Have and Confront Processes, and actually running Routine 2 with Have and Confront Processes, the processes change with considerable rapidity. They can be expected to change, so you have to be very alert.

Now, you're not trying to run the tone arm motion out of the Confront Process. You're not trying to, but the Confront Process must move the tone arm. You see, a Confront Process is a very junior process. It is a very mild process, but it has the effect of making people feel sane. It is quite good in that, you see? This fellow, he's feeling all confused or something, and he's had a lot of cognition's, all of which are opposite, and a Confront Process is really a doll. It changes the immediate state. And actually it has almost no long-term benefit. You never saw the results of any process fade out as quickly on a Confront Process except maybe Have.

Objective Havingness and Confront are both unlimited processes, but if you run them in an unlimited fashion, like you would run SOP Goals or something of this sort, your pc would feel absolutely marvelous – just feel absolutely wonderful. You – I'm sure right in this room there are people who have had this happen to them. And they just had seventy-five hours of Havingness, you know. Just marvelous, you see, and they just feel fine, and a week goes by and they still feel
all right. And another week goes by, and they don't feel that good. And then another week goes by, and they're right back where they started.

Same way with Confront. It has this odd aspect. That is why you don't find the word Confront on the Prehav Scale. Well, that isn't the original reason. The original reason is another one, but you don't find it on the Prehav Scale because it is of no lasting benefit. It is just marvelous for making somebody feel good. They get unconfused, and they come up to present time, and so forth. And the Have Process, that orients them.

And actually, to know more about these processes, to know the answer to your answer – I'm not digressing – you actually have to know really what these processes are. And then that alone would give you judgment in when and how to use these processes, see. And it would answer all sorts of things, so I wouldn't have to be telling you, well, you run eight minutes and seventeen seconds of Confront and eighteen seconds point three of Have, you see, because that's silly. It can really depend on your judgment exclusively if you understand really what these processes are supposed to do and what they are. And when you've accomplished that end with either of these processes, you of course have accomplished that end of it. That is all.

The whole criteria is this: "Do you feel better now?" Fellow's running Havingness, you see. Well, your meter will tell you whether or not he feels better because the needle is looser. If the needle loosens up between the front test of the Havingness and the end test of the Havingness – which by the way you always use – (get your pencil busy). You always use this test in every session that you run Havingness. You always have him squeeze the cans at the beginning of the Havingness and squeeze the cans at the end of the Havingness, and see if the needle has loosened. You got that?

So every time you run Havingness you go through that little routine. That's part and parcel not of just testing for havingness, but that is part and parcel to using it. And all you want out of Havingness is a loosened needle. Now, how loose? Well, it's just like the one-command process, if you ask somebody to look around the room and find something that's really real to them, and they all of a sudden find one object in the room that is really real to them and they're not pretending about in any way, shape or form, that is really alive. It's a marvelous process. And that is its total effect. It's a one-command process.

The other one is "Think of somebody that believes you're sane or doesn't think you're insane." The person thinks of one person and that's it. Now of course, he might think of two or three more, and you might be able to kid yourself in believing that – and it might even appear that it'd be a good thing, you see, to run these processes for ten more commands or twenty more commands, or fifteen or twenty hours. If they're this good, you see, they ought to be that good. Well, they're not that good. And until a person is way up and almost Clear, Havingness has no lasting benefit. The valence eats it up. See, the valence and consumption circuits eat up the havingness. Got the idea?

Now, it's absolutely necessary when he is almost Clear to stabilize his whole case, and his whole case will stabilize, and his stabilization at Clear will take place when havingness stays
stable. Once run, it stays there. And this isn't a needed test but happens to be one of the tests.

Well, this person is awful close to Clear because when he runs Havingness it stays with him. This orient him in the environment. He goes out and looks around the world and it stays that way. He gets a good reality on the world. For instance, he remedies his havingness in this room, and his havingness is remedied for this universe. Got it?

Until a person is up in that kind of state, he remedies his havingness for this room but it is not remedied for the next room, see?

All right. As long as the fellow has a dominant valence or dominant machinery, it's going to eat up all the havingness you run on him. And you can run the whole bank with Havingness. You can sit there, and the engrams will run by, and the case will change, and it'll just be dandy, and boy, are we producing an effect. But that's all you're doing. You're producing effect.

You're not giving the case any lasting gain. The lasting gain of Havingness occurs somewhere in the vicinity of eight or ten commands. Very short. Very brief. And when you've done that, you've done it. Now what you've done, then, is sort of peg the guy at a new level. And that havingness, that much havingness, remains constant. That's okay. He's got that. He can have that. But if you run another half an hour of it, he can't have any of that, you see, so it's just a waste of time. Let's run the case by music therapy, Los Angeles fashion or something. You've heard of that I imagine. Let's give the case some good auditing with some ARC Straightwire, and then let's spend the next – rest of the week on music therapy. And then, of course, any benefit he got, you see, occurs in the first few minutes of ARC Straightwire – which, by the way, is another one of these processes that works dandy for a few commands. And then the rest of it is just lost. See, there's no use doing it. Yes, it'll run the case. Yes, the pictures will change.

Yes, the person – but look, this is a hell of a way to run a case: to get his attention on the wall so he'll run his bank. See, what you're doing is run a shift of attention. After Havingness works, after about twelve, fifteen, twenty – the zenith I don't know, but the zenith certainly wouldn't be more than about thirty-two commands. I mean, it'd be up in that range. After that, all you're doing is saying, "Take your attention off your bank. Thank you. Take your attention off your bank. Thank you." And, of course, the bank changes. And the engram that he was halfway through mysteriously moves the rest of the way through. But in view of the fact that it moves the rest of the way through without the pc inspecting it in any way, of course, it's no benefit. It'll also move through the next day.

If you want to run an engram perpetually, forever, why, just keep running it with Havingness. Say, "Now, you're nicely fixed in that engram. Good. You've got that engram. 1601 it was when you murdered the king. Very good. All right. That's fine. Now you're sure you're there? That's good. All right. Now we're going to run some Havingness."

And we run twenty commands of Havingness and then we say, "Well, how about that 1601?"

"Oh," he says, "that went."
"Oh, well, you'll have to get that back. Let's get that back now. And just -- just how was it that you went about the assassination? What kind of a weapon -what kind of a weapon would you most hate to be assassinated with?"

"Ohhhh!"

"Oh, all right. All right. That's good. Now get your idea of that weapon. You got that real good? All right. That's fine. *Now* look at that wall. Thank you. Look at that wall. Thank you. Look at that wall."

And the engram will *reel* straight through again. And you could actually run it through perpetually. I don't think it would ever run out unless those little beginning commands of getting him into it and the little datings that you were doing happened to blow it. But the Havingness itself will move the engram through, move the engram through, move... Like making somebody sit in a cinema through the picture time after time and making him look at the usher. Years later they see the motion picture and they say, "What's this?" you see. "Never seen this before." So you get the point here that ...? So that's a limited sort of a process. Yes, it'll apparently produce enormous results after run for a few commands -- apparently. And this is very inviting.

Back in '55 I was investigating this like mad, and I knew there was something there in this Havingness Process, but I couldn't establish exactly what. And it was mysterious, and actually if you review the old tapes and bulletins and things like this, you'll find out I said so often, that I didn't know what Havingness was all about.

Same way with Confront, because Confront is actually Subjective Havingness. Now you're going to run the reverse. You're going to make him face the wall. You're going to make him face the bank. I don't care what the Havingness command was, exterior, or what the Confront Process was, subjective; all you've said to him is, "Now, look at that wall. Now you got the real universe? That's right. That's real good. Got it real good. Well, look at it a few more times. Oh, that's fine. Feel better now? All right. That's dandy. That's it." You got it?

All right. Now you have him look at the bank, and you say, "Bank, bank, bank, bank." I don't care what command you're using, see, for the Confront Process; you're saying, "Bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank. You feel better now?" The guy says, "Yes, oddly enough, I do."

Well, don't expect him to go on feeling better for the rest of his life, you see, because it's too arduous, as a process. It -- there -- they do things. Odd things will happen doing them. There're vagaries. The full benefit of the Havingness Process and the full benefit of the Confront Process, as far as therapeutic value is concerned, is realized in something on the order of eight to a dozen commands in Havingness -- zenith about thirty-two commands. And Confront? Well, it's a little harder to establish in terms of time, but what you want really is a wiggle on the tone arm.

You want the tone arm to wiggle and preferably go lower. If you can make the tone arm do that with a Confront Process and you can get it done in ten minutes or fifteen minutes or something, why, you've done it. And if you're not doing it in ten or fifteen minutes, you'd better
say, "Well, it's just too bad, but this pc will have to feel bad till the next session." I mean that's it. Because a process is nothing to fool with if it is not producing benefit. And if it's not producing benefit, you won't get a tone arm motion. Got it?

So therefore, the Havingness and the Confront Processes apply all the way from the bottom of Routine 2 to the near top of Routine 3. Routine 2 to Routine 3. Hm? And they are always used exactly the same way. You use them exactly the same way. But look, this case is changing. So if you find them too early, you're just going to have to shift them every time you run them. And if you find them too late, all you're using them for is stabilization of Clear. And in the middle ground it's sensible, but you keep your eagle eye on the needle for the Havingness and you keep your eye on the tone arm for the Confront. And if all of a sudden – this person's been running along fine on the Confront Process of, "Get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour" – that was his Confront Process – and the hitherto – if he was sitting at 4, it would go to 4.5, and it would then blow down to 3.5, see? Some much – such evolution as this ...

I've gotten more data on this, since I've given anybody any of it, by the way. I'm glad you asked the question. I've had quite a bit of data accumulated on this one way or the other. I haven't even written a bulletin on it.

And it works just fine – "Get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour. Thank you. Get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour"; whatever the Having... Confront Process is. And hitherto it would go up a half a tone and then it would blow down a tone. Something on that order. And as soon as it blew down a bit, you'd come off of it and you'd skip it after that. Ah, that's good. That criteria, by the way, used to be used for the Havingness Process, and it's not used there. Use it for the Confront now.

All right. And you start him in on the Confront Process, and the tone arm doesn't go up. And you run ten commands, and the tone arm doesn't go up. And you run ten – fifteen commands, and the tone arm hasn't gone anywhere yet. Well, it's too confusing to find another Confront Process right at that moment You simply come off of it, run your Havingness Process and that's it.

And the next time you audit the pc, say, "Now we are going to find a Confront Process," because that Confront Process is no longer functional.

All right. You always do the can-squeeze test. You wouldn't have had to have done any of these things, you see, if we weren't traveling at a fast rate of speed with our auditing progress. It was perfectly all right. The finite period of time that they lasted before didn't require all these cautions, but they certainly require it now.

So here you are with your case going along at a whizzing bang, and you give that can-squeeze test just before you run the thing. All right. You say, "Squeeze the cans." You watch the needle, you see. "Squeeze the cans" – watch the needle. Don't necessarily set the sensitivity knob, who cares? And then you say, "Look around here and find something you can agree with. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can agree with. Thank you. Look around here and
find something you can agree with. Thank you." Run it about eight times, something like this – maybe twelve times. And, you don't count them. It's not that exact an action. Counting them is something on the order of the ensign going out and holding the sextant upside down in a bleary-eyed way and shooting Venus when it should have been Arcturus. And then he comes back down and spends three hours of the most minute mathematical calculations you ever heard of, don't you see. And he reduces the ship down to a pinpoint, only he's 150 miles north of the headwaters of the Nile, you see. It's very amusing, you see, to take something that is of a gross application and then figure it out minutely, and yet the world of mathematics is doing that all the time. That'd be something on the order of counting the Havingness Processes, don't you see.

You run it kind of watching the pc. Don't watch the needle on the Havingness Process. And the pc says, "I agree to that. I agree to that. I agree to that. And I agree to that, agree to that, agree to that, agree to that, agree to that. Yeah."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Okay now. Would you give the electrodes a 'squoze'." And you look at it. Wham! You say, "All right. Thank you very much. That's the end of that process." No bridge out. Don't bother.

Confront Process is run before the Havingness Process. And what you do there is you say, "Now get the idea of your bank flying by at ninety miles an hour with a witch on it. Thank you." Whatever your Confront Process is. Watch that tone arm. Watch that tone arm, and it goes zzz-zzz-zzz-zzz-zzz-thoom! And you say, "Thank you very much. That's very good. Ah, that's real nice. That's fine. How do you feel now?"

He says, "I feel much better."

You say, "Good. That's it."

And all they are – are stabilizers of the gain. Now, an individual gets no idea of what else is going on. He is running this horse, you see. And he's running Fail Leave on a horse. And my God, he just runs Fail Leave on horses and Fail Leave on horses and Fail Leave on horses, and Fail Leave on horses, and Fail Leave on horses, and Fail Leave on horses, and horses failing to leave him, and him failing to leave horses, and others failing to leave horses and horses failing to leave others, and horses failing to leave horses, and – man, he's just been having a ball, you see. And all this time he's been having trouble, see. That's the way the bank is going on this silly valence, and the valence is separating out, but he's having trouble this whole time. What's happening here? This is – gets to be very amusing when you're running a valence directly, because what's happening here?

You know, there are other quadrupeds that failed to leave. Namely donkeys. And he's gone along through the course of auditing, obeying the auditing command very nicely, except every once in a while something in the bank would say "Hee-Haw", you know, or something of this sort. And he'd say, "Well, down. Get away from here now. We're supposed to be dealing with horses." [laughter]
And during the process of his auditing, he will stack up quite a few donkeys over here. Somewhere on his left or somewhere behind him there'll be some repressed donkeys. Get the idea? This is inevitable, see.

Well, now listen. Let's give him a chance to get rid of the donkeys, and that's why we run the Confront Process. Whatever the Confront Process is, the first thing he's going to confront are the things he kind of restrained himself from confronting, because he was running horses. The mechanics of the process, in other words, have prevented him from confronting certain things. Well, so he blows that off; you don't hear any more about the donkeys. Donkeys aren't any difficulty for him. They're just an associated terminal, see.

All right. Let's say we have one case running on a terminal that doesn't occur in this lifetime. Never occurs in this lifetime – the terminal doesn't, that's it. Or if it did, it'd be so slight. But the person for various reasons – not necessarily this particular case that there aren't any in the present lifetime, but just the case is the person is incapable of being one in this lifetime by reason of sex. So we're running this person when and how? We're running this person out of the present lifetime, all the time, on the terminal.

Well, let's give him a chance to catch up. Let's give him a chance to come up to present time. And the best way to get him up to present time is a Confront Process. Confront is the old answer – 1950 – of how you got a pc up to present time. You could have confronted any pc that got stuck on the track back up to present time. If you moved him out of present time, you could have confronted him back up to present time, don't you see?

On such a terminal, if you do not run the Confront Process, no vast catastrophe is going to occur, but the pc is going to be perpetually uncomfortable. And the fellow will finish the session over here holding down these eight donkeys, you see, and he will find himself going around until the next session with these damn donkeys. [laughter] You see? It's not even catastrophic. It will not hold up his progress, so it is not a vital action. It simply keeps the case on a little more even keel and maybe speeds it up because the case might not get so many ARC breaks out of session, because they're in a little bit better shape in the physical universe, don't you see? That's why you use the Havingness and Confront Process.

Now when you use it, naturally – you would certainly be wanting to use them on somebody who kept feeling a little spinny. If the person's kind of feeling a little spinny, level by level, and you don't have his Havingness and Confront Process, you haven't got the weapon necessary to set him right. A little bit of Confront does marvels for the fellow's spinniness. You know, guys can get pretty far off beam with this spinniness. They can get pretty nyarowrrrow, you know?

Anyway, where do we have a borderline between not running them and running them? It's just auditor's judgment. It's just the state of case and auditor's judgment. And they run all the way through from Routine 2 right on down through to the bottom of Routine 1. And the more the case is progressing, the more rapidly the Havingness and Confront Processes will change, and you will start somebody out, and he'll be getting along fine...
They don't necessarily go up scale or down scale, you know. Just as a word of warning. A person starts out, "Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you." This remedies his havingness beautifully, you know. "Look around here and find something you can have." Wonderful. It just remedies his havingness gorgeously. And about eight sessions later, he's made a good case gain. See, he's had a good run on a level or something like this. And he's got a lot of withholds off on a Joburg. And you run "Look around here and find something you can have. Look around here ..." eight times. Squeeze the cans again, you know, and it just goes clank! Almost stands up and barks at you, see. It doesn't move anywhere near like it did on the first can squeeze. Well, this is running his havingness down now.

Well, it's not a temporary condition that will fade out in – during the next session, something or other. He might have gotten an ARC break you haven't caught, or some other things might have caused this. But you'd catch those on the end rudiments. This Havingness Process has ceased to work, and now you're liable to find something corny. Here's a Havingness Process: "Why, look around here and find something that would substitute for something if something wasn't there." And you say, "How in the name of common sense can this Havingness Process ..." you see – which you've picked off the list or any existing list; there are lots of them – you say, "How could it remedy anybody's havingness."

Well, it's doing so because the can-squeeze test before and after shows it loosens up the needle. And you'll get along and you'll suffer with this – along with this one, and your curiosity and mystery and not-know of how this could remedy anybody's havingness. And all of a sudden, why, clank! Can squeeze – it didn't work. You're going to have to find another Havingness Process. And this time you find, "Look around here and find something you can have," and "Look around here and find something you would rather not want", or whatever it is. And that remedies havingness now. And then we get another one: "What scene isn't that wall part of?" Oh, that works like a breeze.

You see what's happening here. The bank is shifting. The valence is going nuts. The pc is getting better, but the valence is going crazy. And you can expect the Prehav level on a valence to deteriorate. And you can expect the level of complexity of the Havingness Process to deteriorate. And you can expect the level of complexity of the Confront Process to deteriorate as long as they're being run on a valence, and he's not rid of the valence yet, so therefore you're running on a valence. Got it? So therefore, they deteriorate.

And there's only one other thing I'd like to add on this general subject. There apparently is some idea abroad that the only thing that will clear anybody is running a valence directly and immediately. You look what happens to valences on a Routine 2 run. All kinds of little side-panel valences start flying off the main valence. And you get rid of plenty of extra secondary valences on a Routine 2 run. And when you finally ask the fellow for his goal, after you've thoroughly done Routine 2 ... Ah, it might be 150 or 200 hours later; we don't care. But if you ask the fellow for his goal, and his terminal and so forth – there's his goal; there's his terminal! Bang! It falls. You assess them for level, and all of a sudden they run out.
Where's this goal? Where's this terminal? Well, you assess them for a level, and what are you doing now? You're just doing SOP Goals, but of course you've – your general runs hit all these valences. Only they hit them less speedily. They separate them out more. They do different things with valences, but they get rid of valences.

And CCHs, Routine 1, gets rid of valences like mad. They all do the same thing. The whole criteria on Routine 1, Routine 2, Routine 3, is not how nutty you are, but how fast these things will operate. And I will lay you down an operating rule right now for these. An operating rule in no uncertain terms. And that is, if a case in large quantities of auditing has not had a significant change – and I'm talking about past processes or even present processes – if he hasn't had a significant change over a long period of time – he's still got his lumbosis; his zorch is still out of order, you got one answer. This is policy. It has to be policy because valences protest on it. Regardless of graph, meter read, opinion or objections, you run Routine 1. Got that one? HCOB 17 June 1961.* I just put it in the mill. I might as well tell you what it is.

Don't monkey with this one, huh. If a case hasn't been rapidly changing on auditing, the most rapid way to make the case change is the CCHs with a Security Check. If the case hasn't been changing over a long period of time in auditing, the most rapid way to make them change is CCHs and Security Check. It has nothing to do with their nuttiness. We don't care whether they're nutty or not nutty or anything else. It's just what's the effective thing to do, that's all.

So if you follow that as a policy ... I'll give you an idea, Wing goes into New York City and there's a perfectly nice fellow, and he has always been a nice fellow, and everybody knows he's a nice fellow, and he is very sane, and he has been very helpful and so forth in Scientology, and Wing says to him, "All right. You say you want some auditing? All right. I'll give you some auditing. I'm going to run the CCHs on you."

And the fellow says, "No, no, no. Under no circumstances." Well, my God, he just did an assessment on the man, didn't he? Do you know all of us have got the CCHs unflat on us, practically? We've had them run a little bit. It's too beefy a process to leave unflat. It'll flatten off. Of course, you get up toward Clear, it'll flatten off in a morning But sooner or later, you're going to have to collide with them and face up to the fact that they require finishing. It's no more serious than that.

The reason Wing would say, "I'm going to run CCHs on you" is he happens to know that the fellow has had lumbosis ever since 1952 and it hasn't disappeared and the fellow has had a bit of auditing – quite a bit of auditing during that period of time. Without monkeying around about it and without running into whatever it was or trying to analyze what it was that kept this fellow from cutting free of his lumbosis and spending eighteen hundred hours in the arena, bleeding and raw, fighting this lion to find out what is this that is so tenacious that is continuing lumbosis on this case and getting very brilliant and brainy about the whole thing; just "Give me that hand, brother." That's all.

* Editor's note: HCOB 17 June 1961, "CCHs and Routine One"
And all of a sudden, Mr. Lumbosis, when you combine "Give me that hand" and the rest of them with Security Checks – that lumbosis, first it runs up a little white flag ... First you see this helmet being waved over the parapet, you see, rather meanly, you know. "You can't get me. You can't get me. You can't get me." And then finally you see a dirty pocket handkerchief, you know, being waved. And then they finally help you – and then they want to beat a parley. And all kinds of things. And then all of a sudden, why, "Oops! There went my lumbosis. Hey, it did, you know." And that's it. What I've done is figure out a way that you can't make a mistake with a case.

You see, there are several things you can know about a case. You can put them on an E-Meter and find out how they read. That's very reliable. You can give them a profile; you can read the profile. That's very reliable. There's another way of reading a case: Looking at them. You can look at them, make up your mind about it, and that's another way of figuring out a case, you see.

All right. There's yet another way. This person has been audited for the last four years and hasn't had much gain. Isn't a Release yet or something like that. Well, that's a complete assessment of the case, isn't it? Otherwise, we'd have to assume that all auditors are bad auditors, which they aren't. We'd have to assume that no processes have worked in all these years. And they have. See? And we'd have to assume these various things.

Well, why sort all this garbage out? Why spend hours and hours and hours and hours and hours monkeying around with this? Because look, somebody else has already spent hours and hours and hours monkeying around with this one. Well, there's one answer. And that is, it evidently doesn't surrender to the basic mechanics of formal auditing. Whatever it is that's wrong with the guy doesn't normally – he's alter-ising the commands or he's auditing through a machine, or he's going on a big via, or he's got a present time restimulator that is very, very rough. It's this. It's that. It could be ten thousand different things. And you can worry yourself to death over it. But look, out of all those things there's only one common denominator for the whole lot. And that is, he's been audited quite a bit and hasn't had a significant case change. That's fine. That's all. That's it.

So you get up on the pitcher's mound. Let's see, what's a pitcher in cricket? A bowler. You stand on the bowler's box or you get in – on the pitcher's mound, and you wind up and you pitch CCHs, man. That's all. Or you bowl them. God, I'm international today.

Anyway, there you are. You ask for a simpler tear-apart of a case than this? And there's no reason to be upset about it because actually the very reason that a person gets upset about the fact that somebody thinks they're a little bit potty is an index in itself. You see this? Because it tells you they must be worried about the world's opinion of them. You see? It tells them that pride is entering into processing.

Well, I don't know. I've been run on the CCHs. I don't see anything very bad about it. I know other people who've been run on the CCHs. It produced results on everybody I ever saw it run on actually, if it was run right. So what's the difference here, see? That's all there is to it. I hope I answered your question anyway.
Female voice: Thank you very much.

Good. All right.

Male voice: And a big one of mine.

Good enough.

Male voice: Same here.

Good. We had an interesting incident, by the way, going on in a course – special course that's being run someplace. We had a boy – he's pretty stormy. He's quite a guy. Pretty stormy. And he walked in on this course and found out that there was kind of a lot of yow-yow-yow going on about, oh, well, this stuff about Security Checks and so on, you know. [laughs] All these cases, no advance, no spins and so on. And he got down and he told them, "Now look, you guys. This is your last chance, see. Because if you don't make it in this course, I'm gonna make sure that you just go out and spin forever. So you better get serious about these Joburg Security Checks, and you'd better snap and pop, and you'd better give up those withholds and get it whizzin' and bangin'!" And everybody says, [feeble voice] "Well, all right," you know.

They got in and started standing and delivering as though we were being attacked by highwaymen. Then the most interesting thing evolved. A very important person in that area had been invalidating Security Checking and most of the students had withholds about that person. And that one little speech all by itself cleaned up a whole Scientology area. They had been practically under orders to regard the Security Checks as just a nonsensical idea.

And I've just heard from another area that wrote a special Security Check for the Academy. [laughter] I think that's very nice. I like that. Sooner or later, we'll get out one for the Academy. And the only difference between that and a standard Joburg will be in every third question "What unkind thought have you thought about your Instructors?" [laughter] and so forth. Get the idea? It'll be Scientology personnel about every third question, you see? That's the only difference it'll have.

But this was a nice, sweet Security Check. It consisted of something on the order of about twenty-five, thirty questions, and it all says in a high generality "Have you ever been a paid agent working in Moscow directly and immediately for Khruschev?" That's good. Well, we've taken care of communism. "Now, have you ever been a homosexual? Thank you very much." Or I don't think it's that general. "Have you ever been a homosexual in this organization?" or something. Real cute. Probably says something on the order – I didn't read it all, but probably said something on the order "Have you paid your bill?" or something. And that was a Security Check. That ranks with this other one, "Have you had an ARC break with ... ?" That was another doll. That was a real wowie one.

So it just comes down to the fact there must be no special Security Checks. There must be standard Security Checks, and that's it. And is – it happens at this moment that it's HCO W[W] Form 3. When we say Security Check, we mean HCO W[W] Form 3. We don't mean the special Academy edited check, because you see "It's very rapid to give it, you see. It's very rapid to give
it. And the other takes too much time." And – because people still will walk around their with-
holds, that's all. Somebody writes a Security Check independently in some vast different part of
the world that is in objection to the Joburg Security Check, you can just be sure that it has noth-
ing whatsoever to do with a Joburg taking too much time in the Academy.

In the first place, certainly in an Academy, for God's sakes, these people must learn how
to do complete Joburgs, not be given a little twenty-five-question short form and not ever be
permitted to have a Joburg anywhere near them – which is what this adjudication amounted to.
You know, "It must not be given in the Academy. Only this one is given in the Academy."

Interesting, isn't it? You've got to watch that one wherever you are. You see somebody all
of a sudden saying, "Well, I think it's perfectly all right." I'll give you the pat answer to this be-
because we're not stopping anybody putting together Joburgs and Security Checks.

It works like this: Unless we lay down a blan-
tet rule that the Security Check given shall
be an official HCO WW form with a number for a certain purpose – unless we lay that down –
then, although we have opened the door for anybody who is inventive to write himself a lot of
Security Checks and actually contribute to Scientology, we have also opened the door wide for
isolated areas of the world to carefully omit their own overts from the particular list and issue it
as another check. And that is what happened in this area, I am sure. This is too nonsensical.

This other ARC break one that came out – that came out before the Joburg. That came out
before there was any real importance being put on Security Checking I just use it as an example
of how mild a Security Check can be.

But if you want to put together a Joburg, if you think there are a lot of questions missing,
and there certainly must be, I'll tell you how to put together one. I've got a special category going
right now. Did you ever know anybody that had about thirty or forty baskets sitting in the same
space? Did you know that thirty or forty baskets could occupy the same location in space? That
would have driven Hayakawa mad, wouldn't it? Or even Korzybski. But I've got one on the cor-
ner of my desk. It'd be absolutely impossible to rack up enough basket systems and enough filing
systems to take care of all categories of my immediate projects, so I put them all in the same
space over here at the side of the desk.

But oddly enough, although they get up to tow-
ing, I let the projects accumulate, and I
know I'd better not let them go to files, you see. If they go to files... I have now put the rest of the
office staff to work – and I'm going to put them to work, but not this senseless filing. When I get
a stack this high, and it's all questionnaires to Ds of Ps that I've put out, and I finally see that the
stack is high enough to justify my believing they have all replied – like, "Send me all the profiles
you have on all new Academy graduates." Nothing of this sort, that – too silly a project. But if
there'd be such a project, I'd just let them stack! See, stack. And I don't send them to file.

And then my basic system that I have newly been putting into effect is simply pick up the
whole lot on a donkey cart someday and turn it over to somebody and say sort them out. And
they sort them out, and they bring them back. But I know if I – you see, the answers of these pro-
jects are addressed to me. We have so many things going. I don't have time to advise everybody what every project is. So the easiest thing to do is collect them. And I do collect them. And I do sort them out. And I do all of a sudden fire one of these things when it's all accumulated, because we are now in a zone and area of accumulating information from organizations and people and auditors, you see, and that sort of thing.

And when I ask them for some information, because we're so far flung, it takes an awful unconscionably long time to get something all the way down the Congo out through the various pirates in the Congo now, such as the United Nations and Kennedy's special emissaries, and so on, and it takes a long time to get here. But it gets here. And then I accumulate them, and I put it together.

So don't think that something you send me on a project of this character is just waylaid and neglected, because it very often isn't. Verner, when he was over here looking over the organization – one thing stuck thoroughly in his mind. They showed him all the files and papers and routes and it all looked very fantastically interesting to him. And amongst these oddities was the fact my initials appear on everything or my routings appear on everything. And he had the idea that I sat in an ivory tower somewhere, you know, and never saw anything, and you couldn't communicate with me and all that sort of thing. And he looked this over and he saw this vast ocean of accumulated detail, papers, despatches, all this kind of thing. Yeah, I see them. I don't always answer them. I try to get them answered, but I don't always answer them.

Sometimes there is no answer. I think, "Well, later on I'll have an answer to something like this, and I'll put it out in a bulletin." Sometimes your despatch gets answered very – on a very odd via but not too often. And I'm saying this, giving you this preamble of the thing: If you've got questions that do not appear on these Security Checks or you think should appear on these Security Checks, just address them to me on an ordinary piece of despatch paper. And this file system where the twenty or thirty or forty projects all sit in exactly the same area of space eventually accumulate these things. And one day, why, I'll get some time – some 2:30 in the morning sometime – and sort them all out and stack them all up and give them to somebody and say type them up. And there we are. And then we'll sort them out. We'll find the questions repeated very often. And we can sort them out, and we will have a new Security Check. Now, Jan right now is doing a very nice rundown, and Dick, with a whole track Security Check.

One question that they originated stuck in my mind on the thing is, "Have you ever wantonly, viciously and villainously destroyed hostages given to you to hold under your sacred trust?" or something like this. So various questions on the line like this and they're good questions. This is a bearcat. And it's the result of saying that one of these days, why, we need a Security Check, that when a person got up about halfway to Clear and his whole track keeps opening up, and he's got withholds on the whole track, and we keep trying to check him in this lifetime, and the withholds are no longer in this lifetime, he goes practically potty. If somebody would just ask him some of these questions, why, it'd all turn up and work out, you see?

All right. So there's a project: whole track questions. There's another project: What pecu-
liar questions should be asked in an Academy? That's another project for another Security Check. And: What peculiar questions should be asked on a repetitive-type Security Check which, while covering the whole Joburg, yet covers it a page at a time? Well, there's got to be certain repetitive questions occur. You see, every time that page is asked, certain other questions have got to be asked with it. So that you could get in the CCHs a one-page administering of the Joburg at a time. You got the idea? And the fellow would always be getting new Security Checks, which yet wouldn't neglect his old Security Checks, you see. It's an interesting problem.

The whole track Security Check, there – actually is basically the improvement of the existing Johannesburg Form 3. And the more minds we get to work on what horrible things people should have done to people, why, the more broad and effective that Security Check can be. And it could even be something wild or as far approached, "Have you ever done any illicit diamond buying?" [laughter] And nevertheless would catch some case.

Remember that a security question or a withhold-type question – remember that it doesn't produce any bad result, it really doesn't waste enough auditing time to worry about now that you're doing instant read, and yet will catch some off-base case. And you yourself as the auditor sitting there reading one of these checks down will say, "What on earth? How could anybody possibly have ever done anything like this? That's a very unlikely question." And then all of a sudden one day you ask this thing, "Have you ever put any cats in slingshots," you see, "and fired them over walls?" And the thing falls off the pin, and we get somebody who has devoted his whole lifetime to doing nothing else. [laughter] There it is, brother. Bang!

And then, of course, there have been other codes of justice than the South African code of justice that was the original derivation of the original Joburg. South African code of justice is very precise. You can do more things wrong in South Africa than in most other countries, but in South Africa they have more problems, and all of these things are wrong in other countries except they aren't forward enough to say so. It's just a franker code of laws, you see?

They don't have so many of these catch-basket laws, you know? "Have you ever done anything the government doesn't like?" You know, like – that's US law now. US executive branches in their law, after they've gotten Congress to write up their laws, they always add this catchall law. "Have you ever been non persona grata with any official in this particular and peculiar department and refused to bribe him?" [laughter] or something like that. And they add this catch law, you see, on top of all the other laws, and then you never know where you're going. You never know what you're doing. You never know what the law is, you see? You don't know whether you're breaking the law or not. A big not-know enters into the scene. As societies tend to deteriorate, not-knowingness enters into their laws.

But there have been many other law codes. There's been a Code of Hammurabi. There've been Persian law codes. There've been Egyptian law codes, Greek law codes. There are Spanish law codes right at the present moment. There's French law codes. And all of these things announce crimes of one kind or another that are rather unlikely, you see, to the Anglo-Saxon. For instance, our own law codes in England and the United States have gotten a little bit sloppy in
various ways. There's tremendous numbers of laws on the books that don't get enforced, and there are a tremendous number of things that get enforced that aren't on the books, you know. It's getting slopped up this way.

Well, the Joburg actually has to follow through two legal systems because it's basically jurisprudence because it deals basically with the third dynamic, you see. And the best area to find the misdemeanors of the third dynamic, of course, is the justice codes of the third dynamic: What have these things included as being withholdy? Because somewhere on the track people were made to withhold things by a justice code, you see. And they were taught to believe these things were bad and then they deteriorated these things, and then they got inventive about what they did wrong with them. And then a law finally got passed to tell them not to do these things.

The Polynesian legal code, for instance: If you were to run a Security Check on a Polynesian under his old taboo system, your Joburg wouldn't apply. That is, at least 50 percent of the Joburg is perfectly legal in Polynesia, but there must be something on the order of a thousand other things that you would consider perfectly ordinary that would be absolute sudden death, "Throw him into the volcano", you see – that kind of thing. "He has walked under a kapok tree." [laughter] "Hmmhmmhmmnhmmnhmm! Hang him!"

So the more – the more minds we get operating on this sort of thing, why, the better off we are. And I – I believe we'll probably be evolving Security Checks up here in the next ten years, easily. I can see it now. Maybe someday somebody'll even find Peter's crimes. He wasn't looking for that. That's a bad thing to pick on him this way.

Okay. Now I think you're – the basics that I know about at the present time, that I think you're grappling with one way or the other, might be pretty well answered at the present moment. Are they? Do you feel you're adrift? Do you feel you're seriously adrift anyplace? Hm?

All right. I have no fault whatsoever with anything you are doing. You might possibly put too much emphasis on picking up data here and too little emphasis on practicing. There is data available here which isn't available generally. And most of that data is – well, Mary Sue, myself, Instructors, that sort of thing – they can give you this data, but the perfection of practice is what we're terribly interested in. Because you will dream up questions, as you try to apply it, which will become burning questions to you, which won't be included in any bulletins anyplace merely because nobody ever dreamed you'd ask these questions. You got the idea?

Nobody would be able to foretell exactly what you would become confused about. And not being able to tell this, of course, you can't write a bulletin. It'd take a bulletin for everybody's blind spot, don't you see? And there's nothing wrong with having a blind spot, but the way to handle a blind spot is to not worry about feeling silly about it – and not jump on Ken one – in answering it the way I did one day. He startled me. Sometimes you get startled.

The criteria is that I am more interested in what you find out is a zone that is unknown to you, in the process of application, and that you get that zone cleared up. Because frankly, there are no unknown zones in Scientology at this particular time.
The only thing that is unknown is a question I always leave up at the top of the scale:
"Are we all one, or are we separate individuals?" That's an unknown zone. But it's an unknown zone in theory only, you see. You get a reality on it. If it's true, it's true. Whichever's true is true, you see. And when you lay down facts and say "Now listen, you. We is all one. We is all – we is all 'Nirvanese', and that's why we is – we'uns is so nervous. And when the great pearly gates of Nirvana open up and we all merge with the infinite ..."

Well, you start laying down stuff like that, and you've obscured truth with your inevitably certain zones that remain unknown. But they are not in the zones of "How do you clear somebody?" They are not in the zones of "How do you apply a process?" They are not in the zones of "What is the basic rationale back of why you do this? Why, for heaven's sakes, do you do this?" Well, believe me, there's probably a darn good reason.

And you might get to wondering about this "Why does – CCH 1 – why don't you run it with both hands?" Well, you've gotten the idea you're trying to clear hands, you see. That isn't your purpose of CCH 1. CCH 1 isn't trying to clear people's hands. If you wanted to flatten CCH 1 for its own sake, and just for itself, you'd have to, of course, bodywise, flatten it on the right hand, flatten it on the left hand, flatten it on both hands. Flatten it on the right foot, flatten it on the left foot, flatten it on both feet. Flatten it on the right ear, flatten it on the left ear, flatten it on ...

[laughter] You have to call a halt on this sort of thing so you might as well call it right up at the front of the parades.

It's very easy to go into superdeveloped, evolving systems of this particular character. It's like the gardener today. Our boy out here that handles stone masonry and bricks and that sort of thing – he came up to me rather worriedly. He had been trying to see me, and the gardener wanted him to start a brick wall which goes from the exit at the back gate there on up the road in front of the garage, see. And he intimated to me he didn't think this was too good an idea, and he didn't really have any good reason why he thought that was a bad idea, but it just seemed to him somehow that that was a poor idea.

Actually, it was a poor idea. Where do you stop? See, you start in running a small brick ledge. Where do you stop? Because if you're going to run it up there ten feet, you've only made it obvious that you had better run it twenty feet. And if you've run it twenty feet, you had better make it up there because it won't match the front of the garage now, you see. So you'd better run it the distance of the garage. But that doesn't go up to the gate up there at the top there, at the top of the side road, so you'd better run it to the side road to make it neat. Yeah. But then this doesn't take in the field there. That field there. That better be bricked up, too. The next thing you know, we're in Manchester. [laughter] Now, we didn't intend to go to Manchester at all! We were ...

You can get strung out this way very easily in research of application. It gets very ridiculous.

Okay. All right. Well, now I hope you have a nice weekend. And I hope everything goes well in any other activities you're taking up. And those that are doing a lot of the auditing here and so forth – hope you get in some sessions on one another over the weekend. And I haven't
looked over your case reports yet for this week because I've got all day and all tomorrow to do it, but apparently you're doing all right.

How do you like, by the way – just as a general question, any one of you who's on Routine 1 and a Security Check, how do you like it? How do you think it's going?

*Female voice: Very good.*

It's going very good? Good. You notice how those new things keep coming up on ... Do new things keep coming up on Security Checks or ... [laughter]? Huh?

*Female voice: I spent twenty-five hours on one.*

Oh, no! Coo! That's rough, man. [laughs] I'd say – I'd say that doesn't just stop the Security Check. I'd say that must have stopped an awful lot of thinkingness someplace or another.

All right. Very good. Well, that's coming along okay.

*Female voice: Yes.*

Do you get new material on it all the time?

*Female voice: Well, what I got, I certainly shouldn't have thought was the answer to the question, but it seemed to answer it.*

You what?

*Female voice: The things that came up didn't seem, analytically, to answer the question, but it seemed to lift the charge off it pretty much though.*

No kidding. Weird. Weird. Something like that'll blow out at the other end of the roof. That's very unusual for something like this to happen.

All right. Those of you who are on Routine 2, how do you think Routine 2 is going?

*Male voice: Great.*

Good. Good.

We haven't got quite as many goals being searched for here at the moment or terminals and so forth being searched for – and I don't want to put a stop to that by a long ways. In addition to doing Security Checks, I guess, start looking for goals. I mean, I don't care what ... [laughter] Interesting combo. It'd be perfectly all right to look for goals while you're being run on Routine 2 by somebody else because you do it all the time anyhow. You're – every day and night you're walking around, you're wondering, "I wonder what my goal in life is?" and so forth. And everybody's always walking up to you, you know, sort of saying – inferring – that they ought to be informed of what your beingness is. You know? What is your name? What is your name, rank and serial number? Who are you? You're answering this question all the time, you know. Every time you've put up the body – is every time you walk in down the hall and walk into a room that somebody else is in, you're answering the question "Who am I?" You got the idea?
I mean, you run this one perpetually in this universe, you see – identification of self, which is terminal finding – And people are always asking you, "Well, what do you really want to do here?" You see? "What are you really trying to do?" or, "How can I help you out?" or, "What don't you understand?" Well, you're actually announcing to them "My goal is ..."

You could look for goals and run Routine 2, but I don't think – and a Joburg. You could probably run Routine 1, a Joburg and look for goals. You could probably run Routine 2 in its entirety and look for goals. You could probably do S... Routine 3 and also get some CCHs run. You probably could combine these things in the most infinite and scrambled fashion, you possibly could. And the only danger you'd get into would be being run by two auditors at the same time on, let us say, Routine 2, you see, and they're both looking for levels and doing general runs on you [laughter] – irrespective of what the other one is doing. But oddly enough, two people could be looking for goals on you and you wouldn't get mixed up.

All right. We've even run two people on one person on the CCHs and not gotten too upset by it. And certainly we already are doing two people on Security Checks on the same person, and nobody's getting mixed up in it.

In other words, you've got a variety of combinations here which are occurring. And you can keep Routine 1, Routine 2 and Routine 3 in very tight compartments and do just those and they are themselves. But also realize that they're sufficiently related that most of them could be done concurrent with the others. Okay?

So have a good weekend. And thank you.

Audience: Thank you.
Okay, this is what, the 19th of June? It was a few minutes ago.

I want to welcome the new students here. I hope that you make it. It's probably doubtful. You see, most people won't put forth the effort to make it. And most everybody has come to us too late. [laughs]

Now that we've got the psychiatric clichés off the line that have been extant for the last few thousand years, let's get down to business.

Now, I usually ask for questions at this period, so are there any questions? Thank you. [laughter] So, what's the question?

Female voice: Which is the senior – or is it known which is senior at the moment – Opening Procedure by Duplication or the duplicate level of the Prehav? And which one will run the other out if it's unflat?

Which is senior: Op Pro by Dup or the duplication level of the Prehav? What's very interesting is when Op Pro by Dup is left unflat, there isn't anything that will flatten it. No thought process will flatten a CCH-type process. And if you've got somebody that Op Pro by Dup isn't flat on, it'd be a good thing to flatten it.

However, the two things are not particularly related, since on the one hand the individual is trying to do a think duplication, you see, and the other he's getting an actual physical CCH duplication.

And you find Op Pro by Dup is pretty marvelous and it's still very extant and many hours should be run on a new student in an Academy. But they usually don't flatten it. And if it bites it bites, and it bites hard and actually should be flattened.

It's quite an interesting rigor. But being a CCH-type process it, of course, falls into the lineup of CCH 1, 2, 3 and 4. If you were going to flatten Op Pro by Dup on a Routine 1, you would simply add it somewhat in the vicinity of CCH 2, making it halfway between CCH 2 and CCH 3. Put it into that lineup, rather than try to flatten it all by itself and it'll flatten faster.
It isn't also necessary to run Op Pro by Dup in just one session. That is not necessarily necessary. It is a good thing to do and it's a good test of an auditor and so on to be able to do so, but it is not a vital thing. If it is unflat, it can be picked up later.

Now, the reason we saw Op Pro by Dup fade out, apparently, between two sessions – in its effectiveness – was usually the rudiments went out. And of course, this is in view of the fact you weren't handling the case with rudiments and that sort of thing. So it appeared to be flat next session when it was not finished biting in the last session you ran. And that's true of all CCHs.

And the best way to get around this is not handle rudiments, but to put it into Routine 1, if you're going to use it. And put it in between CCH 2, CCH 3 and just flatten it as you come around and so on – which, of course, would give you five CCHs in CCH 1.

You'd only do that if somebody'd had some Op Pro by Dup run on them and it wasn't flat and you wished to flatten Op Pro by Dup on somebody you're running CCHs on. Just put it in that slot and carry on with it.

Run it, again, by the rules of the CCHs. Which again, run it only so long as it is producing change and run it as long as it is producing change and cease to run it when it no longer produces change for twenty minutes. That would be the actual proper way to handle the thing.

It's rather been – you see, it was a – it's hung with its own postulate, which is to say, it was developed to get students to duplicate auditing commands. And so, it stayed that way, as a process, ever since. And it's never been added into the routines, but there's where it belongs. Okay?

*Female voice:* Thank you.

You bet.

*Female voice:* Yes, I – I can understand when you assess for a goal and get a terminal; it's quite sufficient just to read through the Prehav levels. But suppose you assess for a long term PTP? Now, suppose you got Mary and her trouble is she can't have an effect on Joe, who has Faith, or something.

Uh-huh.

*Female voice:* Now, if Joe's the terminal, do you want the No Effect, or do you want the Faith?

Now, let's go over this again. Give me that question again.

*Female voice:* Look, suppose you've got Mary whose trouble is ...

Yes.

*Female voice:* ... Joe.

Yes.

*Female voice:* Now, Joe has Faith, but Mary has a No Effect on Joe.

Right.
Female voice: Now, which is the level that – that you're looking for? The Faith or the No Effect?

Oh, you're trying to do a Goals Assessment on a PTP by doing both ends of the PTP. Is that right?

Female voice: Yeah, well, which do you want? Which – which should you go with?

Well, you want the one that falls the hardest.

Female voice: I see, so you ...

You want the most meter reaction. Run by the meter, always.

You would do a real Terminals Assessment, in order to isolate a long-term PTP. That's a real Terminals Assessment, you find both ends of this goal. You assess it. You take the one that falls the hardest, if you were doing a thorough, 100 percent assessment.

And then, you would assess that terminal on the Prehav Scale. And, of course, it is going to fall only on one level of the Prehav Scale. And actually, there's only going to be one terminal that falls hard on this long-term PTP. Okay?

Female voice: Hm-hm. So you wouldn't bother to ask the question. You'd just say – you'd find the terminal was Joe, and you'd just say, "Cause, Failed ... "

That's it. Well, let's – the reason you've got a question, is because you're not looking at, perhaps, a Terminals Assessment as a thoroughgoing thing to do with a long-term PTP.

Now, when you've got a long-term PTP, it isn't up to the auditor to say what the terminal was. It's up to the E-Meter to register it.

And when it's a long-term PTP, you would get the thing stated as to what it exactly was. And then, having gotten this statement – you see, it's sort of a Goals Assessment on difficulty, is what it really is.

You get the same thing as, you say, "Well, just what is your difficulty?" You know? And make a list of the person's difficulties with regard to a certain thing, if you want to just go at it ad nauseam, the final ne plus ultra.

And then, having found that, then you would go ahead and do a Terminals Assessment on this goal just as stated. And you'd get the cause-and-effect end of the difficulty.

Female voice: Mm-hm.

And you'd take those two ends of the difficulty. You would get terminals lists for each one. Then you would get the – by this time, probably, your PTP has disappeared, but you'd – you'd assess the thing down. You'd finally get one terminal that fell on it, and then you would assess that one terminal on your Prehav Scale.

Now, it's very possible I have missed and haven't answered your question.

Female voice: No, you have answered it and that brings up the other thing. Suppose – the two terminals in it – one of them is herself? Now, would you ever assess on self?
Oh. Well, yes. You run into this problem though: "Who is this person?" And you have to assess it on that basis.

And whenever anybody comes up with self as a terminal – you can, of course, run in some kind of a sloppy fashion – you can run O/W on self. As a matter of fact, we just did this afternoon.

We can run almost anything on self. You can get a Dynamic Assessment and find the first dynamic is the only one that falls. All right, well, you can run self. It's sort of a sloppy way to go about it. But that's pre-SOP Goals, you see?

Now that you've got SOP Goals, one of these terminals is self. Now, you would Q-and-A off into the long, far horizon as to "Who is self?" And very often the person's main terminal will fall out of the assessment. Got the idea?

Female voice: Hm-hm.

And you won't be able to get rid of the fall, and you'll find yourself sitting there – I did this identical assessment down in Greece. And the goal the fellow had was so-and-so and so-and-so, and "self". And it was something like he wanted to improve himself. And it fell off the meter and it wouldn't go away and so on. So, this left me with a Terminals Assessment of he wanted to improve himself: You get the circularization here? It's like a closed circuit.

Well, all right, you ask – for the beginning and end, you're asking the same question "Who is he?" and "Who is self?" You see?

But you – I sorted this thing out, and the fellow came up with this preponderous [preposterous?] – well, this actually creaking statement that, well, he didn't know and – and so on. And he got to thinking it over and all of a sudden, his eyes lit up and went round as lighthouses. And he says, "I'm a seeker." And that was what really fell. I got a lot of terminals, but then "I'm a seeker." And this explained, actually, everything this butterfly was doing, you see? He was going around and lighting on all the philosophies he could find, one after the other, you see? And he was a seeker.

It was a very applicable terminal. As far as I – I don't know whether it ever got run or not. I simply assessed him. The other fellow that was in the area was having a great deal of trouble, one way or the other, and I don't think they ever got down to any serious auditing. All he had to do was assess "seeker" on a Prehav Scale and he would have been off like a rocket.

But that was his PTP. That was his basic goal. It wasn't really assessed as a PTP, but his PTP and the basic goal and the difficulties he was having improving himself and all of these things all fell out of the hamper. And his goal fell right in the middle of it.

So you could commonly suspect that one of two things will happen on a present time problem of long duration when assessed just like SOP Goals – arduously, arduously, arduously. And when this is assessed very, very arduously – and by that I mean just a routine, hammer and tongs, down-to-earth SOP Goals Assessment, even though this thing is only a little snivelling PI problem of long duration. You get the idea?

One of two things is going to happen. You're either going to blow it – if it isn't on his terminal line – and never run it. Because it'll blow in the process of locating it.
You just run "What is your problem?" or "What is your difficulty?" or "Explain that difficulty." And that, all by itself, keeps changing, changing, changing, changing. The person's various difficulties start getting as-ised, as-ised, as-ised. And you find yourself chasing all over the south pasture, you see, trying to look at this thing, and through the woods too.

All right, now you've finally got one that does stick, that does fall; he has defined it. Now you get both ends of the terminal on this, the causative and the effect terminal on the thing, and you sort that on down to this PT problem. It's – it's liable to blow.

Or you've got his goals terminal. It's not a waste of time.

One – one of two things will happen: It will cease to exist, or you do have the fellow's goals terminal. Well, you've been assessing for goals all the time, although you've been calling them difficulties. Got the rundown on this?

So there is no difference in the assessment for present time problem of long duration and the assessment of goals, except just this word, one word. You don't ask for goals, you ask for difficulties.

Female voice: Thanks.

And you get that assessed.

Never take the pc's statement and run it. That I've learned the hard way. Don't take the pc's statement that his back is his real difficulty, because you all too often start to assess "back" on the E-Meter and you find out it doesn't live on the E-Meter.

He has been told by his dentist he is having trouble with his back. And he – and actually, he's having trouble with a dentist, not a back. Get the idea? He doesn't know what his troubles are, but you can sort them out. And of course, this is terrific – I mean, this is terrific auditing.

The other day somebody said well, Goals Assessment had been going on for twelve hours. Person had a twelve and a half hour intensive, didn't get changed. And the D of P and the Assoc Sec were totally agreed that it won't – didn't change because they were only doing an assessment.

Hey, come off of it! Come off of it. How – how could you assess somebody for twelve and a half hours without a change? I don't think you could do it.

You'd have to really try, you know? You'd have to get in there and put both feet in the preclear's lap and smoke a cigar, knowing he was allergic to cigar smoke and go out of communication. Connect your E-Meter up to the radiator.

And then – now and then at random intervals, tell the pc that you're in a terrible hurry and you had a train to catch and couldn't possibly, really, finish up the session because you might have to go at any minute. So he was to be prepared for this, you see?

And then run it all by Pavlovian model session. Which is have some dog's saliva, "Here is a circle. Now we'll make you into canned meat." I think that's about the way that goes. Got the idea?
So there would be a tremendous change of case if you did this. And one of those two things will happen if you assessed a present time problem of long duration all the way to its ne plus ultra of an SOP Goals. Man, he wouldn't have a problem left on the track.

That's also, by the way, a method of finding out hidden standards. You see, the lower on the scale and the less prepared a case is before you start finding an assess – a goal and terminal, the lower, the more difficulty you're going to have and the more complications you have to go into to establish the person's goal. You got the idea? In other words, the sooner you do it, you might say, earlier in the case – let's say you took a case that isn't necessarily a low-scale case that must be run on CCHs or Routine 2. But let us say you took this case, felt very uncertain, very queasy, had a lot of present time problems, rudiments were all out, CCHs would bite like mad, all kinds of complications are occurring between sessions, you see? The normal things. Because a person that's having a hard time in life, adds to the hard time they're having in life practically every moment they live outside the auditing room, you see? And it just gets more and more complicated.

And supposing, however, you just took that case and you said, "Well now, we're not going to do it the fast way. We're going to do it the – by SOP Goals."

You see, any one of these three routines can be run on any case. Except a totally unconscious person. Only the CCHs would work on that. But any one of these. It's just a question of how fast.

Well, supposing we said we were going to do an SOP Goals Assessment on this case and we did it the right way, you see? If we did, you'd probably get farther if you started assessing it sort of halfway between difficulties and goals. Because you're going to find this person with hidden standards. And the test of such a case is – whether or not a case should have been run, actually, on the CCHs – is whether the case does have hidden standards. That's a pretty good test. That's a safe test.

Not all cases that have hidden standards should be run on the CCHs, but it's a good test. One of these off-the-bat tests, you see? You say, "Well, I wonder what we ought to run on this person."

"Well, what would have to happen for you to find out that Scientology worked?"

And he says, "Well, my right ear would have to stop burning. Uh and uh, my eh – neighbor would have to get along better with his wife."

And you say, "Are they Scientologists?"

And he says, "No." And "My son would have to stop stealing chickens and uh ..."

Doesn't even have personal goals. I mean, this person – if you audit this person, somebody else gets well. I mean, wow! I mean, the pc's never even in the auditing room. And the fastest progress you'll make will be CCHs, see?

Now let's take a – a flip of the coin. Let's say to this individual, "Have you got any hidden standards about the thing?" Only, we say it in a different way. We say, "What would have to happen in order for you to know Scientology was working on you? What do you want to really have done? What do you want, really, Scientology to fix up in your life?"
And he says, "Well, uh... I don't know, nothing, nothing, no, nothing."

And you'd say, "Well, what do you consult to find out if the last session worked?"

And he says, "My left foot." [laughter]

And you say, "Well, what has to happen to your left foot for a session to work?"

And he says, "Oh, has to stop burning. It burns, you see, all the time and if it – the burning increases then I know the processing didn't work. And if it decreases then I know it did work. And if it just remains the same, why, I know it didn't work." The person says, "You know, it's kind of funny, I nev – hadn't really thought of it that way before. But that's what I test it on."

Well, this person would be an awful good bet for Routine 2. Or CCHs, you see? That's just, a – you know, an off-the-bat; you haven't got the guy's graph, anything of this sort. That – that's a good one for general runs, just starting out with. Why?

Well, actually, you make a little more progress, a little faster and you'll be able to do a faster Goals Assessment when you get around to it. All right. Oh, faster by about a tenth.

Nevertheless, on – on both of these cases you can do an SOP Goals. But on either of these two cases, you would do well to ask for difficulties as well as goals. In other words, particularly on the first one I mentioned that had to have their neighbor grow purple hair in order for him to work – Scientology worked. You'd better ask for difficulties.

You see, the rougher it is for the person to concentrate and the less a person remembers about his life, the harder it is to assess him and the more expertise and the more vias and the more twists you've got to employ in order to assess him for SOP Goals. Now, any auditor that is well trained in the assessment for SOP Goals, and so forth, would – would be able to get around all these humps. It would op – would not operate as an insuperable barrier. You would be able to get over that.

But you – you've got another problem, here. You – you know you've got complications in the lineup. And you know you're going to have to be much brighter and you're going to have to be much more alert. You're going to have to keep your rudiments in much harder. You'll find yourself occupying a tremendous amount of time with PTPs and ARC breaks and things like this in the session. You – you won't get as much goals running done, don't you see? All of these things tend to barrier, which simply stretches out the amount of time necessary.

Yet, frankly my attitude toward SOP Goals is simply monitored by what I have seen auditors doing. It isn't monitored by my own experience.

My own experience is, you take this fellow, his tongue is hanging out, he keeps tripping in it – over it as he comes in the door. His eyes are looking north, east, south and west. He has little spurts of fire come out of his temples occasionally. And he sits down, says he feels very repressed, and all three of him are having trouble. [laughter]

I'm sufficiently insouciant about it all to know that I can assess him on SOP Goals. And practically, at that case level, have done so very successfully, without too much time. So, my attitude on it is just a little bit different than the put-out attitude.
But I have seen people flubbing on this. And I have seen them getting incredible goals. They get impatient with the pc. I'm talking about a relatively untrained person, see? And he gets impatient about it, and he feeds the pc goals. And he puts his own aberrations in there. And he -- he isn't content with the pc's goals, because they don't fit what his goals would be. And I've seen various things like this happening. Well, the best action that can be taken there, rather routinely, is for the person who is auditing them to do them on CCH 1 or CCH 2 and prepare them for assessment. And they would have more success. They would do it more accurately. They'd improve the case more per unit hour of auditing. All of these other considerations enter into the thing.

On the other hand -- on the other hand -- if I were to see that a case, in eighty-nine hundred thousand hours, or whatever poor old Joe said that he had had, in terms of auditing. He spent two hours in the auditing chair for every three hours he committed overts against the organization. And didn't ever seem to add up with him. This boy -- I'd look at this tremendous backlog of auditing, you know? And I would see that nothing much had happened during that period of time. And I would say, "Well, what's the most economical, easiest, surest, surest route on this thing? Heah, let's get the CCHs. Let's break them out."

"Give me that hand."

And now, we'd know we were going someplace. You got the idea?

I suppose I, myself, would do that. But at the same time, I don't doubt my ability to get the present time problem of long duration, the pc's goal, get all the terminals associated with it and get the correct ones out of it. I haven't any doubt about being able to do that, either. And I haven't any doubt about it that, if I hit it right on the button, everything that was wrong with this pc would fold up, too.

You're going on a basis here which has to do with the fact that any of the three routines can be run on any case. It's just what can you have the most luck with, and what do you get the most certainty out of. That's about what that amounts to. Okay?

*Female voice:* Yes, thank you.

You bet. Okay, good enough. Any other questions? Yes?

*Male voice:* How do you measure a Release? How do you test a person and know that they are a Release?

How do you test a person and know that they're a Release? That's very easy. You'd say the first consideration on the thing would be an E-Meter test, if the person is not reading weirdly on the E-Meter. By weirdly, I mean his sensitivity isn't up to 16 and -- in order to get a third-of-a-dial drop. Something like that. Sensitivity is pretty reasonable.

In other words, the tone arm is down. The sensitivity knob would be down to zero. You got about a full-dial or two-dial drop. Something like this.

You got a heavy bang, you see, when the sensitivity is down to zero on a modern Mark IV British meter.

He would have to answer these questions, without getting an E-Meter reaction:
"Do you think you're getting any worse?" or "Do you think you will get any worse?"
"Does Scientology work for you?"

And "How do you feel about help?" without the thing falling off the pin.
"How do you feel about control?" without the thing falling off the pin.

If those considerations occurred and panned out, you for sure would have a Release.

This is, by the way, upgrading the state of Release quite considerably. The state of Re-
lease has always been defined exactly as follows: "Do you think you are getting any worse or
going to continue to get worse or are liable to get worse in the future?"

And the person, with great honesty, could tell you, "No, I don't think I'm going to get
worse now. I think I'll get better from here on." That was a Release.

Now, we have to make the Release testable – testable in HGCs, testable in HCOs. And
so the considerations which I just now gave you would be the considerations that you would
monitor a Release by. There are a tremendous lot of Releases in the world, only nobody ever
bothers to check them out. Answer your question?

Male voice: Yeah.

Good.

Okay. Now, I've got a few things to tell you. There are four new additions to the Pri-
mary Scale. Another Primary Scale will be in your hands shortly.

The only additions that come to a Primary Scale are those things which are actually
hanging up a case, that the case isn't likely to get to on a Secondary Scale very often. In other
words, the determination of what is on a Primary Scale – is a button important enough to stop
any of the advance of a case? You got the idea? Which would not necessarily check across
from the old Primary Scale.

Other consideration is, I don't know that the misemotional scale shouldn't be on the
Primary Scale. I still don't know that. I mean, the standard old Tone Scale of which we are
greatly enamored from a long way back – I think, actually, it belongs on the Primary Scale.
Because I see some people going around in anger. I see some people going around in resent-
ment.

The Clear in – in South Africa there, probably wouldn't have made it if I hadn't taken a
look at her. And I said, "Well, regardless of anything else, run 'resentment' on her in a few
brackets." And it took off. And that was the end of that case hang-up.

This was simply an expressed emotional tone. And because you haven't got these emo-
tional tones on the Primary Scale, you could miss this one. And I went at it half-heartedly and
put shame, blame and regret into the Primary Scale and then took them out and put them un-
der the heading of Misemotion and Emotion.

But I don't know now and probably will put back into the Primary Scale all of the old
standards – you know, shame, blame, regret, grief. You know, the rest of'em – anger and fear,
resentment, antagonism, boredom, enthusiasm.
By the way, did you ever see a needle on enthusiasm? It's quite interesting, the old Tone Scale. That's why it should be in the Primary Scale. You never fail to get a reaction someplace on that lineup. And it doesn't take too long to flatten those things off. But it's quite interesting.

There's another one that might belong on the old Primary Scale, by the way, is "Displease." Apparently, it's a very general button. "Approve" and "Displease" – they – they're apparently very powerful buttons, from way back. All we're doing is culling off of our experience, you see, of about eleven years now – culling back things that, generally would move cases and – though they become the Primary Scale.

You got some interesting things, though, on the old – the old Tone Scale. And one of them is, if you put somebody on the E-Meter – this won't happen with every case, I suppose. This only happened with those cases which I have put on the E-Meter when I happened to think about it and asked them about enthusiasm.

It's almost a rock slam question on almost any case, apparently. I mean, ask them about enthusiasm – their reaction to enthusiasm. I haven't put too many cases on, but I have noticed some odd needle responses to this single thing – enthusiasm.

It isn't the responses you would ordinarily believe should be, to enthusiasm. This is what's shocking about it, you see? This individual, apparently, responds very easily to enthusiasm – but gets a rock slam when you mention it to him, you see? But there are some oddball reactions on the old Tone Scale which, of course, do that.

And naturally, the Tone Scale is a denominator of human behavior. And we now have a great deal of technology on the old Tone Scale, and so forth.

And I don't see, in actual practice, the levels of Emotion and Misemotion leading very many cases off into the old Tone Scale. So it's not a very effective detour, you see. It's – the Tone Scale kind of would be a sub-Primary, not a Secondary, you know? I mean, it's – it falls in that category. Well, the easiest way to get it in there is just put it in the Primary.

I think the Primary Scale could probably get up to about three hundred words without getting too desperately in your hair. I would rather it stayed below a hundred. If you think that this is getting terribly long, it's because you're taking too long – your comm lags are too long on reading the E-Meter.

For instance, Dick was watching me the other night run a Primary Scale assessment and it didn't take very long, did it? I let the pc respond, heavily. I gave the pc ample time to respond. Considered it from all angles. Actually gave the pc time to even have a secondary reaction. And ran a Primary Scale. I think the first run on the thing was probably something on the order of about oh, about 110 seconds for the whole run. And I was doing it slowly. Under two minutes, probably.

You see, if you don't get that needle reaction in a tenth of a second, you haven't got anything. And the more you let your pc talk, the more body motion you have to sort out and the more latent reactions you get. So, apparently the best way to assess, when all is said and done, is the way I was doing it in the first place.
The pc sits down and – you're always doing that to me, making me detour off to something I know works for me. The pc sits down and you say, "Shut up!"

And you aren't talking to the pc anyhow, you're not assessing the pc, you're assessing a reactive bank, don't you see?

And you say, "Now shut up." Oh, you say it politely, of course. You say, "Now, you don't have to answer any of these questions I'm asking you or acknowledge any of these things. Just sit there and pay some attention to what I'm saying and shut up!" [laughter]

And then you go off, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, just reading your levels, at about that speed, you know? Bark, bark, bark. If you haven't got a reaction in a tenth of a second, you aren't going to get one anyhow. What takes you time is, having found a reaction, you have to make a notation on your paper.

Now, you read the whole thing, from the bottom to the top – Faith being at the bottom. And you go on up to the top of the scale and then you've made certain marks. Not "one and one-thousandth divisions fall," or anything like this. You've just made a pencil-touch.

You can use up an awful lot of mimeographed sheets like this, but who cares. I stretch a mimeographed sheet by going it over one time with dots. I'll assess a pc with dots and I'll notice that this sheet is pretty gummy with dots, so the next time I will assess the next pc with circles. Do you see?

When they react on a thing a second time, I put down a – first time, I put down a circle. When they react on the second time, I'll put down a circle. If they react a third time, I'll put down another circle after the level, you see?

And I notice this thing's getting gummy with dots and circles, so now I assess the next one with X's. The test of the sheet is, whether or not I can still read the scale itself. You don't get lost doing this.

So anyhow, you read them just from the bottom to the top. Of course, it's – the scale is arranged backwards, so that's easy to do, Faith being at the bottom. And you go bark, bark, bark. That one reacted so you put a dot. Bark, bark, bark – just reading your levels, you see?

By the way, you look at the sheet and pick up the word and then look at the meter and bark. You got the idea? See? You don't look at the sheet and read the level and then look at the meter to see if you get a reaction. Because, actually, the reactions you want will have probably be gone by the time you looked up.

You look at the sheet, you read the level to yourself and say it at the meter. Don't say it till your eyes are on the needle. It give you an odd sensation the first few times you do it, you know? You feel like you're double-duplicating a something or other, you know?

You read – you read "Faith" to yourself – you see, "Faith" to yourself and then you look at the meter and say "Faith", you know? "Cause." It's like reading elocution lessons to a fast-talker. Anyway, that's the fast way to do it. And don't say the word till you get your eye on the needle. And if it doesn't react within a tenth of a second, you simply read the next one.

If the needle agitates, however, on some secondary or latent reaction or something like that, why, you let it settle down again, which it'll do in a moment or two.
So what you really are doing – let me put this exactly straight. You look at the level, so that you know what level to say. And then you look at the meter, see that the needle is quiet or only rising. Say the level. See if there's a reaction within a tenth of a second. And if there isn't one within three quarters of a second, look back at your paper, pick up the next level and so forth.

And if there is a reaction, you merely touch your pencil to the Prehav sheet that you are using at that point, making a dot, a circle, some other symbol that won't tangle you up.

When you get to the top of the list – remember you're assessing a reactive mind and boy, does a reactive mind react. Why does it react? Well, it reacts because there's no time in it, that's why. There's an electrical charge, but no time. Time is jammed in the reactive mind a hundred percent. All right.

So therefore, wait for a second, you'll get the latent read. You've now got a reading on something else! Now, you go chasing that down and we've just got a case that is going to take seventy-five hours on one Joburg. A seventy-five hour run on one time through on a Joburg. Now what is that auditor doing?

Oh, yes, he's getting all, all kinds of things. And he isn't doing the case any harm. But he also is not following down the center of the road. He's driving over to see the outskirts. And he's looking at the cathedral. And he's looking at the place where the ashman was buried and, that's where the witches were martyred and so on. And he – having a good time going down to the river to see what they're catching down there. And he hasn't anything to do with getting an assessment done. He's running a paid – or an unpaid tour of Irrevelancia, which is a country that auditors sometimes like to explore.

The latent read – the read that occurs within one second, or within three seconds, or within five seconds of after you say anything – whether a Security Check question or a level or a goal or anything else – is a related read. It is not a read on what you have said. It is a related read and it is only related. And no matter how many ways you slice the cake or crumble the cookie, it turns out that you have gone on a self-conducted tour of Irrevelancia.

Oh, it does a case a lot of good. You say, "Have you ever stolen any cats?" And the pc says, "Hmmm..." – clang. You have now read an analytical response. The theft of cats is in the analytical sphere. Why explore it? Since it's explored! This is something like everybody going over the footsteps of Columbus to find out what he discovered, you know? The pc has already been there. There's probably not even much charge on it.

So Irrevelancia would now present this interesting scenery:

"Well, I had an aunt once who stole a cat."

"Oh. Oh, I see."

Now, if you're really in Irrevelancia, even wearing the uniform of the day in Irrevelancia, why you inevitably, of course, ask the next question, which is "Well, that – did that give you any idea that you had stolen any cats?" "What kind of cats were they that your aunt used to steal?" Or better still, "Did you know your aunt very well?" [laughter]
Now you're not on even – you're not even in the State of Irrevelancia. You are over there beyond the border into nothing but Dispersal. And the State of Dispersal is poorly governed at best.

So, here is where you are – here's where you belong, is on that tenth of a second boulevard. And you'll find out, "Did you steal any cats?" ... twitch. "What was that?"

"Well, I had an aunt once that stole some cats."

"Well, what was your aunt's name?"

Now, this is a 75-, 125-hour, one coverage of the Joburg. As compared to this:

"Have you stolen any cats?"

"Have you eaten any bonbons?"

And the pc says, "On the subject of cats ..."

And you say, "Yes, what about cats?" Mustn't go out of two-way comm with your pc. Purely courtesy. "Yeah, what about cats?"

"I just happened to think, I haven't stolen any cats. It was my aunt that stole some cats."

You say, "Thank you. Thank you very much. Now about these bonbons... Good."

"Have you any illicit diamonds bought?" [laughter]

Here we go, see? It's just bang – bang – bang. Wait for the needle to settle. Read the question – bang. Here's the question, question, question.

And you find, all of a sudden, the 199-pound wins are all in your lap. The State of Irrelevancy is not well explored and the State of Dispersal has been totally ignored and left to its own congress and president.

All right? You see how you do these things right? I don't know what got me started on that, but that's – you can get an awful lot of auditing done on instant needle response.

So get these two terms down, because you're going to have to criticize them in students left and right, center – HGC auditors left, right and center. When you see them again – Ds of Ps – sneer!

The person says, "Well, here's this case and he's been twenty-seven and a half hours here on this Joburg."

At that moment you say, "Ow. You're following latent reads, eh?"

Auditor says, "Latent reads? Latent reads? What's a latent read?"

"I don't know. Did you learn to read latent light?" [laughter]

You say, "When that e-meter doesn't react in one-tenth of a second – bap – you leaves it alone. You don't twitch the steering wheel. You go right on down the road. 'Cause it's just a Burmashave sign, I don't think they make it anymore." [laughter]
Latent read – a read that occurs within two to three seconds after the answering the question is nowhere for an auditor. It is nowhere on a goal, it is nowhere on a terminal, it is nowhere on a level. What you want is instant reads. Your pc shuts up, and you read it. You don't have to have the pc answering the auditing question verbally or giving his opinion on how he feels that this assessment at this particular level is going at this time.

Because you're auditing a reactive mind. And that's your proper auditing target. And all auditors using the analytical mind as an auditing target make nobody any better. And there is the primary slow-down in auditing and I found it not very long ago, and that really blew the lid off. All of a sudden we got speed, speed, speed, speed, speed – it isn't that we have to go in a tearing hurry, but this state of irrelevancy is getting so boring to me – if I hear about just one more aunt, you see?

See, I'm not auditing his aunt. I'm auditing the pc. Got it? It's whether he stole any cats, he, it. I don't care while he was being a "what".

Well, a person said, "Well, when I was a ... a street sweeper, in... Athens... well, I sweep up an awful lot of dead bodies of cats, and, ah... so forth... and actually did steal some cats at that time, but while I stole them, I was just being a street sweeper. So of course I was not responsible at the time, for being a street sweeper, so the answer to the question is – no, I myself have never stolen any cats."

I don't know how we made any auditing time up with this one, you see. All we found out is that he's irresponsible for the beingnesses he's being, and we know that all the time, because that's why we're auditing him. [laughter]

So there is your – there is your line-up. Got it?

Okay, when he can take full responsibility for as a street sweeper in Athens, he not only remembers having been a street sweeper in Athens, but he takes responsibility for the deeds of the street sweeper in Athens, and that's why your Security Checks pan out and he gets stronger and stronger and better and better, and the person has more and more withholds and so forth – and you see all this phenomena I'm talking about, of fast responses, when you do by instant read. And you never see it when you do by latent read.

So it all looks very silly, you see, if you say, "Well, we're getting marvelous gains these days", it sounds like an advertising agency, you see. You will not ever gonna get any if you go on latent reads. It's just gonna cut them all out.

When you ask this pc this security question or this assessment, you are asking in present time, right now, whether this pc's reactive mind does or does not have charge in it on the subject of, which means he's come up to the borderline of being able almost to take responsibility for it himself. And it'll blow [claps] like that, and it'll blow [claps] like that.

And those which are so buried that he doesn't even remember them and he can't dig them up are latent reads. The instantaneousness of it says, "This apple is about to be plucked. Stand away from underneath this tree. We is about to have a shower."
When you say – when you say, "Have you ever stolen any cats?", and it's just pang right there, bing!, you see? Instant response. The pc can find out about that right now and tell you right now or not tell you right now.

Now, a consistent and continual instant read taking place within about a tenth of a second after the question – the pc knows about this. He and his reactive mind are now occupying exactly the same strata. The more he withholds, the more knowingness which he denies the human race, people around him and himself, the more stupid he's going to get and the more reactive he's going to become.

That is why you run sec checks. So this individual will get better to the degree that you pluck the instant reads, and he will hang-fire to the degree that you pluck the latent reads, and that's all there is to it. Then you're auditing straight at his reactive mind, you're picking up what is in his reactive mind, your e-meter is behaving exactly right, all the rules of auditing fall exactly into place, and everything goes off at a startled zoom!

IF YOU DON'T DO THAT – POOH. IT IS MONKEYING AROUND. THIS IS OF COURSE ABOVE AND BEYOND KNOWING WHICH IS THE TONE ARM. YOU TALK TO SOMEBODY ABOUT INSTANT READS AND LATENT READS, AND HE'S ALL THE TIME SAYING, ... [FUMBLES WITH THE E-METER]... [LAUGHTER] "MAKER'S NAME, MADE BY INSTRUMENT, TAKE A LOOK WHO THEY ARE. WHAT IS THIS THING? WHY, IT'S AN ASH-TRAY." YOU TALK TO HIM ABOUT THE E-METER WHEN HE HASN'T GOT HIS TR 0 FLAT. SO HE'S TRYING TO CONFESS THE PC, BUT HE CAN'T CONFESS THE PC, SO HE CAN'T READ THE E-METER, "WHAT'S THIS?", HE'S DISTRACTED, "E-METER?", DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THE E-METER, [FUMBLES WITH THE E-METER]... HE'S GONE MAD, YOU'VE GIVEN HIM TWO THINGS TO DO, EITHER ONE OF WHICH HE CAN DO, AND IF YOU THEN CAME IN ON TOP OF THEM AND SAID, "LISTEN HERE. IF I CATCH YOU READING ANY LATENT READS, I WILL BE VERY UPSET WITH YOU, SO DON'T FOLLOW DOWN LATENT READS." AND HE SAYS, "LATENT... LATENT READS." [LAUGHTER]

ON WHAT? ON WHAT? SO THERE'S OTHER THINGS YOU HAVE TO KNOW BEFORE YOU CAN FAST-READ AN E-METER.

NOW, THE OTHER THING IS YOUR, YOUR RESPONSE TO THE PC AND YOUR WILLINGNESS TO Q AND A, THIS IS THE OTHER SLOWDOWN. YOUR WILLINGNESS TO Q AND A, YOUR WILLINGNESS TO INVESTIGATE THE FISH THAT ARE NOW JUMPING DOWN BY THE STREAM UNDER THE BRIDGE THAT IS 12 MILES OFF YOUR COURSE. AND THE PC AT THIS MOMENT SAYS, "THERE ARE SOME HERRINGS JUMPING UNDER THE BRIDGE, AND WOULDN'T YOU LIKE TO SEE THESE HERRINGS, BECAUSE IT'S GETTING AWFULLY UNCOMFORTABLE WHERE I'M SITTING HERE. AND IF YOU ARE GOING AT THIS WITH THIS TOO MUCH VELOCITY, MAN, YOU'RE LIABLE TO CLEAR ME OR SOMETHING, YOU KNOW?"

YOU SAY, "HAVE YOU EVER STOLEN ANY CATS?", AND THE PC SAYS, "... ER... UM... SEE, I'VE GOT A BAD PAIN IN MY SHOULD – HAVING THIS PRESENT TIME PROBLEM – I HAD THIS PRESENT TIME PROBLEM FOR SOME TIME NOW DURING THE SESSION, AND ER... SO THERE'S ALL THESE HERRINGS UNDER THE BRIDGE, YOU KNOW?"

AND YOU SAY TO HIM, "HEY, ER... THAT WAS A PRETTY FISH, I'M SORT OF TIRED OF SITTING HERE AUDITING, TOO", AS THE UNDERSTOOD SITUATION, YOU SEE, AND YOU SAY, "WHAT COLOR ARE THESE HERRING?" AND "HOW LONG HAVE YOU HAD THIS... SHOULDER?" [LAUGHTER]

"WELL, MY... I HAD... EVER SINCE MY FATHER HAD A BAD SHOULDER, I'VE HAD IT EVER SINCE... MY FATHER, ACTUALLY, I HIT HIM ONE TIME ON THE SHOULDER WITH A STICK, AND I'VE HAD THIS BAD SHOULDER..." BOY, THE GUY IS SAYING "BOY, I REALLY GOT HIM OVER THE HILLS AND FAR AWAY NOW. IF I CAN JUST SHOW HIM A FEW MORE FISH UNDERNEATH THIS BRIDGE, WE'LL SIT HERE A-A-ALL DAY!"

And an auditor is, actually, tremendously respected by a pc if he simply says, "Well, very good. How's that seem to you? All right. Is it all right if we go on with the session?"
"Yes. Well, I ... it's all right."

"Now, have you any illicit diamonds bought?" Obviously expecting this, you see?

*Boom!*

"Yeah, I was head of the ring for twelve years."

Now, you're getting auditing done, don't you see?

Every valence fights for survival. The pc can do nothing but survive. The valence can perish. And so, learneth and runneth the lesson of lifeth. And whenever you have anything struggling for survival, it is not the pc. It is the valence.

So, you have somebody saying, "Put me down, put me down, put me down. Because, if you – if you just ask two more questions, I'm getting off ... And – and this pain um – and the head, y – is – ah – uh – gosh! Uh, you know? And – and uh, so forth and I just don't want ...

And when you get all these things, you couldn't possibly be looking at the pc. That's all there is to it. You're seeing a struggle for survival of aberration. Because nobody can stay around us very long without finding that willy-nilly, they do get better. And if they don't easily learn this lesson, why, it's just a valence struggling one way or the other.

I'm not now trying to give us anything that's self-congratulatory or an easy way out. We don't need any alibis. But where we see the red herrings being pitched, the pc is very often doing it against his will. And is saying to himself, "I really shouldn't be doing this to this auditor."

But if the pc is a very clever pc and he is a very smart pc and this valence that he is wearing is notably well educated into the roads and byroads – in fact wrote the guidebook; wrote the guidebook for the State of Dispersal – he will take advantage of his auditor.

And sometimes he does it so persuasively and so convincingly that anybody is sidetracked. And it looks so good. And from the moment that this occurs, on through, you don't get any auditing done. And it's just a waste of time, even though it seems like something's going on.

And there's where your Releases and Clears are going. It's just on that one basis. And on that one basis only. The auditor is being taken advantage of by a reactive valence which is struggling for survival.

Now, there is a very interesting thing about auditing: is you must keep the reactive valence quiet enough and give it no motivators by which it can object. That is the rest of the game. And the Auditor's Code is totally devoted to keeping the valence unwarned, giving it no motivators, so that its survival does not feel challenged. You got it?

And if you do that, all of a sudden the fellow says, "What am I doing sitting here wearing this trash heap? That's an interesting thing to be wearing! How fascinating. By golly, I've gone along for the last several million years wearing a trash heap and everybody said it was a Paris hat." [laughs]
So, here's the conflict that is going on all the time. It looks so very funny, but actually the pc gets most upset by the auditor's failure to take care of – bulldoze through the case. And that is where a pc's real upset with an auditor occurs. It's something to remember. If you're going to get a pc that's going to be ARC breaky, it is because the pc has lost confidence.

In other words, the valence sat up and said, "Red herrings, red herrings, red herrings. Look under the bridge, look under the bridge," and the auditor looked under the bridge.

And the pc says, "Oh, God, am I going to spend another eight hundred trillion years in this ash heap?" See? And that's the ARC break.

You watch it. The auditor fails to push the pc through something. And then, you just watch that pc for the next few sessions. And it may take him a few sessions to become unmanageable, but he will.

Why don't I get in more trouble with pcs? When I audit pcs who are recalcitrant – I don't advise you to do this sort of thing, but the pc blew the session and was en route to the door – did you ever see one of these adagio dances? Well, I didn't bother to get out of my chair. I just reached up, grabbed the pc, whirled the pc around once. The pc went back in the chair, crash. And I repeated the auditing question and never mentioned the incident.

The pc went square into session again, answered the question and we went on as before and we didn't hear any more talk about blowing. And quite in addition to that, the pc made a real gain in that session.

I didn't even say, "Hey, you, come back here." I didn't even validate the valence that much, you see? I just reached out with my right hand, grabbed the pc, spun the pc around once and sat her back in the chair – boom! And I repeated the auditing question. Wasn't even any misemotion involved with it. And the valence sort of said, "Well, send for the stonecutters. I's gonna need a tomb. I has met mah match." And that was it.

But supposing I had let the pc get out the door. The pc would have been mad at me from there on. Because I pulled an ARC break? No, because there was no ARC break. Nothing caused this but my insistence that the pc answer an auditing command, which was highly uncomfortable. I wasn't even insisting. I just gave the pc the auditing command.

The auditing command was very uncomfortable and the pc said, "Nyah-nyah-nyah-yap-yap-yap-yap." And I said, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

And the pc flung herself out of the chair, went to the door, found herself back in the chair again. I repeated the auditing command. The pc answered it. And the session went on and all was beautiful. And there was no three hours and seventy-five minutes devoted to clearing up the ARC break with the pc.

I cleared the ARC break up with the pc by giving the next auditing question, by showing that as an auditor I was perfectly willing to handle the situation and take responsibility for my environment and see that the pc got some auditing. And that was what I was there for and that's what I did, see? Without any apologies.
And you'll find out, this approach to auditing has a certain deadly certitude about it which penetrates through the most knuckleheaded valences, but which must never happen with any misemotion. It's just positiveness. It's just certainty. You want the pc to do that. You are certain the pc is going to do that. And when the pc does that and the pc makes a gain, the valence loses.

And when you don't approach it with certainty and when you don't approach it with — well, you sort of approach it nebulously and, "I'm going to patch it all up. And I'm going to be very, very careful here. And I — I hope I didn't offend you terribly by — by throwing you halfway across the room while you were trying to get away under 8-C. And — and I — I hope not and — and so — so forth ..." You're "kinding" the pc to death.

And you're just patting that valence on the head and saying, "Good valence, you're dangerous. Good valence, you're dangerous. You know, I think you really should survive, valence, because you're so dangerous. And it's very difficult, you know, to handle you, valence. And you're very, very difficult to handle."

And I never believed this. So the valence never gets a chance to believe it. The valence says, "Well, I've had it!" And the pc says, "Well, thank God!" It's just a difference of auditing certainty.

And you'll find this instant-readed approach boosts up that appearance of certainty. And the valence sits up and says, "Oh, no! Here I've been out of this bottle for eighteen trillion years and nobody's found me out yet. And here is a guy and there — he just keeps sawing away chunks of smoke. Do you suppose this fellow I have overwhumped here, totally and one hundred percent, is actually going to get away from me? Hmm!" Valence ceases to activate.

The more you audit apologetically, the more weakly, the less certainly you audit, the more you validate the pc's circuits and their power. And if you know what you are doing, if you know your business, you don't have to be rough and tough. It simply communicates to the pc, while you are auditing the pc, in terms of certainty. And when that certainty goes through, it goes straight through to the pc. And the valences he's got and all this nonsense — they're just invalidated like mad. You're trying to validate the pc and invalidate the valences. And that's all there is to good auditing.

I've seen occasionally, in an ACC, I all of a sudden will get very enthusiastic. And I'll go around and hit all the auditors in the back of the head, practically — you've seen me do it — and say, "Go on in there. Go on in there. Ask him now and don't pay any attention to that. Just ride that thing through. Come on," and that sort of thing.

And the auditors sit up and start to audit for blood, you know? Just real, dripping gore. They — they want raw meat. And the valences all say, "Well, we've been sitting here getting away with this — God! Look what's happen — uhngh!"

And they just start running up little dirty handkerchiefs, you see, as white flags and so forth. And you don't even pay any attention to that. Don't even let them surrender. Just blow the fort apart. It's very unnerving to a valence.
And all of a sudden we've got tremendous case changes. We just get a tremendous re-
surge of cases and so forth, as long as we persuade through that attitude of auditing. "Go to it, terrier! We know it's a long deep hole, but you can make it."

And all of a sudden, the auditor sits right there, you see, and the pc's been saying, "Well, that's – these chairs are awfully hard and the cats are crawling all over the roof. And you keep answering – asking these embarrassing questions," and all of this sort of thing.

And the auditor keeps saying, "Well, I'm awfully sorry, but you see, I'm being made to do it. And I'm not taking any real responsibility for the session here, because they're forcing me to do it. And the Instructor is really auditing you. I am not."

No gains occur. Why? Because the whole thing is devoted to the validation of a false valence which is interested in survival. Okay?

All right. There being no other questions before the house, I think we had better ab-
scend. Thank you very much.
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Thank you.
Give her the applause, she's doing all the work! I don't know how she does it. I think she's got you all fooled.

I've seen her tremendously popular. I've seen her step up on a congress stage and I didn't think anybody on the whole continent had ever heard of her, you know. And, you know, for the local Assoc Sec everybody applauds, you know, a little bit. And everybody applauds, and applauds for the others. And all of a sudden, you introduce Mary Sue, and the chandeliers jump! You know? I don't know how she does it.

I'm sure that being a very excellent D of P, always getting results, all that sort of thing – I don't think that has much to do with it.

It's the prevailing opinion in most Central Organizations and Scientology areas, current moment, that getting tremendous results and big wins has nothing to do with administration or income or keeping the show on the road or doing anything about the world. And this we are trying to change. And one of the things this Saint Hill Course is devoted to is trying to change just that. Okay?

Now, let's see. This – when I last looked – it might have changed since I came down here – but it was the 20th of June when I was upstairs, and it was 1961. But looking around here, I see that it isn't 1961, in a couple of cases.

Now, I see a note here, that a question has been asked sufficiently of Mary Sue, that she wants this answered by me in this briefing lineup.

She says, "When doing ..." – I haven't read this in advance. "When doing a Security Check, don't just keep repeating the same question, allowing the person to say, 'I don't know.' Vary questions, so as to give the pc a hand, returning always, of course, to your original question in the Security Check."

Oh, man! This is a wide-open invitation to a Q and A, like I was talking to you about the other day. And every time auditors get turned loose on varying the question, a tremendous amount of randomness enters into auditing. And tremendous auditing failures occur, madly, in all directions.
So, when I tell you that this is something you have to know very well – the difference between varying a question, and Q-and-Aing with the pc.

Now, if you can get that down, you can really do a red-hot Security Check. But let me tell you, that this has been a very difficult point to get across.

Now, I'll give you – try to give you a couple of examples, here, off the bat, that are like this:

Auditor: "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

Pc: "Well, I don't know."

Auditor (having seen a reaction on the meter): "Well, do you know anybody that has stolen any cats?"

The pc says, "Yes, my aunt once stole some cats."

The auditor: "What was her name?"

Now, that is a Q and A. In the first place, who does it ... what does it matter who else stole some cats? We're not auditing his aunt. Well, we couldn't care about this. This is not a varied question.

The next point is, that is a direct Q and A. Now, a Q and A is defined, this way. The reason it exists – it is question and answer. But there is a technical fact that the perfect answer to any question is the question. It is colloquially used.

This is the Philadelphia Congress of 1953 – Philadelphia Congress, fall 1953 took this up, completely, and it's never been mentioned since.

It is an oddity, and a perfectly worthwhile one to know, that the perfect answer to any question, of course, is the question. Therefore, when the question is phrased exactly right, it answers itself. This is the engineer's version of this.

There's a fellow by the name of "Ninety-nine Percent Johnson" at MIT, and every student from time immemorial called the man "Ninety-nine Percent." I don't know that he ever knew this. But he was fond of saying, "The question which is asked right is already 99 percent answered."

And this is very true. You can take an engineering problem, or any other kind of problem, or a human problem (if there's any vast difference), and if you can ask the right question – the exact question – it's already practically answered.

You're trying to lay out, let us say, the location of serving equipment or something, in a hotel kitchen. And you keep pushing escalators and dumb waiters and so forth around on your drawing paper, you see. "And you get this and so on." And you finally wake up and say, "Well, what the hell am I doing here?" You know?

This is all a good thing to do, sooner or later, after you've been working on some problem, it hasn't solved itself in a few hours or days. "Why, what am I doing? Just what am I doing?" And that is an awfully good question.
And you suddenly wake up to the fact that what you have been doing is arranging machinery. But what you are really doing is trying – trying to arrange serving equipment in a hotel kitchen.

And you say, "Well, what am I doing?" you see. And the answer is "What am I trying to arrange?" or "What am I trying to get accomplished?" And these questions are different questions.

And you all of a sudden say, "Well. Ah, yes! I'm trying to get food." I'm not fooling with an engineering dra – .

This is why there's very few good layout engineers, or very few good design engineers. A country's mechanical progress goes along as fast as it gets good design engineers, by the way. And they're, accidentally, only as fast as or only as good as they are able to ask questions of themselves or their work or the world at large.

And a smart one will go down – after he's worked with this for a long time and he can't seem to get all his pantry equipment in straight – he's liable to get the actually brilliant idea of going down and finding the man who's going to use it, and asking him, "What do you try to do in a kitchen?" you see? "In getting – what are – what are you trying to do in a kitchen?"

And the fellow gives him this terrific, revelatory answer, you see? Which is, "Well, we're preparing food for the guests."

"Huuuu..." [laughter] That's a new one, see? "Aw, then, all of this stuff I've been fooling with on the drawing board ... You mean, I'm trying to get food from the kitchen to – how many rooms? How many dining rooms?"

"Well, there's eight private dining rooms. There's the staff dining room. There's the main dining room for hotel guests. There's a public dining room. And all the food comes from this one galley – this one kitchen here. And it all goes ..."

The guy says, "Yeah! Now, let's see. You're trying to get food there. What condition must the food be in when it arrives?"

"Well..." The guy says, "Well, it must be hot. It must be still crisp. It must be this, it must be that. It must be easily identified", [laughter] "...and it must be very rapid. And there must be a place, down here, for the cooks to get orders, to put it together and throw it up onto things, and then it can be recovered and shunted ..."

"Oh," the fellow says, "what you need is a – an IBM sorting system."

The fellow says, "An IBM sorting system in a hotel kitchen? What are you talking about?"

And the dining engineer says, "That's what you need. That's what you're going to get, too."

And then so all of a sudden, mysteriously, at the Conrad – the Conrad Filcher, new hotel in Glasgow – which never before has it ever happened that anybody in the dining room ever got anything to eat – all of a sudden, this starts occurring. And everybody gets very
happy all up and down the lines, and so forth. Why? ’Cause somebody asked the right question. That's all.

Well, old Ninety-nine Percent Johnson – he claimed that if you phrased the question that you were asking exactly right, that it was instantly answerable, see? Well, theoretically, the 100 percent – not the 99 but the 100 percent answer to "How is the weather today?" is "How is the weather today?"

See, that's a perfect duplication on the cause-distance-effect communication line in Scientology, see? So, "How is the weather today?" – "How is the weather today?" Now that's the 100 percent.

What you're trying to do is come as close to the 100 percent as you can. You want this withhold. So it's "What am I trying to do? I'm trying to get the not-knows that this character is running on the world off of the case, so that he'll brighten up and get on the run." See, "What am I doing here?" That's the first thing you've got to ask yourself.

Now, that you know – I told you just the other day – this is why you are giving a Security Check. Not to be nosy, not to make people feel embarrassed, and not because Ron said so, see, but actually, to get the characters to release these tremendous overts of not-knowingness, because it's got them parked in total stupidity. You're not running failed withhold on the pc. You are running overts called "Keep 'em stupid." Got it?

Now, when he stole something, it disappeared and its owner couldn't find it. And a tremendous not-know was entered into the owner's sphere of livingness, right? It's an overt. To hell with whether or not mest passed. That is the basic overt.

So when you make these things known and scrape them out of the pc's reactive bank and get them up into his zone of knowingness, you raise, of course, his intelligence. Therefore, you raise his knowingness. Therefore, his responsibility comes up enormously, right?

Processing, in general, raises his responsibility and throws these not-knowingnesses into restimulation. And unless they are released or vented, then the pc does not make any further progress. And the fastest way in the world to stop a pc's progress is to do a lousy Security Check.

Now, you can audit with your finger just exactly, properly, correctly held in holding the E-Meter. You can say all the right incantations and rituals. You can have incense in your electrodes, swinging from right to left in a rhythmic way. You can do your auditing with the proper Latin chant going in the background.

No matter how good this auditing is, no matter how expertly you have assessed your pc, no matter how minutely you have followed through the auditing command and cleared each one, no matter how well you've gotten the rudiments off; you are still going to run into this one: You're going to get that case along just a few yards up the line, and you've increased his responsibility to a point where his overts now hurt.

These withholds, these not-knowingness overts now hurt. Because you're increasing his knowingness, so therefore they're being revealed to him. And they're not-knowingnesses,
and he cannot vent these things, and he can't get rid of it. And that not-knowingness just stays like a cyst in his mind. See, his case progress stops right there. Boom.

This makes another method of stopping case progress.

One of those methods is to audit with a rudiment out. The way you can deteriorate a case is to audit with an ARC break in existence. A case will deteriorate with the ARC break. A present time problem? The case will not change. With a withhold on, the case will not change.

And by failing to give expertly administered Security Checks at routine and regular intervals throughout processing, you stop the overall progress of the case, just as though you had let him run into the bumpers on the end of a train track.

He's going to get unhappy. And the better you audit from there on, the unhappier he's going to get. Why? Because auditing begins to hurt. So he all of a sudden realizes that it wasn't a smart thing to do to jilt these nine girls in high school, that he really upset them. That years afterwards, actually, he found out that he'd made a tramp out of a couple of them, you know? And this was not smart.

You're auditing away on the "Failed Sneeze." And he all of a sudden goes, "...Uuuuuh." You're asking this boy to confront his life, aren't you?

Well, the reason he didn't ever get well in the past, automatically, was because it was too painful to take responsibility for the things he had done. It hurt. So he'd take his theetie-weetie, Dale Carnegie Dramamine pills, and get to feeling a little bit better. And he'd go thumm!

This, by the way, is the manic-depressive. He feels wonderful until he suddenly realizes he has an overt. So he feels lousy. Then he recovers from this, and then he feels wonderful till he realizes this same overt again. Well, it just will keep going in the same stupid, dizzy cycle, on and and on and on. It'll never release.

So when Scientology got hot and its case advances got rapid, all of a sudden this new factor showed up. And it was a brand-new factor: that cases exceeded – could be made to exceed, through auditing, their ability to tolerate their improved condition, and what you had to do was let the steam off. And the mechanism to let the steam off – that was absolutely necessary in this particular case – was what we're calling Security Checks, more properly called processing checks.

And unless those are given well, wow! You're just going to park a case. And your rudiments can be out, and you won't get gains on the case. You can have a wrong assessment – that'd really be a nice way to get no gain on a case. And you can fail to give Security Checks properly and, man, then you'll get no gain on a case, beyond a certain zone.

Why does this fellow's leg hurt? You audit it, it feels better, and then the next day it hurts. Why? Well, you audited it up to a point where he could recognize his responsibility for it, and then you didn't give him any chance to come off of it. Isn't this cute? Isn't that fascinating?
About the cruelest thing you could do to a case would be leave its withholds on it, for any reason under the sun, not to clean up this case's withholds.

Now, we found that auditors don't do well when they're just turned loose to ask, "Do you have any withholds? Thank you. Do you have any withholds? Thank you. Do you have any withholds? Thank you. Do you have any withholds? Thank you." They don't do well this way. So you have a Security Check that particularizes all types of withholds.

As a matter of fact, there are some new Security Checks. We were dreaming them up the other day. I said there could be Security Checks. Jan got real busy, Dick got real busy, and man, they really whipped you up some Security Checks. There's some staff member Security Checks, there's an HGC pc Security Check, Academy student Security Check. The staff member Security Check isn't being yet, but the others are.

Now, that's just particularized types of withholds that would be – if any of them were out – it's like rudiments – if any of those were live, the case would only do so much advance and then stop advancing. Unless that withhold is gotten off, in other words, the case is going to stop in its advance, right there. Screaming brakes – boom! Do you see this?

Why? Because the auditing increases his ability to take responsibility. His ability to take responsibility blows into view the withholds!

As soon as the withhold comes into view to him, if he has no chance to impart this withhold, oh, he's miserable! So of course, he says, "I'd feel better if I were aberrated." And he's absolutely right. He'd feel much better being stupid and aberrated and president. You got the idea? I mean, he halts his own forward progress.

And there's the primary reason why you had Clear slumps. That's the reason for your Clear slumps, not the guy postulating himself into the ground. He ran into his own bank. He had to confront it all at once. And gradually, as time went on... I said there was a settling out period for a Clear? Well, if any time during that settling out period he all of a sudden found himself confronted with the tremendous irresponsibilities of his own background, and it became too painful, he said, "I better be aberrated."

Absence of Security Check, then, is the most effective way of halting a rapid case gain toward Clear. Have you got that? This was a bug.

We used to have another mechanism, and actually have had for seven years another mechanism, which we used rather constantly. And we don't find it in our midst right now. We used to do this with a responsibility process of one version or another – Confront or Responsibility. You got it?

We used to accomplish, less ably, the same mechanism. Unless you ran responsibility on an engram, we used to say, why, it wouldn't stay stably gone. Okay? You remember that? All right. Well, now that was the same mechanism at work there, but not well articulated, not well understood, and so forth. Now, we've got another mechanism that supplants that and that does it a thousand times better. So, you've got to learn how to use that ably.

But just as the pc does not clear up well on "Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a
withhold? Thank you. Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a with..." You know you can run him for a week and a half on that process with no difficulties whatsoever? They did it on the 22nd American, didn't you? And it didn't arrive anywhere. All right, why?

Well, the pc is trying to avoid all of his withholds. And if the auditor can't remember all of the viciousness of man all the time, you then don't get any interrogation which results in a release of the exact withholds the pc is withholding. So this is fast! Presession 37 went back to the oxcart. You know? We relegated it to the Metropolitan Museum.

I heard from them today, by the way, or yesterday. And I find out, they have all the art objects of any kind that they will ever need, and know all there is to know about the whole track.

And I'm on an awful withhold today from the Metropolitan Museum. On two or three occasions, I've been doing work with Scientology organizations and other things – sitting up at my desk, talking to Peter, doing other things. And it's a terrible temptation to write them and say, "Congratulations." You know? "Congratulations upon the abundance and finality of all of your collections."

How I'd come to hear from this, I'd asked them an embarrassing question or two, and I found out that they don't need anything in their museum. Nothing. They've got everything.

I wasn't trying to give them anything I was – I thought that there was a possibility that there was a place they might get something. And we find out they have everything they want.

I think that's pretty good, isn't it? It's like some self-satisfied pc. And you'll get this self-satisfied pc that doesn't want to improve. Well, why doesn't he want to improve? Because it might be painful, and something might show up.

You would have to audit the curators – combined and collected – of the Metropolitan Museum, and get off their whole track overts, before they would accept the specimens that they ought to have in the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York City. Because it shows up grandly that these characters are restimulated by the crown jewels of Ophir. Because they, of course, stole them once. That's why they're there. They're now in the valence of the brass watchdog they used to have on them. [laughter]

But any more collection would lead to more knowingness. And more knowingness to these characters – because of the peculiarity of their position – might be painful. So we have whole societies becoming very self-satisfied about what they know. They know all there is to know about everything. That is a mechanism.

"Let's not run into the pain of having taken responsibility for what we've done. If we knew that, it would be painful. So therefore, if we know more, it might be possible that we would come to know that, too. And if we came to know that, then that would be very painful.

"So we'd better keep telling everybody, 'Well, psychology, that's – ha-haha-ha-heh-heh – that ... that's ... that's the kind of a science we want – ha-ha-heh-heh! Doesn't reveal anything. Ugh-ugh. Yeah, that's what we want. Nice, nice, stupid sort of thing, you know? And the more stupid the people we can get in it, why, the happier we'll all be."
That's true, too! The crazier they'll all stay! That's true, too. And the crazier they'll get. That's true, too.

So pcs play this game on you just like societies do. And you'll find the pc sitting there – Dianetics 1950. That was enough for him, that was it. He's got it. Doesn't care to know anything since. Doesn't care to know anything since. That's it. Why?

It might be painful if he found out his own overts. If he knew a little bit more about the mind, he might find out about overts. And so, you had something on the order of a third to a half of the people who were interested in Dianetics 1950, and so forth, very content to stick with that level of it. And not at all willing to advance up into Scientology. Do you remember that as a phenomenon in the States? It was interesting, wasn't it?

Male voice: Yes.

All right, that's the mustn't-know-any-more factor.

Now, the mustn't-gain-any-more factor and the mustn't-know-any-more factor is something that you, as an auditor, can Q-and-A with the pc with. If you yourself aren't getting auditing and getting off your withholds, then you're liable to get into a situation where if this pc found out more, it'd be very painful. So the kind thing to do is not to do anything else but just say the process. Let's do the minimum; let's do the minimum.

So, when we ask, "Have you ever stolen any cats?" the pc gets a fall on the meter and it says, "I don't know." Do the minimum.

The minimum is "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

And the pc says, "I don't know."

And so you do the minimum. And you say, "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

Believe me, you're just going to get nowhere from there on. That is the slow way to go about it. But you've found a nice eddy from the mainstream of life. And you can sit there, under the banks, with the willow trees full of pigeons. And use it as a repetitive question.

The Security Check is not a repetitive question process! It's not!

Now, because you might Q-and-A, your Instructors don't get enthusiastic about turning auditors loose with this.

So we get the "Have you ever stolen any cats?" – fall.

"What was that?"

"Well, uh ... hmm ... Uh, no, no, no."

"Well, have you ever stolen any cats?"

See, that's the extreme one. "I don't know."

"Have you ever stolen any cats?" Repetitive question.

All right, now here's the next version: "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

This is a Q and A.
"I don't know."

"Well, what was that fall?"

"Uh, well uh ... hmm, I don't know."

"Uh, well, has your ... has ... do you know anybody that has ever stolen any cats?"

The pc says, "Oh, yes, my aunt stole some cats."

"Now, well, uh, what was your aunt's name?"

Now, of course, this is the same mechanism as the repetitive question.

This again, blocks any further knowing on this line, which we all know will be painful. But in a Security Check this is the only way to take the pain off. The only way you can reduce the pain, of this additional knowingness is give a decent Security Check. So the Q and A is... is well... is poorly situated.

So what do we get here? "Have you ever stolen any cats? What is your aunt's name? Where did she live? Do you remember what she used to wear? Have you got a picture of your aunt there? Uh, do you have a picture of the house? How long did you live with your aunt? Do you have any of the illnesses your aunt had?"

That is a mechanism of denying further knowledge. Because you don't get any more knowledge on the subject of has the pc ever stolen any cats? And that's all you want to find out.

So now, here is a non-Q-and-A, knowledgeable, advance version of this. And here's – here's – here's the way it'd go:

"Have you ever stolen any cats?"

Pc (gets a fall) says, "I don't know."

And you say, "Well, what was the fall?"

And the pc says, "Well, I don't know, because I have never stolen any cats."

All right, now there's a dozen things you can do. But they all have to do with the direct and immediate question of the cats and the pc having stolen them. Not his aunts, cousins, sisters or the moon.

Now, the way to illuminate this, the first rule – don't try to do this by rules. But a rule, that goes back of this is compartment the question. That's one of the nice, handy, good things to do with any security question.

You're asking somebody, "Have you ever – have you ever been in DC before?" The pc falls off the pin. And you say, "Well, when was that that you were there before?" And you don't get a reaction. And it's all very mysterious and gets very confused.

DC were the initials of Davy Crockett. The pc is in full restim on this. So whenever you say "DC" to the pc, you mean Washington, DC, and he means Davy Crockett. And believe me, you're not getting anywhere.

All right. So you ask the question, something of this order:
"Have you ever stolen," (no reaction) "any cats?" (reaction)

"Well, what gives with you and cats? Have you ever stolen any cats?" (reaction)

"Any cats?" (reaction)

"Have you ever stolen ...?" (no reaction)

Phuh. Promptly, the whole thing clarified.

"What gives with this cat? Cats?"

"Yu-uhhh."

"Well, what about cats?"

"Thh-uhhh!"

Now, you're pressing the button that the meter fell on. And it's awfully smart to stand there with the unlimited switchboard of the pc and your great big wide thumb.

You need bartender thumbs, see, from the mother-lode district. They used to hire bartenders with inch-broad thumbs, because a drink was a pinch. And the bartender would reach into the prospector's poke, with his thumb and forefinger, to take out the pinch of gold for the drink. So they'd get this inch-wide thumbs, you know?

Well, you need these great, big, inch-wide thumbs, actually, to run this here switchboard called the pc; it's not just the E-Meter.

And what you're trying to do is find out what is the meter falling on?

And you may come to one of two conclusions: that it's falling on one or more parts of the question, or that it's falling on the question. Now, it's falling on something in the question.

There's nothing mysterious about this. You don't have to clarify the question on this basis of "Well, are you allergic to cats? Have cats often disturbed your sleep?" No. Once more you're off the line, because you're trying to find out what the pc has withheld about cats.

And by compartmenting the question, "Have you ever stolen ...?" That's null.

Why are you pursuing this question, then, "Have you ever stolen cats?" as long as you get a fall on cats?

So this kind of questioning opens up, "What's a cat?"

And you find a cat is a feline object that has long teeth and is colored purple, and is very often forty feet high, and is used to moor ships.

And you say, "Aw, come off it."

So, you clarify the question. And you say the whole question again, because this was the question you were trying to clear.

"Have you ever stolen any cats in this lifetime?" No fall. Go to the next question.

All right. You say, "What's cats?" – clarification.
The E-Meter says, there are certain parts of the question that are alive, or all of the question is live. So it's up to you to find out what part of the question is burning. And then take your bartender thumb and step on that button hard, hard, hard, hard. And the pc all of a sudden says, "All right! All of my life, I haven't been able to understand cats. I just haven't been able to do anything about cats. That's all I can do, is just every time I see a cat – heh! I used to keep this Holland and Holland 50-caliber elephant gun. And every time I heard a cat meowing outside, I would shoot him! Hooh!"

Or you hear something remarkable, "Well, I used to have a trap in the backyard. And whenever a cat would get into it, I would take him down in the basement, where nobody could hear him, and I would cut his paws off one after the other. And I've begun to realize, recently, that this probably isn't nice." [laughter]

Now, the E-Meter says there's buttons to be pressed. And you in your interrogation are only trying to find out what button. Exactly what is the button? So, for a while you press with your bartender thumb. And then you take your little finger, which has a long, pointed, Chinese fingernail that you can actually press very delicately, and you press the exact combination. And the pc goes – boom! And it's in a hurry. It happens fast.

You say, "Have you ever PDHed anyone?" And you get a big fall.

Well, for God's sakes! say, "Have you ever?" You get a fall. "Have you ever? Have you ever?" – get a fall and get a fall.

All right, "PDHed someone? PDHed someone?" Null.

"Well, have you ever what? What? What? for pity sakes? Have you ever what?"

"Huh – I was afraid you'd ask that." [laughter]

See, it means something, exactly and immediately and directly to the pc. And he finally tells you, "It's just you asking all the time, 'Have you ever, have you ever, have you ever, have you ever,' and I have never." [laughter]

And you say, "All right, what have you never?" if that's the button.

"I've never had nerve enough to ask a girl. I haven't dared tell anybody."

Bang! You've sprung the trap. You see how that would work?

It is a matter, actually, of not playing any instrument more complicated than a one-finger version of "Home Sweet Home" and "God Save the Queen" on a piano. And you can even play it out of tune and still get it done. But you will never get it if you do this other thing.

Either you just take no responsibility for getting the question answered, and you say, "Have you ever stolen cats?"

"Don't know."

"Thank you."
"Have you ever stolen cats? Have you ever stolen cats? Have you ever stolen –"

Did you ever hear of this process, "Have you ever stolen cats?" I've never heard of this process. I've read all my bulletins and I don't read it in them anywhere. "Have you ever stolen any cats?" No such process. So it certainly is not a repetitive question.

The other way of debarring information is to w-a-a-a-ander.

You see, here sits this console keyboard in front of your face, and lights are lighting up. You know, like a pinball machine. You know? The meter is saying "Something's hot! Something's hot! Something's hot! Something's hot! Emergency! Emergency! There is smoke in Number Ten compartment!" And you say, "Well, well, what do you know!"

Well, this is no time to say, "Well, there's too much motion in that thing. I think I'll put that aside, and we'll go on with this calm thing of finding out... Because I very well suspect that he doesn't like pea soup. I think so. And I think I've found the person here, in his aunt, who made pea soup. I think I'll just find that out now."

And this poor console is sitting over here and "Smoke in Number Ten compartment, smoke in Number Eight compartment, smoke in Number Two compartment, smoke in the engine room. Abandon ship! Abandon ship!" You know?

And you say, "Well, it's got too much motion in it. Let's get rid of that thing. And let's carry on something here with a true professional mien, that has dignity and aplomb. And let's not get into any of this wild excitement." Because it can get pretty exciting.

It's like if you don't know how to interrogate on an E-Meter, you can get the E-Meter to say anything, anything, anything! You can say that it's PDHed the pc, and so forth, just by associated think. Because it falls on this, it falls on that, it falls on something else. You find out what it's falling on. You got that?

Now, we had somebody the other day who had the word "shop" mixed up with a business. Got the idea? So it's a good thing to say "What's a shop?"

You take everything apart, almost syllable by syllable if you're having any trouble, and give them each one of these things. And you say, "Aha! That's hot, and that's hot, and that's hot. And these three things, added up together, make something else. Now, what gives here?" See?

And the person says, "A shop. A shop. Well, a shop – that's a business."

"What kind of a business?"

"Well, that's an administrative office, a shop is."

"Oh, it is?" And right away, why, the interrogation, of course, narrows down promptly and instantly.

And your taking something on the order of twenty-five hours to clear a question, is a bad comment on your ability to compartment a question and to step on the buttons. Because the pc is very often quite willing to answer your questions if you ask them. So if you don't ask the right question, you're not going to get a right answer. Follow that?
Now, this is very true. In fact, nearly all of your Security Checks depend utterly on your skill in taking apart each question, asking the fringe questions necessary to it. Now, what do I mean by a fringe question? Well, your fringe questions actually occur after you've taken the question apart.

You say, "Have you ever stolen a cat?"
"Have you ever stolen ... a cat?"
"A cat" is dumb – numb. You get no reaction on it. You get a latent reaction. Pooh! Ignore it.
"Have you ever stolen?"
And the pc says, "No, really, no! No, no!" and so on.
You say, "Well, have you ever stolen?"
He said, "No."
Aw, come off of it. Get good. Get good, right at that point.
"Have you ever been accused of stealing?"
"Yes. Yes, yes! And I didn't do it! I didn't do it! I ... I really didn't do it, and nobody'll believe me," and so forth.
"Well, were you lying at the time?"
"Well, yes, I was." [laughter]
Smooth, swift resolution of withholds depends upon the auditor asking the right question. You've got to be right there on the ball.

The pc actually needs help, because the thing is still about two-thirds or better in his reactive sphere. He is not very conscious of what it is.

The borderline between the reactive mind and the analytical mind is the broad savanna of "I don't know." And when something moves out of the reactive mind of total unknown, it moves into the foggy mist that is coming up off the bayous. And it's just a mist. The pc needs help.

It isn't this kind of a situation:
You say, "Have you ever stolen a cat?"
Instantly name, rank, serial number of all cats stolen appear, magically, and go by in a little railroad car, and all he has to do is read them off. Well, that isn't what happens.
You say, "Have you ever stolen a cat?"
The reactive mind says, "We've had it boys," and so forth, and goes clamp! And the mist goes up.
And the pc says, "Whoo-ooo-ooo-ooo!"
Because there he is attached into the "I don't know" of reactivity, you see?
And he says, "Whoo-oo, wait a minute, wait a minute. Whoo-whoo-oo. What – what's going on here? Phoo! Just a moment ago, I could look clear out there. And I could see the palm trees and the city in the distance. And there's nothing now but this horrible miasma which is coming up around me, and so forth, smelling of dead fish. I wonder what this is!"

*He's* wondering what it is as well as you are, you see?

But it's just moved into view, he knows something is there. You ask the question again, it clarifies the question a little bit. But that's about all you'd ever accomplish on a repetitive question.

You say, "What fog are you in, Mutt?"

And, of course, this machine is going to tell him. Tell you and tell him. Because "Have you ever stolen ... a cat?" *Pang!*

"A cat? Well, what gives with cats? What have you done to cats? What have you done to cats?" *Pow! See?*

"What have you done to cats?"

"Oh-oh-oh-oh," fellow says, "Didn't amount to very much. Never felt bad about it before. This just doesn't seem right, right now. But when we were little boys, why, we used to lower them into boiling oil, an inch at a time. Because their screams annoyed our mothers. And I don't think that was so good."

Get the idea? And right away, why, your Security Check picks up in velocity, picks up in velocity, picks up in velocity, you got it?

You must also be able to compartment a goals question. All of these things are subject to compartmentation. You got it? All right. So much for that.

All right, there's one other thing I want to talk to you about. I have just discovered something of magnitude. This is a magnitudinous, cum laude, ne plus ultra discovery that ranks with a cognition on the part of one of our early pcs. It's big. No kidding.

We for a long time have known there was difficulty in some co-audit teams – for a long time, knew there was difficulty in a co-audit team. They make slower progress.

They sometimes kind of went out of this world. And they would go on grinding, grinding, grinding, grinding. And per hour of auditing, their auditing was less effective than HGC auditing, or something like this, you see? It's been a big mystery. And this has been on the track for years and years and years and years. They make slow progress. And I found the answer to it. And the answer you wouldn't really suspect.

Now, the first inroad I had on this "Why do they go so slow?" – the first clue I had for this – was that when a D of P checks the rudiments on an auditor's pc, he often finds them out, even – that the rudiments are out, even when the auditor, having just checked them, found them in.

This is rather constant. This is rather constant. All right. Take it from there.
This has led Ds of P into the belief that the auditors were careless and couldn't run rudiments, and has lessened executive opinion of auditing ability, and has lessened Instructor opinion of auditing ability, and so forth.

The truth is that the rudiments weren't out with the auditor. Because that auditing crew, grinding together, even so much as twenty-five hours, can develop a mutual set of rudiments. This is the dizziest thing you ever heard of, and yet this phenomenon exists. They develop mutual rudiments and their mutual rudiments are out.

The rudiments they have in common are flat to each other but not to anybody else. And they make a solid, small island in the middle of the sea of not-know, where they don't have their rudiments out to each other, but their rudiments are out to the rest of the world.

Now, let's get a good one on this. Let's get a good one on this. They are both agreed that the family of one of them are a bunch of swine. So, of course, no rudiment really goes out on the subject of the family, because the pc is in perfect agreement with the auditor and the auditor is in perfect agreement with the pc about the family being a bunch of swine.

But somebody else comes along and checks the rudiment and what does he find? He finds there's a fall on "family." Because he's not a part of the agreement. You got that? He's not a part of the agreement. This is quite remarkable.

It's almost as if the auditor is saying, "Now, has anything unusual or is there anything unusual going on about the family?"

And the pc says, "No, it's just the same old grind. The stinking swine, the skunks, are just the same as ever."

And the auditor knows they're swine, so he says – he's out with them too, you see? And he says, "Well, all right. Well, there's nothing new or unusual about that." And of course, there's been no fall on the meter.

Why is there no fall on the meter? Because the meter registers disagreement, and you have a pair of people who are in perfect agreement. [laughter] And it's as simply, mechanically, as that. Don't you see?

Now, this is the dizziest one that has ever come up. And you know, I've been tracking this thing and sneaking up on the edges of this thing and sniffing at a spoor seen in the far veldt for years.

Why didn't co-audit teams make more progress, or more rapidly? Because, actually, their ARC should build up easier, and they know each other's cases better – every reason in the world why they should get along well.

Well, I attributed it, to a marked degree, with the fact that they had spats and upsets with each other and ARC breaks with each other, and they'd chew each other up. But therefore husband-wife teams had a liability, or guy-and-girlfriend teams had a liability, you see? That the two – something like this.

That isn't the answer. That isn't the answer, because auditors have these things with pcs, too, anyway. No. The answer is mutual rudiments.
Now, there's a dozen ways to solve it. The most thorough way to solve it is do a new –
do an old-time Formula 13. List of all the people, you know, in the physical universe at this
present time. Let's make a list of them. And now, let's run them each and individually.

Let's assess the list for a fall, and then let's run something on that person. And then,
let's assess it again for another fall and run something on that person. Assess it again for an-
other fall. Have you got the idea? And just clean up all these people, irrespective of whether
one agrees with this or not.

Now, one of the things odd about this – I must mention it in passing is – the reason I
never noticed it is Suzie and I never have this trouble. This is one – one spot where we've
evidently had a variation of some kind or another from the norm.

We're both sufficiently coldblooded about auditing. That is to say, auditing is auditing,
you see? And evidently, there's a recognition that if you feel bad about something or some-
body, whether it is agreed with or not, it will show up. And I will go in like a small or a very
large pavement-breaker, one of these widow-making drills they use to bust up concrete, you
know?

And I'll finally say, "All right, what is it? What is it?"

"No, I don't have an ARC break with the maid. No, I don't have one", and so on.

And I can understand it perfectly, that the maid is probably giving her a bad time, and
that sort of thing. But I don't buy it. Because she – I know she probably has an ARC break
with the maid. And I want to clear it up with the maid, you see, something like this.

So I'll keep on going on with the pneumatic drill, and I will finally spade up the fact
that, agreed upon or not, "Yes", and actually knock out the mutual-agreement factor practi-
cally every time, and so forth. And she'll do the same thing.

You got an ARC break; well, that's it, you know? An ARC break with is an ARC
break with, and an ARC break is an ARC break.

So I was slow to notice this. I don't say we're better than others, but we've ...
Co-
auditing has its adventurous aspects, you know?

The auditor, who has just run all of the mean, vicious, violent things he has ever done
done to the pc, out of the pc, has had to sit there, tamely, listening to the damnedest distortions,
[laughter] ... the wildest interpretations of things he never could have been guilty of, you see?

And the – and on the reversewise, why, it goes reverse end to. But for the twenty-four
hours after that session the auditor, willy-nilly, will be rather cool. [laughter] But the pc, in
this case, is galumphing up and down the halls, feeling sprightly and wonderful to get rid of
all of that burden of woe.

And then they get to the next session. And now the pc is the auditor. And the guy goes
in, sits down, suddenly settles into the irresponsibility of being a pc and starts to give.

He'll say, "Well, goddamn you!" [laughs] Some polite opening! [laughter] You get this
kind of a notion? Well, it's real bravery. It's real bravery.
The only time you can't make it is when one – a party is – just won't audit, won't do any auditing, and won't be audited. And that's a total impasse. And those people are nuts anyway. So... hell, you could probably even do it with the CCHs.

But the point I'm talking about is that a co-audit can have its ups and downs. And I thought these ups and downs of, you know, the overts and the withholds and the this and the that, and "Now all is revealed. And that is why, all during 1957, you treated me like a hound dog. O-ohh-hhh! No kidding! And you'd been out with that guy five times, and didn't even tell me!"

You see? This kind of thing. "Blaa-hhh!" You know, that gets rough.

All right. Now, what do you do? What do you do? It must be that, that was keeping co-auditing teams from advancing. Well, it wasn't. That was just so dramatic, and it was so well known, that it looked logical.

And the thing that slows down a co-auditing team is the mutual rudiments out. They have an agreed-upon regard toward the rest of the world. And they begin to settle more and more into this agreed-upon "that's the way things are." And so their rudiments aren't out to each other.

The first way of blowing it up, as I say, a Formula 13 (even old-style Formula 13) or a Prehav 13. You take an assessment of everything – everybody the person knows in the physical universe, and you assess them all for the heaviest terminal at the moment. Run that terminal on the Prehav Scale, preferably with a two-way command "What have you done to them?" "What have they done to you?" That sort of thing, you know? Two-way command, at whatever the level they assessed at, see? Not a five-way bracket, but just two-way. Bang. You find out it'll knock out fairly rapidly. Prehav Scale is very powerful.

You don't even make a twenty-minute test on that sort of thing, you know? That's – you just take the needle action out of it, and go on to the next person and assess them. And you just clean up everybody they knew in the physical universe in this particular fashion. That is new Formula 13. That's Prehav 13.

All right. There's another, simpler way of doing it – is just substitute "we" for "you" in the Model Session rudiments, beginning and end rudiments. And you won't find those rudiments are now calm. Just substitute "we."

"Have we got an ARC break?" [laughter]

And you'll find out that all of a sudden the thing livens up and becomes very wild. We've got an ARC break, but I haven't got an ARC break, don't you see? It's an incorrect question. It's very sequitur to what else I was telling you, about Security Checks. It's an incorrect question.

You say, "Have you got an ARC break?"

No, he hasn't got an ARC break, we've got an ARC break, you see?

"But I haven't got an ARC break that you don't know about. And you would agree, perfectly, with this ARC break that I've had. Because all day long, salesmen have kept com-
ing to the door. And you know how busy the place can get around here. And I have an awful ARC break with salesmen." That might be the actual answer.

But you say, "Do you have an ARC break with anybody today?"

The pc knows that the auditor would totally understand that salesmen interrupting every fifteen minutes when they're trying to get something done would be very annoying. And he'd say, "Well, that's too bad." But he knows, also, that's usual.

And the present time problems are usual. And the ARC breaks are usual. And the withholds that they have, mutually, are all usual. And their opinions of other people are all usual. And their unkind thoughts are all usual. And so they don't fall on the meter.

And that is quite a discovery. And you can count on the fact, this isn't just a co-auditing team. This is any auditing team that's been going longer than twenty-five hours. It happens that fast. It happens in HGCs all the time.

Somebody has been going for a hundred hours, and the D of P calls him in, checks the rudiments to find all the rudiments out. Yeah, but they're not out for the auditor. And the auditor'll stand there practically jibbering. And you've seen them, you know?

And they say, "But the rudiments ... " (they always say the same thing, the same words) " ... but I just checked them before I came down here and they weren't out!"

And the D of P thinks an unkind thought about the auditor and says, "I'll bet you did, you knucklehead!" or something like that. Or maybe he didn't think that exact question or that exact answer, but it's something like, "Well, yes, yes, we'll have to get some more expert auditing done here. He's kind of..."

Actually, that was a totally incorrect judgment. It was absolutely true, the rudiments were checked and they weren't out. And he came down to the D of P, and the D of P checked them, and boy, were they out!

Now, we made enormous progress in the South African ACC, 3rd South African, by making everybody... All the students were checking the rudiments of all the other students' pcs and pointing it out with a nasty, long, bony and critical finger. In other words, on an auditing team, we were routinely making other students do D of P checks on other auditors' pcs. And we were making very nice progress.

And I thought this would be a good idea, in case any of those people ever got to be auditors or Ds of Ps, they would know what this was all about, and it'd – already had the advantage of doing a police job, you see, on the thing.

And there was an accidental lying in that whole thing. There was an accidental.

But it is the mutual – the mutual rudiment. And that could hold up cases, that could keep them from advancing, that could get them all upset, that could just throw it down to a walk. You got the idea?

So I found a new method of slowing down auditing. Just get into total agreement with your pc that his viewpoints against life, and get in total agreement with your auditor, that this viewpoint against life is ordinary and usual, and therefore isn't out, but would be considered
unusual by somebody else. So if somebody else checks the rudiments, of course, they're out. And if the auditor checks the rudiments, they're in. You got that?

That's a sneaky one, isn't it? Well, you should think it was sneaky, because let me tell you, it has taken I don't know how many years. I don't know how many years this observation has been made by me or how often.

And I looked that over and my eyes popped, and I said, "By golly, here's this old problem sitting here in front of me again that I've tried to solve time and time again. Maybe I'd better look it over a little more closely." And just the night before, I had checked a co-audit team where this exact thing had occurred again. And I just looked at it, and I said, "Oh, wow, now, what is this? There's something here."

And then, Mary Sue – I was checking rudiments on Mary Sue with her auditor, and they were out. And then she gave me some data about this other team. And all of a sudden I said, "Oh, no!" And that's the way it is. That's the way it is. It just fell out of the hamper, just like that.

You see it, don't you? It's perfectly crystal clear what'll happen. You've got an island against the storm of the world. And it doesn't react to the rest of the world, after a while, because, of course, the E-Meter reacts only on disagreement. Got it?

Three solutions. I repeat, three solutions. Old Formula 13, the failed-help proposition on everybody you know under the sun, moon or stars – that's the longer one, but very thorough. And I point out that the first Clear made in South Africa had fifty hours of Formula 13 immediately before she came on course. Not a bad process, huh? All right.

The next one – next one would be to do Prehav 13, which is just Prehav Formula 13, which is just to make a list of everybody they know. Assess the terminals very rapidly. Take the one who falls the most on that particular assessment. Assess it, then, on the Prehav Scale. Form a two-way command for that particular level. Run the needle action. Just that.

Soon as the needle is still on this person, you ask them again, "How do you feel about this person?" You get no twitch? Come off of it, right now.

Do another terminal assessment. Take that terminal; do another primary Prehav Scale assessment. Form another command for that particular level you've now found this next person at.

Run the needle action out until you can say, "How do you feel about Joe?" and they say, "Oh, I feel all right." And the needle – the needle now doesn't react on Joe.

That might happen, you know, in five minutes or fifteen minutes or an hour or two hours or it's a very undetermined period of time. So you ask the question often "How do you feel about Joe now?"

All you're trying to do is clear Joe as a mutual rudiment. You're not trying to run processes here, you see? You're trying to clean this person's ARC breaks out of existence as a rudiment.
And what you're doing is broadening the question "Do you have an ARC break?" And you're broadening this question to include everybody they could possibly have an ARC break with in present time.

And you're just running – you're assuming they're...all these people might have ARC breaks. And you're clearing all these people off for the immediate lifetime. And then the pc doesn't get ARC breaks and interrupt the auditing, and the case doesn't worsen, and it speeds up. Okay?

There is that Prehav 13. Okay?

The next one is a very fast one – maybe not as good, but certainly more broadly applicable – is "Do we have an ARC break with anyone?" See?

"Do we have a present time problem?" Got it?

"Is it all right if we audit in this room?" You got it?

"Now, do we have a withhold?" You got that?

This is sparked up by the fact that I found out there was another pc who is having difficulty and is worried about Security Checking because he thinks he is holding some data that has to do with another person that might be discreditable in some fashion. Well, part of the data is correct and part of the data is false. But this pc has not bothered to clarify this data but is afraid of being security checked to protect somebody else. Interesting state of affairs.

Now, this could be broadened up into a basis where they have to have a special auditing team. This fellow has to be specially security checked by some special person, and now the two of them think they're going to make some progress. Let me tell you, they're not going to make any progress because we now have a withhold. Do you see that clearly?

So the road out is not a special Security Check by a special person so that all will not be revealed.

I happen to know, by the way, that about three-quarters of the data which this pc thinks he has is a lot of bunk. So he's not only holding on to something that way, but he's also holding on to something that's highly fallacious. Well, boy, how about – how about having a delusion as a withhold?

Pretty grim, huh? That's what this person is doing.

So you got this "mutual rudiments out"?

And I think we can end, right now, a lot of slow gain on the part of an awful lot of long-drawn co-audit teams. And we can also end slow gain in HGCs when the auditing goes up to a hundred hours, or something like this, or fifty hours.

After about twenty-five hours you've got a unit there. You've got an agreed unit. The auditor agrees that the pc has been treated badly, and the pc agrees this, and so on. And they agree so thoroughly that it's never a fall on the meter. Okay?

All right. You're welcome to that one. And we're already overdue, so go and get your mutual rudiments in! [laughter]
Thank you.
Thank you. Thank you.

Well, your auditing has improved, so I'll wear a jacket. [laughter]

All right, what is this? The 21st, or what?

_Audience: 21st._


Well, I haven't anything bright to tell you today. I've shot the bolt now. Now you know everything there is to know. And I'm certainly glad of that! I'm certainly glad of that. Certainly you know everything there is to know, because I don't.

There's a couple of bugs kicking around of one character or another. And I don't know yet if you've got them totally licked or not. They're basically just slow assessment, slow, slow, slow assessment, slow, slow, slow security checking, slow, slow, slow, slow SOP Goals. And nobody's trying to make you unthorough, and nobody's telling you that you should uniformly and routinely rush your auditing through, but there's a difference between getting something done and wasting time. And that's all I've got my eye on. And I think I've spotted the bugs of what's making it go slow, but I actually haven't got all the returns back. That is to say, I don't know if it's going faster for you now or not.

But it wouldn't make any difference to me if it took seventy-five hours to get somebody's goal. That, you'll find, is the slowest haul. I think we speeded that up with instant needle read. I wouldn't care if it took that long, but it's kind of nonsense. But for it to take very long to do a Security Check, this is what's weird. Because all you do is read the question, and then don't wait for the strains of "Dixie". Make sure that that thing is... didn't fall when you read the question. And then go tearing off to the next question. And when they fall, you probe them by compartmentation of the question.

Something that Frank Aloysius George Q. Sullivan should have done, before he started blasting around about PDH. He, by the way, has got me very suspicious now, because there's now been a big to-do on the part of the California mounties. I think that's what they call the police in California, isn't it? Mounties? Well, they're always on everybody's back. And they have corralled some poor guy up in Eureka. And they're accusing him, because he's a Scientologist, of practicing brainwashing and PDH on people. So it doesn't look like Mr.
Sullivan was quite as innocent as it seems, because he forecasted attack which was also duplicated on the – oh, practically the same day in Detroit. Interesting, isn't it?

Of course, according to you – according to you in general – everybody is reasonable, and all actions are good, and there's nothing you've ever plotted. But we hear about "Scientologists are PDHing people in Australia", then we hear about it in South Africa, then we get a magazine that he cannot afford to publish, being published, saying so in the United States. And then simultaneously in two different parts of the country two thousand miles apart, the police suddenly swoop down on a Scientologist and accuse him of PDHing people.

And then simultaneously Pinkerton swoops down on the police, sent by the organization, and it all blows over. But it's hard on the people when it's happening.

And you can say it's all for the best in this best of all possible worlds, but the Panglossism doesn't go down with me, and I usually say, "Well, ready on the right, ready on the left, ready on the firing line – Fire!" Somebody at the other end says, "Goddamn, we can't fool this guy!" That's a fact.

So don't feel surrounded, because you're the only people that have the weapons. But please, for the sake of my morale, don't be so reasonable. Don't leave me standing there all by myself, you know? Don't start telling me, "Well, Ron, it's just human nature." Yeah, it's human nature to get itself in such a stew, but that's no reason. There's also some political nature back of it, too.

You see, we're actually not just stewing around in the bullpen, you know, because we are so happy about people's aberrations, you know, and "It's not their fault," and "People are leading unhappy lives," and so on. That's really not what we're doing. We're also doing that.

And that is fine.

But let me tell you something: that if we weren't here, the lights of Earth's civilization would be out in another twenty-five years – if we weren't here. And people know who is sitting, baying at them. But you see the great ease it would be to scoop me up, or shoot me down or do something to me. You might ask, why is it that this has never really happened?

It's come close to happening a couple of times. There's been an airplane out on a landing field warming up, waiting to kidnap me, and a couple of hoods standing by, real tough mugs. Only they couldn't handle a .45, and I could. This in the confines of Los Angeles.

The war cooled off, as far as I was concerned, many, many years ago, and I don't expect it to hot up at all. I don't even bother to lock the doors.

And it's not case as far as I'm concerned. I'm just pointing that out to you as a matter of record. Because if I had a man – number of overts here, or if I had a bugginess going here, the attack on you and the attack on me would be fantastic. But you see, if you haven't got tremendous motivators, they can't get a big enough overt going against you, because you just don't suck it in, that's all. You see? And that mechanism alone is why we're still alive.

And there isn't anything going to happen to us. Just around the fringes – just around the fringes – here and there, why, there'll be a little popgun. Down in Perth all of a sudden, why, somebody swoops down and picks up some auditor, they ... And it works out this way:
He himself has got some kind of a wild series of motivators that has nothing to do with us. And listen – we can't even help him. In this Perth affair, we tried hard to help this person. And they wouldn't even accept an attorney from us. Nothing much happened to them, they went down and paid a small fine and that was it. But wouldn't even permit an investigation.

We've got a backflash going right now in Australia which is – actually, it went. We've been on the winning side of this picture in Australia now for many months. We've had tremendously effective people there. These people are awful fast on the draw. They remind you of what the Western movies would like to believe the old Western bad men were all about, or the police marshals. Because, boy, those guys are awful quick on the draw in Australia. You shoot in their direction and, the enemy, long before the trigger actually gets pulled, the air just begins to hum all around their ears.

There's a guy down there who wishes to God he'd never been elected as the head of the BMA of Australia. Every night when he goes to bed at night he says, "And Dear Lord ..." [laughter] and all of a sudden, why, the wolves came off, and there hasn't been anything happening down there since.

And now the other day, one of the leading trade union papers published a very congratulatory article on the E-Meter, and that sort of thing. Well, that's gaining ground.

Well, the Australian knows he's under fire, so he cooperates. In the United States they don't know they're under fire. They think it's all for the best in this best of all possible worlds. And it's all so reasonable, and Ron is – "You know, got – well, he's a little bit aberrated on this subject", and so on. "He's fighting a shadow", you know, and "it doesn't work," and so forth. "Actually it's Ron that's PDHing everybody, and..." You know, reasonable, stupid kind of action. And it's getting knocked off.

One of these days, one of these days, people, more and more, month by month – you'll watch it – will start coming up and backing us up, and backing us up more and more. And backing us up more and more and more. And all of a sudden, there'll be a splash in the Pacific and a splash in the Atlantic, and that will be the end of subversion in the United States. You watch it happen. I promise you it's going to happen.

But it's only going to happen because I'm quick on the trigger, keep my eye open, and everybody in HCO is very, very fast on the ball along this line. When you want them to act, they act. Consequently, within hours private detectives will be swarming around Eureka, asking questions. We have only one weapon. We investigate loudly. Investigate very loudly. That's the only weapon. But we'll make it to the degree that our technology is good, sound and fast.

We're on a wave of the future. And if anything, we are the wave of the future. There is no technology that can approach anything we are doing. And you'll find if you study great civilizations that they roll forward with new technology. The sweep of the Romans resounded with the clash of arms. But basically England was conquered by Rome as much as a century before the first Roman soldier ever put his foot on English soil. Look up history and you'll find out it's true.
Roman culture and know-how had invaded England. It was coming over from the Channel ports. And everybody thought it was very nice to be able to grow a crop. That was pretty good. And instead of finding out about this (the Roman military intelligence didn't find out that they probably would have got roses in the street), they landed an expeditionary force. That's something like you, after you've cleared a pc, decide he's aberrated and attack him. Not quite as extreme as this, but that was kind of what happened. But every new civilization is forecast and is a new technology, and that is all it is. And philosophic technologies are far more prone to the founding of new civilizations than otherwise.

So you're working on more than you know, and the eyes of the future upon you, and all that. So you better find out something about it, huh? [laughs]

The caliber of what you are doing improves with such rapidity, as soon as you land here, that you can almost tell how many days you've been here. This is from the reports I get. So there is a right way to do things, and nothing actually does better than knowing just exactly how it is done, being able to ask questions immediately and directly to find out if you're doing something wrong about it, because it develops a certainty. And I want you to develop this certainty. I want you to, whenever you think up a dumb question or think you're astraddle of some kind of a riddle-raddle or something of the sort, well, for heaven's sakes speak up.

Now, Jan has been speaking up quite interestingly – last night asked me, "On this Prehav 13, do you ask all of the names over and over, or do you do Assessment by Elimination?" She brings up a point there which very well might go terribly crosswise somewhere. On your terminal assessment for Prehav 13, you're not doing an Assessment by Elimination. You are doing simply a runover. And as a person gets his overts off, of course, against all the people that he knows, the people you have already passed over and found null on your scale all of a sudden live up.

It actually doesn't matter much who you choose to get the overt off, as long as there was some immediate action on the E-Meter. So what you do is make a terminal assessment sort of thing. You collect all the guy's terminals that he – everybody he knows in present time, you see. And you write all these people down on a piece of paper. And you start down the list. And every time you get a fall, well, you see if you can't clear the fall by two-way comm. And if you can't clear the fall by two-way comm, you run the action out of the needle. And then go on to the next person and see if you can't do that. And it's more a Security Check than an assessment. Have you got it?

Now you find somebody you don't clear with – you say, "Well, how do you feel about that person? What have you done to that person?" or something like that. And it doesn't clear. The needle keeps reacting. All right. Assess the person on that terminal on the Prehav Scale, and run enough two-way commands to clean the needle.

Now, you're not going to get too many of them to the Prehav Scale, probably. Most of these terminals are going to clear just on a glance. Now, you go back to the beginning of the list. And you can keep adding new people; he keeps thinking of new people and so forth. Well, just put them down and go on about your orderly affair. But now go back to the beginning of this long list of terminals and go over the thing again, and you're all of a – going to – sudden find that terminals that weren't hot are now hot. See, you're raising his responsibility.
for the people in his environment, and as you do this, of course, you raise his ability to see what he has done.

It's just a list that you go over and over. This is not necessarily something you would have to do as a full-time activity. You could do this for half a session and run whatever else you're running for another half of the session.

I call to your attention that the girl who went Clear on the South African ACC had — here's a missing item for you — had fifty hours of Formula 13 immediately before that ACC. It was almost impossible, you see, for her to have ARC breaks, so forth. She had all these people in her environment pretty well cleaned up. And in view of the fact that they were pretty well cleaned up, what did this leave? This left the fact that most of her auditing session was devoted to getting Clear, not to patching up the environment. And rudiments didn't suddenly go out on her all the time. You understand?

All right, now, that is a somewhat imperfect statement of how you do Prehav 13. I see it still leaves you just a little bit puzzled about it. But I will go over these steps just rapidly here, now, very rapidly.

The way you do it is in a Model Session form. You clean your rudiments, and then you — clean them rather indifferently because you're certainly going to do nothing but clean rudiments on this Prehav 13, you see. And you just take a list, you say to the person, "Now, I'm going to make a list of everybody that you know" — you can say, "intimately," or something like this, or "everybody that you're associated with"; whatever wording, ah, "...in present time. Everybody that you know in present time." They'll ring in a lot of dead people on you and stuff like this. Well, put them down. Who cares. It's not a precision activity anyhow.

And you make this long list, see, and it'll go two, three pages. Well, while they're thinking about this, they're actually exteriorizing and they're getting their bank straightened out. So that, itself, is auditing, because they're doing differentiation. It's a differentiation exercise. And if you just did it as a differentiation exercise you'd find it was quite unusually therapeutic for people. Because they have all these people crossed up with people. And you'll find out as they're doing this they'll separate these people out, and they become individuals instead of masses, and so forth.

All right, you get this long list. All right. Now, you go over this thing, and I frankly don't care what approach you use in order to straighten this up or ask this. Ask the person, "Well what have you done to ... ?" or "What have you withheld from these people?" But I'd say "done to" is probably more productive than anything else, because they often add up "done to" as "withheld from."

And you say, "Well now, all right. Now we're going to take these people, and we're going to cover your relationships with them." And this is all right with the pc. And you start in at the beginning of the list, and you say, "All right. Now here's Joe. And here's Bill." You know, you're watching for that instant reaction, see? "And here's Pete. And here's Oswald" — pang! Of course, a fellow with a name like Oswald should get a pang! [laughter] And so — any similarity to persons living or dead is purely intentional. [laughs]
So anyhow, bang! This word goes "Oswald." All right, your next approach is "Well, what have you done to Oswald?"

And the person says, "Well – I – oh, so-and-so, and so on, and so on," and you get a big rocking needle on the thing.

And you pull an overt, and you say, "Well, how do you feel about Oswald now?" And you get a big rock on the needle again, and you say, "Well, we've had it. Now, we are going to take this person," and we take out our – remove it from its Lawrence leather scabbard – the Prehav Scale, and lay it out here on the E-Meter board, and say, "Now, is Oswald ...?"

Now, don't be surprised if by the time you start to run the thing that Oswald has vanished from the face of Earth. Because you say, "Is Oswald faith?" Or "Would you have faith in Oswald?" And just go on down the line, and find the Prehav Scale as applied to Oswald, see? And you're trying to find the level to run Oswald. That is your intention. You want to find a level, and you honestly and sincerely are not sitting there hoping he will just vanish, you'd like to find a level for Oswald. And this isn't going to happen very often.

It'll take somebody like – oh, I don't know – they've been married to somebody and in business with them, and eventually wound up with a law suit with them, and so forth, and that reminds them of everything on their own rock chain. Now, that's that person. All right. Now, all of a sudden we find as we're assessing the Prehav Scale, which we're reading on down the line – we find that several levels are live. We go back and try to pick up these levels that have livened up on Oswald, and we find out that one does still react.

All right, put up a command like this. Let's say the level that's still reacting is Failed Withhold. All right. "Now, what have you failed to withhold from Oswald?" And, "What has Oswald failed to withhold from you?" Those are the commands, see. "What have you failed to withhold from Oswald?" "Yap, yap", he says. And you say, "Thank you. What has Oswald failed to withhold from you? Thank you." And that's all there is to it. And you do those a few times, and that's the end of Oswald, even then, see.

You watch the needle. There is no twenty-minute test on this. You just watch the needle, and you say, "How do you feel about Oswald now?" And you don't get any instant reaction on the E-Meter, you instantly and immediately say, "Well, all right. Thank you very much. Now, is it all right with you if we return to this list?"

And he says, "Yes."

And you say, "All right." And you do so. You can close the end of the process out, as far as that's concerned.

All right. Down we go, down the list here, and we've got the next person now, and we've got the next person, we've got the next person, they're all null. And then we hit one, and we say, "All right. Well, what have you done to this person?"

And he says, "Wow, row, row, row and yeow."

And you say, "Well, how do you feel about this name?" and you read the name again, you get no reaction. And so you say, "That's dandy," and you read the next name and the next name and the next name and the next name.
And he says, "Just a minute. I just remembered – I just remembered – I knew a girl by
the name of Bessie Ann. Bessie Ann. Just remembered this."

And you say, "Well, all right. That's good. Thank you very, very much."

Now, if you go ahead and Q-and-A, you of course will say, "All right, what have you
done to Bessie Ann?" And we won't have anything more to do with the list, but we'll move it
all over here in the next county and only assess new names and forget the list and get all con-
fused.

No, the pc responds to an orderly progress. So we put Bessie Ann down at the bottom
end of the list and say, "Thank you very much," and take the next name which was under our
thumb up here, which we were clearing, and we will find that it's that name that has the asso-
ciation with Bessie Ann.

All right. So we go down, and we're now twenty names down the list, or twenty-five
names down the list. Here we are. And we say, "And then there's Mr. Stiffwhistle." And the
E-Meter goes clang on an instant read, you know. And you say, "Well, all right, what have
you done to Mr. Stiffwhistle?"

"Well, 'tisn't so much what I've done to Mr. Stiffwhistle. Actually, it's what he'd
done..."

"Well," you say, "that's good. Thank you very much. It's what he..." "Thank you very
much. Now, we're going to assess Mr. Stiffwhistle over here on the Prehav Scale," and so
forth.

And now – "Would you have faith in Mr. Stiffwhistle?" You get the idea? And we can
even vary this around. You can actually run "Faith in Mr. Stiffwhistle," "Would Mr.
Stiffwhistle have caused anything for you?" see? You could just take your opposite sides of
the thing and read them crisscrossed. You got the idea? You read your odd-numbered levels
with "you-Mr. Stiffwhistles" and the even-numbered levels "Mr. Stiffwhistle-you." You got
the idea? Keeps you from developing a stuck flow on "Stiffwhistle." You see how?

You can do a lot of tricky things like this but you can keep a flow from getting stuck,
and you'll get a better assessment. Well, by the time you've gone over the list once, you've
knocked off four levels where Mr. Stiffwhistle fell.

Now, you've gone over the list wholly once. You only go back, just as you do in any
assessment, to these four levels that you've made a dot after, and you read that one, and you
read that one, and you read that one, and you read that one. And if they're all null, don't be
surprised. Don't do anything further if they're all null. If one stays alive, form the command
for it. Still ask, "What about Mr. Stiffwhistle?" and only if Mr. Stiffwhistle still falls do you
actually run the command. You got the idea? Because he's evaporating here at a great rate of
speed.

All right. You make sure that he's flat, and you go to your next consecutive name on
the list. You go on, clear on down to the end of the list in this fashion, paying attention only
to those that fall, and paying attention to them only so long as they fall.
You don't go overshooting the thing with great enthusiasm here, and spending a half an hour on Aunt Betsy Crocker just because she made such horrible cakes. Let's get into something else here that's more important. Let's find out periodically if Betsy Crocker still falls. See, you can overshoot this kind of running madly. You know? It's like – in the first place, you're shooting – you know these little water bugs that scoot around on top of the water, you know, and walk on the water tension very amazingly, so forth? Well, you're just the same as shooting water bugs with a sixteen-inch gun. If you're not very adroit about it, man, do you get splashed. Because you can go too far. You can overrun this level, just madly, you see? And the pc's bored and upset and so forth. Of course, this guy's evaporated. He's not interested in this anymore.

All right. Now you go back to the beginning, the first beginning of the whole list when you have finished it. Every time he has thought of anything you added another person at the bottom of the list. Of course, you covered those too eventually in their turn. You go back to the beginning of the whole list and assess it once more. And in a relatively short time – not anything ghastly in terms of auditing – in a relatively short time you've got a clean list. You can go over everybody this person knows in present time without getting a needle disturbance. And the person begins to feel wonderful about these people, and begins to feel wonderful about everything. You got it?

All right. Now, that's how you run Prehav 13. Did that straighten it out for you a little bit better?

Male voice: Yes.

You see what I meant by saying I had to give you an accurate idea of exactly how you did it.

My basics – I'm telling you how to run this. And the way to adjudicate just how to run this, is – I know the behavior of the Prehav Scale. I know the behavior of present time terminals on the Prehav Scale. And please be advised, I want to repeat just one more time: if a terminal continues to fall, which is a present time terminal, or continues to react badly on the present time list of this character, I don't know, you're running the pc with the rudiments out, or you're doing something else that hasn't got much to do with it. Don't you see? Something else is going on.

And we had a case here of somebody – well, I'd written a snifffish note to the D of P of London, actually. Pushed in her anchor points a little bit more violently than she deserved, to tell you the truth. Auditor started auditing me on her. Now, I think I've only seen her about, oh, I don't know, not more than two or three dozen times in my lifetime.

He started to run her, and he started to settle into a profession [laughter] ... of running me out of this one person. Now, that wouldn't be right. So there's something else going on. He probably has done this. He probably said, "Now, look. She's gotten a bad despatch, and this has upset her, because she says so. All right, very good."

Now, he's made up his mind that this is what is wrong with the pc, and he hasn't consulted Mr. E-Meter. See? So he starts running something that isn't particularly wrong with the
pc. You get this? And runs it with the rudiments ignored because he is so certain this must be what's wrong with the pc.

Of course, he's now running on a completely sour assessment. It wasn't determined at all. See, he didn't try to do anything about it. So constantly – he actually, I think, tried to run two whole sessions on this thing. That was impossible. It was frankly impossible. He just couldn't have done this. And yet he did it. But that was how he would go about this. He'd say, "Obviously, because she received a rough despatch, see, that says, 'Pull up your socks, to the knees if necessary,' and so on, obviously then this is what is wrong with this pc."

So he takes off and says – doesn't assess a terminal; says "Well, this is the terminal." Then assesses the terminal on the Prehav Scale, gets some random and wild falls here and there on the Prehav Scale, picks one up at random, forms up a five-way bracket and starts in a profession. And goes, of course, for five hours of run without even vaguely flattening it. Well, what do you mean "flatten it or non flatten it"? Well, the tone arm kept being different, and things kept being different, and they kept being different. The pc wasn't changing, things were just different. You got the idea?

If you want to see this happen, by the way, do this with SOP Goals or Routine 2. Just make up your mind that the pc's level is "grapeshot." "Yes, 'grapeshot.' That's the proper level we ought to be running on this pc because the pc is always spitting grape pits out while I'm auditing, and so, therefore, 'grapeshot' is the right one." And we start running "grapeshot". And we start getting tone arm reaction on the annoyance of the pc, see? And we get tone arm action on the ARC break of it all. We get tone arm action on the unreliability, and the unreality of the whole thing, don't you see? The mystery in the person's mind. "Why is he running 'grapeshot?'" "Have you ever shot any grapes?" [laughter] And the person gets very, very puzzled.

And of course, what does this do? It pulls in all the "not-knows" on the track. So the "not-knows" give you an action on the tone arm as they naturally would. But the pc isn't running. Now, if you were to – have – you go at this right, you don't ever make up your mind this is what is wrong with the pc and run it.

It's perfectly all right for you to make up your mind there's something – "this is what's wrong with the pc." But don't feel so invalidated when you put him on the E-Meter and find it isn't so. Always have nerve enough to test your theory on the E-Meter. And instead of "shooting grapes", you find out what's trouble with the fellow is "cellar doors". He goes around cellar-door all the time. He just can't leave cellar doors alone. And way up the line someplace you run into some weird computation that if you cellar-door enough on the right side, it makes you spit grapes. You know, it'll be something utterly incredible. You say, "How in the name of God did he ever arrive at that?"

Well, if you're auditing at the reactive mind, this question won't enter your mind, "How did he ever arrive at that?" That's what's wrong with him. It's the held-down five. The thing isn't connected right, and it doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense to him; it doesn't make sense to you. And your trying to outguess the reactive mind is, of course, an heroic activity, because you'd have to be as crazy as he is. [laughter] So don't be at all surprised if you're all set to drive down Center Street, and you step into this Hispano-Suiza, and you're all
ready to tear down Center Street at a 120 miles an hour and clear this case up like mad; and
you suddenly find yourself driving a Buick in Chula Vista. [laughter]

Don't be so heartbroken about it! Because that's what's the matter with the pc. He gets
into the Hispano-Suiza on Center Street and has always wound up driving an old, broken-
down 1922 Buick in Chula Vista. And this is what's upsetting him. You get the idea?

Actually he tries to do this: He tries to get into old, broken-down 1922 Buicks in
Chula Vista, hoping someday he'll wind up in the Hispano-Suiza on Center Street. And it's
one of the heartbreaks of his life that he never does. His method of realizing his goals is quite
often to run them backwards.

The goal is to enliven and make wonderful and beautiful every woman you meet.
That's his goal. Now, obviously every time he does this, something happens, intervenes, and
he finds this poor girl winds up being a knocked-apart old bat. Get the idea? And he – this
upsets him, see? You know, his intentions are pure. And yet he just seems to just practically
knock any girl he ever had anything to do with right out of the – right out of the firmament.
And he can't understand this. So he will eventually start going about his goal something like
this: "All right, if you take some knocked-apart old bat ..." You see? [laughter]

And yet, that is almost logical for the reactive mind. That's almost too logical for it.
He's much more likely to start piling up stones on the beach, and this has something very
definitely to do with realizing this goal of making all women beautiful. "If you just pile up
enough stones on the beach..." And you say, "What the hell?" But of course, that's what's the
matter with the fellow. It's a case of "What the hell?" [laughter]

I tell you, life is never dull when you have the reactive mind for a target. So as a con-
sequence, when you make up your mind as to what the level or action or the pc's regard in a
certain direction should be, don't feel so whip-cured, see, because it's something else. It isn't
an invalidation of you. It's an invalidation of him. If he was perfectly sane, your computation
would undoubtedly be absolutely right. But of course, the reactive mind is not sane. Anybody
that's walking around that has a long line of reactivity, know that they're sort of walking with
just their eyes out of the water, and there might be a little splashing wave any minute, you
know? Just – they're liable to trip themselves up any second. Have to walk pretty careful, be-
cause somewhere from the depths, some long fangs are liable to all of a sudden appear from
nowhere, see?

So it's no invalidation of somebody. As a matter of fact, it's a validation of somebody
to try to do something about it. You see, the bulk of people that have gone around the bend
and are being "normal" – these characters not only don't think there's anything you can do
about it, they don't think there is anything else. They think that is it, and that is life, and that's
the way you live it. Absolutely screaming messes. They're not living any kind of a life that
anybody would want to live, much less them. And they tell you so, you see. But there isn't
anything you can do about it. You might say they have totally surrendered to the disorderli-
ness of existence.

All right. So much for all that. Have you got a question before we end this? ...Yes?
Female voice: Is there any difference – I mean, apart from the fact that their goals aren't different - between one case who expresses his goal in terms of beingness and another who expresses it in terms of doingness, and another who expresses it in terms of a havingness? Does it tell you anything additional about the case? The fact that they choose to express it, or that it is expressed in these...?

If you had three cases that had more or less the same goal, but one of those cases expressed the goal as beingness, another expressed it as doingness and another expressed it as havingness?

Female voice: Yeah.

Would it tell you anything different about the cases. No, actually not, at first glance. Because be-do-have harmonics. You could pick it up on any harmonic. You could pick up an excessive – obsessive beingness on the part of a person and move him up to havingness, and then you could move him up to beingness, and then you could move him up another one and he goes into doingness. But that's reversed, isn't it? So you push him up a little bit higher and you would now find him in beingness again. And now you find him in beingness for some time, and all of a sudden he'd go totally into havingness. You got the idea? So it's a disorderly progress.

Female voice: Yeah.

So you're liable to pick up a case at any level of disintegration, and you can't adjudicate too much about it. You could say on the upper strata that the be-do-have level – on its first levels, before they start inverting and harmonicing, and so forth – you could say that the beingness is higher than the doingness is higher than the havingness. It is easier for somebody to run on those higher levels on havingness, and it's a little less easy to run on the doingness, and it's pretty rough for most people to run on the beingness. But you're talking now about the upper harmonics of it.

Female voice: Hm.

Okay?

Female voice: Yeah, thanks.

Any other question? Yes?

Female voice: This is just a casual observation that I noticed for myself, that if my sensitivity was at 1.75, say, very often the tone arm would be 3.0 or above. If it were at 2.0, sensitivity would be at 3 or 4.

Yeah.

Female voice: Why?

No, there is no coordination between the sensitivity. But there is an awful lot of error being made on can squeezes, and I'm glad you brought it up. There is no coordination on that. You're saying, well, it's – if your tone arm is at one place your sensitivity is at a coordinated place for that. In other words, as your sensitivity rises your tone arm rises, or your tone arm rises, your sensitivity rises. Not necessarily. Doesn't hold true.
Female voice: Didn't seem to me it ought to be that way, except I observed in ...

No, well ...

Female voice: ... people's sessions that it did that sort of thing.

... it isn't, it isn't true. And it doesn't follow. You don't get a coordination between sensitivity reading and tone arm reading.

I'd like to bring up this, however. The way you're doing can squeezes is probably why I took sensitivity knob out of diagnosis, having put it in – diagnosing by the sensitivity setting. I've taken it out of the lineup. Because, boy, the way you let pcs hold cans varies so fantastically as to hardly have any comparison from one case to the other, and I just found it out the other day in doing some observation. You can make the sensitivity knob do almost anything by holding the cans in different ways.

Now, the proper way, and what we mean by a third-of-a-dial drop, is to have the pc – and this is one of the things you say to him – "Now, holding the cans, put your hands comfortably in your lap." And the pc does this. He stops waving them around and directing, "God Save the Queen" with the cans. And drops them down comfortably in his lap.

Now, you say, "Gently now, squeeze the cans." And you get a proper fall, that we mean third-of-a-dial drop. The way you've been regulating this gives you all manner of wild reads. The pc has the cans terribly tightly gripped. They are just gripped, gripped, gripped. And as soon as you get a ... See if I can make this do this now. Well, here you are, more or less. The meter isn't even tuned in. Now let's do this properly. Now, hold the cans lightly, in your hands, or comfortably. Now squeeze them. Squeeze them with a jerk, see? You get this jerk? Now, I'm even going to exaggerate this now. All right. We're going to exaggerate this now. Didn't see the squeeze at all, did you? What am I doing? I'm sure squeezing the cans! And you don't see that needle move at all, do you? There's a zero move to it. And look, your sensitivity knob is set up there almost at 2.0. I'll do that again. There we go. I made it do a reverse squeeze. How do you like that, huh?

All right, now let's set this thing up so that it makes some sense, shall we? All right. Now we're going to set the cans relaxedly in my lap. Well, if you're going to do that! Somebody has a passion for – you want me to do the first one again? Did everybody see that? All right. Here we go now. See? Unmoving needle. Got that? All right. Now I'm going to put the – now, tune it down below set; this side of set. All right. Now we're going to put the cans comfortably in my lap. I'm going to sit here relaxedly. See? I don't know what it's doing.

Female voice: We have here pong, pong, pong.

Which is my normal drop. Get that? In other words, when the cans are held relaxedly in the lap – you know, you just hold them, you know, relaxedly and then simply squeeze them with the hand itself, not clear on up to the shoulder! [laughter] That's the way you test a third-of-a-dial drop, see?

But you actually – this other trick is to hold the cans, wrap your hands very hard around the cans, very carefully around the cans. You get the idea? Now increase the pressure enormously. Now, I'm holding them very hard right now, see. And then try to squeeze them
right from the shoulder down. And of course there's not a thing going to happen. You got it? Because you've already got the things utterly locked in as tight a squeeze as you're going to get. This thing is – all the squeeze end is already registering. You got that?

So there's no sense in making a diagnosis out of something that is going to be done randomly. It's – the proper thing – what we're talking about when we talk about a third-of-a-dial drop, then, has to have this additional data: that you put the hands relaxedly in the lap. Hold those electrodes relaxedly in the lap, and then squeeze the cans. You can even say, "Gently now, squeeze the cans." And you will get your third-of-a-dial drop, see? And you notice that my proper third-of-a-dial drop is not obtainable on this meter.

This is another thing: There is no sense in backing off sensitivity and backing off sensitivity, and backing off sensitivity and backing off sensitivity, hoping that you can keep it down to a third-of-a-dial drop, because as a person starts getting Clear, what do you eventually run into? Their needle gets so loose, charge is less and less registering. And you've done the same as back the sensitivity knob off the read. And as a person is halfway Clear, if you could set it to a third-of-a-dial drop, by some electronic mechanism inside the thing, you would get no registry of any kind on the needle.

So another factor is visible here. And that is the factor that as a person approaches the state of Clear, their mental charges have less and less reaction on the meter. Not more and more reaction on the meter, as somebody thought once. Their needle gets looser and looser and looser and looser, and the charge as that happens, of course, is less and less expressed. They do not get anywhere near as upset as they used to, even though they can be more volatilely upset. You see?

So you could easily back this sort of a thing off with – electronically, you could put a new rheostat underneath this sensitivity knob that would back it off so that much pressure, to give a third-of-a-dial drop, was all the reading you could get on the thing. And if you did that, as a person was about halfway Clear, they would no longer read in any way, shape or form on the meter.

And in order to finish up clearing, you will find out that you have exactly reversed the whole activity that you did in the beginning. Your person at the beginning was reading down here at a very dead-body 2.0, and you said, "Have you ever killed your grandmother?" and actually they're doing time for it right now.

And the fellow says, "Well, no," and you don't get any reaction.

And you say, "Well could you help anybody?"

And the person says, "Well, I often do, you know. I often do help somebody."

And you say, "Well, what do you do?"

And they say, "Well, I just often do help somebody."

"Yeah, but what do you do that helps somebody?"

"Well, I just do. I just help somebody. I wouldn't tell you," or something weird like this, you see.
And – "Well, name something that would be helpful."

"Well, let's see. I could hold the door open – well, no, that wouldn't be helpful. I could give you some money – no, that wouldn't do any good. I could – I could buy you a din- no, no, that wouldn't be helpful. No, I guess there just isn't anything you could do that would be helpful. People just really pretend there is such a thing", or some kind of a weak, oddball, weird answer accompanies this. Which is, by the way, your most positive test.

All right. Now, this thing starts acting up, goes all over the place. A person that is reading anywhere over the dial here now – you ask him, "Did you ever kill your grandmother?" and it falls off the pin. You got the idea? That's the first time you've ever run into it, and just, bang, you know.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" – bang! "Well what is your present time problem?"

"Well, I've eaten all my candy." [laughter]

See, it's a little tiny microscopic problem – this tremendous read, you see?

Guy gets toward Clear, and your needle is going bong-bong, bong-bong, you know, every time he squeezes the cans once. And you find out – "Do you have a present time problem?"

The fellow says, "Yes, I have a present time problem."

You say, "What's the matter?"

"Well," he says, "I've lost fifty thousand dollars today", and you got a two division fall. He says, "That's all right. I'll get it back tomorrow, one way or the other." [laughter]

"Is that bothering you now?"

And the fellow says, "No. It isn't."

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" There's no fall on it now. You say, what's happened here? Well, it's just that the actions of life are not having just this much disastrous effect upon this guy anymore, that's all.

All right. Now, to clean up this case toward the end of the clear run – this is something that I might forget to tell you and you certainly had better know. At the end of the run, in spite of the fact that it's almost impossible to read, in spite of this, you have got to set this floating needle up here with a sensitivity 16 to stabilize your Clear.

It's almost impossible to read. You'll be here dancing around with your E-Meter all the time. You spend most of your time adjusting the E-Meter. And you say, "Let's see now. Whoa, let's see now – all right, all right. Faith. Do you have faith in Uncle Joe? Has Uncle Joe caused anything?" And you say, "Okay, what was that?" And "Good, that's pretty good. The guy thought of something that got a reaction on it. All right. Fine. Now let's see if we can't get a command worked out here. What has Uncle Joe caused?" Look at the meter. "What has Uncle Joe caused?"
"Well", the fellow says, "I guess he caused quite a few things." There's no reaction on the meter. Uncle Joe has blown. And that was it. But you have to crank that sensitivity up here to 16 to read these last few charges on the bank. And when you're stabilizing a Clear, you're doing an SOP Goals Assessment the same old way, over and over and over. You're trying to assess for new goals, trying to assess for new terminals. You do find a new goal, it does fall. Now, hold your breath; hold your breath. Now let's find a terminal for it. Let's find a terminal for it now. "All right, you've always wanted to fly to the moon on a washboard. Very good. All right.


It's gone, you see! You blew it! Because you've got somebody who can blow these things by inspection. Instead of the loss of his candy hanging around for the next two months and driving him into dementia praecox, [laughter]...you get an entirely different meter reaction. And you actually have to read the last stages of Clear with your sensitivity enormously advanced, which is a great oddity.

In other words, there is a point of insanity, called "normal," at which you get an optimum meter read. It's optimum. Everything falls. The fall lasts. Everything's just wonderful. It's all smooth, not difficult. You get the goal and it just stays there for weeks, you know. And you get the terminal, and it hangs around forever. Everything is just dandy here. And you run it. You can assess it. Everything we've been saying, you see. Form commands for it. You can assess it on new levels. You can assess it on new levels. Boy, you can have a ball, you see.

And then, by the time you've got your next goal selected, just about from there on, you're in trouble, trying to get SOP Goals in a completed cycle. Find the goal. Find the terminal. Assess the terminal on the Prehav Scale. Find an auditing command. Get the auditing command run, you see. And all of a sudden this whole cycle as an action starts to foreshorten, just as the individual with higher and higher increased sensitivity on a floating needle is getting less and less charge, and it's less and less lasting. And so, you eventually are just short-handing it. "Well, do you have any more goals? Thank you. Do you have any more goals? Thank you," you see. It'll actually beat you down to a point where you say, "Well, there's no sense in getting to a terminal or anything like that."

Well, there's a danger point. You could become unalert. He might still have a sticky one. He might have one that'll last for an hour's auditing, you see. And it's that one that you've got to look for. And the end of SOP Goals, Routine 3, is just search, search, search, search, search, search, search. Search it, find it, lose it. Search it, find it, lose it. Search it, find it, lose it. And it happens faster, it happens faster, it happens faster, and pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Then there isn't anything else you can do with the case. Not in the framework of "think" auditing or reactive minds.

Yes, there are other things you can do with a case, but until you've got that one totally stabilized out, the person is not going to be stable 100 percent. There are other things now
you can do with a case. We've invented them in the past, they already exist in the past. He'll, oddly enough, be able to do some of these things.

Oh, what do you mean? You know, Route 1. You mean "Copy, copy, copy, copy, copy."

"Oh yeah, sure, sure, okay. All right."

"Good. Copy, copy, copy."

"Yeah, fine, fine, fine, fine."

"Go outside of it, inside of it, play hopscotch with it."

"Oh, you want an ashtray?"

Okay. Now, if you do have any questions that suddenly rise up and smite you in the face during the course of the day's auditing, and you don't get them answered by the end of the day, why, remember to ask me, okay? All right?

Thank you very much.
Running CCHs

A lecture given on
22 June 1961

I had a piece of interesting news today. The Explorers Club just awarded me Flag No. 163 for the Ocean Archaeological Expedition.

Some of you are wondering, "What's this expedition?" [laughter] Yeah, what's this expedition?

Well, it's a long story. But in 1950, a fellow name of Palmer walked into the Explorers Club just as I was leaving the mail room, and Palmer says to me, he says, "Hey, Ron," he says, "you want a – you want an expedition?"

And I said, "Well, sure."

And he said – he said, "Well," he says, "there's a whole bunch of Greek and Roman statuary that was being brought from Athens to Rome, and the ship went aground on the north side of the Dodecanese." And he says, "Been there ever since. And they've just located it at about thirty fathoms of water." And he says, "Nobody's having anything to do with it." He said, "We have permission from the Greek government, and so forth, to recall the thing.

"But," he said, "I was getting it all organized, and everything was going along fine," he said, "and all of a sudden the government of Ecuador" – he was in an awful rush – "the government of Ecuador has just grabbed all of us to explore the hinterland of Ecuador."

And that's always a very juicy activity when one of those South American governments tells you to explore the hinterland, because they pay you. [laughter] And that is almost unheard of. And they actually pay you by giving you a half a million square miles of headhunter-ridden jungle or something of the sort.

But anyhow, anyhow, he was on his way and he was picking up a couple of fellows instantly. And as a matter of fact, they were walking into the club. And they had the spiked mustaches and looked very Ecuadorian, and they were seeing him to settle these affairs, and so forth.

Well, anyhow, this fellow threw all of his papers and so forth with regard to this expedition in my box at the club. And a few days later I was just about to put my hand in and recover them when May 9th occurred, 1950. That was an interesting day: it was publication day of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health.

I want to call something to your attention: this is eleven years later; there's eleven years more algae accumulated on this statuary. And I haven't had a breather. I haven't had a breather at all. It doesn't take very long. Doesn't mean I would be vastly absent for any length of time.
Actually, what you do is you take the sunny, stormless period of the year (which is not necessarily summer, as anyone in the West Indies will tell you), and, oh, you take a run down and get your feet wet and let the diver get his hose snagged on the coral, you know, and do what you got to do, survey it and lay it out. And next year you go back and push it around a little bit further. And then you happen to find out that Alexander the Great's Wall of Tyre is very interesting, you see? So you drop down and see what's happening there. And you accumulate various things.

We have now accumulated the Maritime Museum at Greenwich. It is now one of our boosters, and the museum at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis is one of our boosters. And we're accumulating left and right. And actually the nephew of Round-the-World Slocum – you've heard him, around-the-world-single-handed-in-a-twenty-eight-foot-boat Slocum? Well, his nephew is a Royal Navy retired captain, so he has now joined the ship's company. This kind of thing starts snowballing, you see? And all you do is innocently lift your head and say, "I think I will go on an expedition", you see? And you've said it; you've said it.

Actually, it doesn't take very much time. You decide, you see, that an expedition is something that people disappear into small igloos for six months at a crack, or something like this. This isn't the way it goes at all. I call to your attention there are aircraft these days, and they put you in the area where your people have been working getting things ready. And put you in the area on a Tuesday, you see, and you can pull out from that area on a following Wednesday. And you can keep up with it pretty closely.

Anyway, we have a ship that's a 111-ton, twin-screw diesel schooner that I have rebuilt on paper, now, into an expeditionary vessel; arguing with the United States Coast Guard as to whether or not it's a scientific ship or a yacht, or whether it can remain to be a yacht and still be used as a scientific ship. And almost ready to throw up my hands and fly the Panamanian flag, if not the Jolly Roger. [laughter]

And I've just been sort of working on this in my spare time and – of which I have quite a bit, actually – and getting it together. Nothing very dramatic in the way of progress.

But we hit these dramatic points, because you have to be pretty well accredited or reputed in order to get accreditation on an expedition; they don't give that to everybody. So the Explorers Club hadn't written me and hadn't written me and hadn't written me; they had me right there on Wait on the Prehav Scale, you know? And I finally wrote them a letter and asked them if the letter was – my letter had been lost, or something of the sort, you know, or if I'd been taken out of the files or something.

And just today, why, they – their delay was explained. They had already put it before the Flag Committee and the board of directors and that sort of thing. So the expedition, as of that action, became an official scientific expedition: ocean archaeological survey with the purpose of discovering various periods of marine history in the past, as possibly represented on the floors of sunken harbors long since passed from the view of man where there are, of course, still ships.

And I don't guarantee that we won't stop by on some of the stuff sunk during World War II and pick up a few tommy guns. [laughter] But anyhow, an expedition of this character
does get a sort of a lonely activity, because people always are smelling the idea that you might bring up the crown jewels of Ophir, or something of the sort, and no telling what might happen.

Anyway, the wide blue horizon opened up and there it is, and I just thought I would tell you about it.

You ever see the Explorers Club flag? It – Oh, I've got it upside down, I sure have. There it is.


Yeah. Now, this flag is not in bad shape – not in bad shape. It was just carried by Waldo Schmitt in his expedition into the Belgian Congo just before the recent difficulties began. My old flag, as I was – I pinned it up there on the bulletin board for you to see – is reported to me to be in such a state of dishabille that it couldn't be issued to anybody else, [laughter] which is absolutely true. Hurricanes are only supposed to go about 100 miles an hour. But that particular flag was flying all through a hurricane that was blowing at 185 miles an hour at Anchorage. It was really rough. Yeah.

All right. Well, I probably used up tape there I shouldn't have used. But anyway, that's the tale about it. Thought you might be interested. I don't always have my attention on the hot brains – don't always. But actually, although I do other things, neither do I let them get in my road. All right. And I keep my job up – try to, anyway.

Now, understand that you're probably going through a number of catastrophes, you probably have run into some imponderables. And I wish to tell you somewhat amusedly that Johannesburg has found a new way of running the CCHs, which is you just sit there and pump somebody's hand for many hours, hoping there will be a reaction. That's pretty good.

I have a hint for that area: they should read a bulletin. [laughs]

Now, they've got one guy on a course that isn't progressing in spite of the fact that they have run him for hours and hours and hours and hours and hours on CCH 1 with no reaction. So Routine 1 "isn't working."

Oh, no! Yeah. That's right. Well, a three-hundred-word cable has just gone out. [laughter] We insulated the telex up here. Actually, the cable is pretty articulate, hardly gibbers at all! [laughter]

Now, I'd better cover the running of the CCHs just for fun, just for fun, just as an amusing activity that, of course, has no relationship to anybody that's ever going to make a mistake; particularly here.

And the way the CCHs are run is CCH 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4 – just like a waltz step. [laughter] You just continue them over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over. And it is a breach of the Auditor's Code, clause 13, to run a process longer than it is producing change; and it is a breach of the Auditor's Code, clause 13, to cease to run a process that is producing change. And nothing we are doing these days has exceeded the Auditor's Code in any way, shape or form.
The odd part of it is, the more we seem to change our minds, the more they remain the same, as far as what we're doing is concerned. People who accuse us, you see, of always changing our minds miss the point that we haven't changed very many fundamentals. But we've sure been looking for an opening in other people's minds, and CCH is one of them.

And the CCHs were basically pioneered, I see, back in about 1956. And that is the first way they were run, and that is the way they produce the maximum change. And after that, I didn't pay too much attention to them, and they slopped into very careless ways. And people started adding additives to them; that is the usual thing that happens. And people started to endure while running them, and it hadn't anything to do with the CCHs.

Hence I'm calling this back to your attention. Commands have been added to them, like "Put your hands back in your lap." Now, what that has to do with the CCHs, I'm sure I don't know, because I never heard of it until I picked it up on a sheet of paper not too long ago.

Somebody refined it and I okayed it carelessly and then forgot about it, and so forth. Truth of the matter is, the words in a CCH process have practically nothing to do with the process.

Now, I had a question on an auditor's report here the other day, as to whether or not you were really supposed to put the person's hand – or touch the person's wrist with your other hand. At least that's the way I interpreted the question. Well, how are you going to get the man's hand? It's a matter of seizure, as far as you're concerned; it doesn't matter whether he's hanging from a chandelier or anything else. You take his wrist delicately between your thumb and forefinger and put his paw in your paw, and you execute the auditing command for him. And you continue to do that. It's always the same repetitive motion; you always do it the same way.

And there are exact motions that you go through. I won't try to describe these verbally; I'd rather show you. They're very simple. For instance, when you're doing CCH 1, your knees are interlocked with the pc's knees. Try to get out of a chair when somebody has got your knees clamped. You see, you don't sit back across the room and so on. You do so much formal auditing that you've forgotten that there was an awful heavy routine regimen laid down here on these CCHs. They were quite precise.

Anyway, you're moved in practically into the pc's chest, and you've got at least one of his knees between your knees, and he starts anyplace, why, there he is. He isn't going to get up, not if you close your knees. And furthermore, you should be between him and the door Always. Your back's to the door; his face is toward it.

Now, he's got a wide perimeter to leap through to get to the door, but you're covering all of it. If you're suspicious of him, back him to the far corner of the room on a CCH 1; so therefore he has to walk through you to get to the door. And you don't lose pcs. I mean, they sit there and run CCH 1, that's all.

You do a certain routine with your hands, and you present the hand into your hand, and you don't shake it and wish him happy days and all that sort of... He has given you his
hand, and at that moment you put his hand back. See, you don't tell him "Now, put your hands back in your lap."

What was this – telepathic CCHs? Well, the CCHs are run with meat. They are very meaty protesses, you see? They're not a verbal "Let's all get along ..."

We had a student one time on one of the ACCs that was running CCH 2, and the pc was giving the auditor a very bad time, you see? But it was just a coaching session because they were doing Upper Indoc. And this pc was – acting as the pc, of course – was slumping and doing unexpected twists and turns. And this dear person who was running this TR, all of a sudden just abandoned the whole thing and turned around to her Instructor – I think it was Dick or Jan, and said, "Pcs never act that way; I'm simply not going to run that TR anymore."

Well, time went by, and she ran into one who did act that way, who acted much worse in an actual session. So all of your Upper Indoc was simply basic training by which you could then do the CCHs. But unless you'd done Upper Indoc, you see, and got your confrontingness up on this amount of motion, then it was difficult to do the CCHs.

Now, two of the CCHs are as rough as bear wrestling. Now, the other two CCHs are not. Nevertheless, they, too, are done by compulsion if necessary.

You can run one-handedly CCH 3 and CCH 4, and you run it one-handedly. That's an interesting aspect of it. You take the pc's hand and you make the pc's hand touch yours and follow the motion. That's all. And then you release his hand. I mean, that's as simple as that. It becomes a kind of a CCH 1 all over again, but it was with motion in a different pattern each time, don't you see? So if the pc is running fine, you run it two-handed and if the pc is not running fine, you run it one-handed. And that's all there is to it.

And Book Mimicry: He says he's not going to do Book Mimicry because when he was very young he got hit by a book. And you say, "That's fine," and you take the book and you put it through a motion, and then you put the book in his hands and you put it through the same motion. And then you take the book and put it through a motion, then put it in his hands and go through the same motion. You understand?

This pc never has an opportunity not to execute the auditing command, and that's all there is to it. And that's CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. The pc never has an opportunity not to execute the auditing command.

And the auditor who will let the pc get away with a non-execution of a CCH – oh, my. It just isn't done – not at all, not even in Chelsea. Not done. The pc always executes the auditing command, no matter if you have to sit on his or her chest and get it done! And you could fully expect the pc to turn up to high-C, high-G, soprano, contralto, or just get into a roaring funk or anything else. Who cares! It has nothing to do with your Tone 40ing through the CCHs. It is just that way. It is not nice; it is effective.

Now, the consequences of letting a pc get out of a CCH are very grave, and you only have to do it once and you will wish to God you never did it again.

I saw a pc let out of CCH 2 one day, and that pc went crazy. How do you like that? It was an institutional pc to begin with. And the pc was getting better under CCH 2 and all of a
sudden made a break for the door, and the auditor did not stop her. And she rushed out into the street. And the auditor walked along behind her trying to persuade her to do the process. And she walked all over the town and was eventually picked up by the cops and thrown into the local spinbin – where she had come from originally; I'm not trying to tell you that CCH 2 drove this person crazy. But do you know that pc didn't get all right for years? Now, the consequences of it are pretty fabulous.

That auditor just stood there and let the pc blow. You got the idea? He heard about it for years, too. Whenever he was getting out of line, why, we'd mention it to him, see? We'd say, "Well, at least you didn't let the pc blow out on the street", you know? And he'd cringe.

No, it's a serious thing. Now, all he had to have done was just to have blocked the pc's leaving. Yes, it was an institutional pc; yes, the girl had been in spinbins till you couldn't count; yes, she'd been electric shocked and all the rest of it. So what? All he needed to have done was simply to have stopped her going out the door and put her back through CCH 2, through the next command. And that psychosis was blowing and would have blown. We know by experience that this is quite common and quite ordinary.

The CCHs run out electric shocks; they run out surgery; they run out almost anything you can think of, if they are run right.

The darnedest physical manifestations turn on. And, of course, the CCH is not flat at its points of higgest volume of reaction. Your pc doesn't, oddly enough, sustain tremendously high-volume reaction, and you almost never see a pc screaming for twenty minutes so that you have to say that it's flat, don't you see, and go on to the next CCH. Almost never happens.

Neither do you necessarily wait till he stops screaming and then say it's flat. Has he stopped screaming for twenty minutes, you see? That would be the test.

But, of course, by rule now, what do we mean by flat? We mean the same aspect of the pc for twenty minutes, which by ne plus ultra, reductio ad absurdum, would be, if the pc were screaming at exactly C-sharp minor exactly, for twenty minutes, that is a no-change. So you'd go on to the next process. You got it?

If the pc is lying on the floor in a funk for twenty minutes, that process is flat. Have you got it? You're executing the auditing command, and the pc remains on the floor for twenty minutes, there's no aspect change of the pc, so that process, as far as you're concerned, is flat. Now, you got that?

Now, how slight a change is a change? A somatic enters and leaves in that twenty minutes. Well, that's not flat. You've got to run it for twenty minutes without the return of that somatic. You got it?

Now, most CCHs run rather calmly. Most of your CCHing is not done with this tremendous duress. About the only time that tremendous duress sets in is usually when the pc is going through something he considers quite painful.

Now, the CCHs turned it on and the CCHs will turn it off, and that is in the oldest rules of auditing: That what turns it on turns it off.
What do you think is going to happen? You've got a horrible, strong, beefy process of this character, and you've turned something on with it. Well, when is he going to get the CCHs run again? See, you didn't run it on through and turn it off. Well, that's a serious thing, you see? That's a blunder of magnitude.

But it's twenty minutes, and it's by the clock. It's not about twenty minutes; it's twenty minutes, by Greenwich meridian, navigational chronometer, sidereal time. Twenty minutes. And if there's no change of aspect in the pc for twenty minutes, then it's flat.

Well, what if the pc, during the whole of the run... nothing happens? Pc just offers his hand and he offers his hand and offers his hand and offers his hand. Well you ... Nobody said anything to – you ran it till you got a reaction!

Now, let me point out something: An E-Meter very often, on a level (and this will fool you sometime if you don't know about it, so know about it pretty well) – the E-Meter, assessed on a level, sometimes for the first three to five hours of run will be giving you the answer to a flat tone arm. A flat tone arm. It's giving you less than a quarter of a division of motion for the first three to five hours, in an extreme case. Less than a quarter of a division for twenty minutes is the signal to change to another process, isn't it? How can you call it flat when it hasn't yet begun to bite?

But there is some motion in the tone arm; there is some motion in the tone arm. Therefore, it is not flat at the beginning of an assessed level run in Routine 2. In Routine 2, it's moving an eighth of a division. It moves an eighth of a division, it almost reaches a quarter of a division, it moves a sixteenth a division, it moves an eighth a division, it moves almost a quarter of a division. You get the idea?

Well, those all say – according to the test – "process flat," because it's moving less than a quarter of a division. Look, how can a process be flat when it hasn't begun to run? It can't be. And you needed some subjective reality on this; you'll run into it soon enough, because it happens to people early in processing, particularly on a Routine 2. But it sometimes happens when you've assessed the goal and you're running on a Routine 3, too. All right.

Here's this little crea-eak, crea-eak, crea-eak, you know? And you say, "Well, by all the rules, it's moving less than a quarter-division in twenty minutes; therefore, I'll come off of it." And then you say, "Well, the pc was ungratefully spun." And the process has not yet begun to run.

Three to five hours, sometime in that period, all of a sudden it suddenly picks up and moves a quarter of a division. Now suddenly it moves a half a division. Now, all of a sudden it moves a division. And then it gets down and you say, "Well, thank goodness, it's coming on down now, and this level is flattening." And it's only moving about a third of a division, and pretty soon it'll move a quarter-division, and then it goes from 1.0 to 6.0 to 7.0 to 5.0 to 3.0 to 4.0 to 2.0, because when they do this, sooner or later they get hot, hot, hot!

Now, the only danger in overrunning a process, of course, is sticking the tone arm. And the only danger there is that you stick it for a couple of sessions, and you can't reassess. But you could stick it for a half an hour and still reassess. So if you're in doubt, while you're feeling your way over this, go ahead and stick it!
It's like I told Barry up at HGC London. He kept telling me, on this one pc, he said, "Well, it's just ... I just ... when will it ever get flat?" You know, it had picked up and had gone very slow, and he'd come off it and he'd reassessed another level in the same afternoon. And of course there I was, looking right down the telex wire at him.

And I said, "Ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah!" I said, "With a tone arm doing that little, the tone arm has not yet begun to move on that level. That tone arm will begin to move on that level. So let's get on the ball here." And he promptly and instantly went off of the second one he had assessed and went back to run the first one he had assessed. And much to his amazement, the first one really started to pick up and fly!

And then he finally wrote me in desperation, about six or seven hours of auditing later. He says, "When is this thing ever going to flatten?"

So I said, "All right now, Barry, you just run it to a stuck tone arm."

And he did; it took quite a while, but he ran it to a stuck tone arm, and then reassessed – stuck the tone arm for twenty minutes and learned how long you could run it and what it looks like.

In other words, this tone arm action, sometimes early in auditing, takes a long time to get going; and at no time can you consider that flat, because it's never run yet. It assessed, so if your assessment was good, it will run. And it may take three to five hours for it to start to run, and we've seen that quite consistently.

Now, that's just one level of the Prehav Scale. Now, let's apply this same thing to the CCHs. This is why I'm taking it up.

Now, your CCHs are run without Model Session and without an E-Meter. We care nothing about the E-Meter in running the CCHs because the pc is the E-Meter. Just as you've learned to watch the tone arm move, so must you learn in the CCHs to watch the pc move – the body reaction. It isn't what the pc says; it is what the pc is doing and is what is happening to the pc. Now, the pc may communicate to you that certain things are happening, and that's fine – that's a change. But the pc is the E-Meter.

You have to consider all four of the CCHs as one level of the Prehav Scale, in this wise, for this purpose: sometimes the CCHs do not begin to bite. So, what do you get? You get twenty minutes of CCH 1, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 2, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 3, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 4, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 1, followed by twenty minutes of CCH 2 and followed by 18 1/2 hours of CCH 3. You got that?

Just as it takes, on a normal level, a while for a tone arm to pick up and run, so does it also take a while on some cases for the CCHs to begin to run. But if you sit there and grind on just one CCH, this won't happen. And if you don't run the CCHs ...

The reason why the CCHs were trotted back out of mothballs, dusted off, the smell of camphor whisked off the top of them, and put back into the lineup, was because you had what happened in the CCHs: the person would run up against the withhold block. In other words, the person would accumulate more responsibility and become aware of more withholds, and
there was no way to get rid of them because the pc wasn't being talked to and no rudiments were being run. So the CCH game was limited by the fact he never had a chance to get his withholds off. Right?

So, in running the CCHs today, you are going to run a processing check – a standard HCO WW form. I repeat, no Security Check is permitted to be edited or altered, changed or added to, ah... period. If it doesn't say HCO WW Form something-or-other at the top of it, it isn't a Security Check. Okay?

And, of course, you don't use a staff member Security Check – that is to say, a new ... one of these new HCO WW Form 6s or something like that – as the repetitive Security Check for processing, or something like that. It means right what it says.

You run a Joburg. You take your most violent versions of Security Check, and you run them one for one. If the pc is an hour on the CCHs, the pc gets an hour of Security Check. You got it?

Now, if you're really booting somebody over the horizon and just really giving them the rocket in a mad way, swap their broomstick for a rocket: give them the CCHs from one auditor and a Joburg from another one. Perfectly feasible. Now, you can actually go ahead and assess for SOP Goals with a third auditor, all at the same time.

In the morning pc gets his CCHs, and in the afternoon he gets assessed for goals, and in the evening gets a Security Check run on him. How fast can you get a gain? Well, wait till you've tried that one – wait until you've tried that one and seen that one go, because, man, you get a gain. It's really inevitable.

But the CCHs are quite powerful, and they throw overts into view quite easily. And the person who is pegged down gets a little bit of auditing and all of a sudden these overts start to loom a little large, and they have to get rid of them.

Now, I don't want you to run into trouble and I don't want you to be abused in auditing, but I hope it happens to you at least once that you get a lot of wonderful auditing that gives you a beautiful case advance without a Security Check, and then suffer for two or three days, and it'll sure make a citizen out of you. Boy, that gives you a subjective reality, right there.

An auditing gain without a Security Check – an auditing gain with velocity, you understand, such as we're handing out now, without a Security Check to clean it up – and you've really handed somebody a bad time. They just practically start bleating, you know? "Why am I doing all these horrible things? My life is such a horrible mess. I have..." You know? They didn't think it was; they were in a wonderful state of fixed irresponsibility just a day before and then something got run on them, like Routine 1 or Routine – I mean, the CCHs or assessments on the general scale. And this was run and all of a sudden, there they are, off to the races.

And you let them improve and improve and improve and improve, and don't inquire into their private lives, because that wouldn't be nice. You'd practically kill them.
I don't wish you any hard luck, but there's nothing that makes a citizen out of you like having that happen to you. You get miserable!

So the CCHs are highly functional as long as they can produce a change in the pc. And the change in the pc is ordinarily stopped by the fact that the pc can't get off his overts. And he's to become more responsible by running the CCHs, and then can't get off his overts and so, bang! – that parks his progress on the CCHs.

Now, how many ways could you park progress on the CCHs? One, you could fail to run Tone 40 auditing. You could go at it in some old crummy way, you know? You got so used, in the Academy, to putting it into the ashtray that you keep putting the intention in the ashtray throughout the auditing session, you see? Be pretty wild.

You run it sort of permissively. You say, "We shouldn't be mean to the preclear," and we just sit back and we don't really press it home. And the pc says, "Well, I'm tired today. And I really don't feel ... I really think this CCH 1 is pretty flat now, and I'm very tired today, and so forth, and I'd rather it wouldn't ... weren't run. I'd rather you'd go on to CCH 4. I think that was the one I was interested in."

Go on to CCH 4, you've had it. Here we go, because you violated C. The first C is control, the next C is communication and the H is havingness. Control, communication and havingness, or communication, control and havingness. Either way, because you apply control, you get communication; and if you apply control and get communication, havingness will result. If you communicate with somebody you can apply control, which will give you havingness. Whichever way this adds up, the end result is havingness.

Now, irresponsibility can deny havingness. Irresponsibility, then, is pulled off of a case by the Security Check, which results in havingness. All O/W results in havingness. So Routine 1, whether looked at from above, below, plan view, or projected, gives you havingness. And the final net run of it is havingness. Routine 2, all the prehavingness buttons, are the things that prevent people from having. Prehavingness might as well mean "prevent havingness" buttons. But we don't call it that because somebody would say the scale was designed to prevent havingness. And by that overt, of course, they prevent themselves from having any gain.

Anyhow, prehavingness, and the end result of patching up somebody's various buttons on the Prehav Scale is to give him havingness. And when the individual has enormous numbers of unrealized goals all over the track, the net result of all of these all up and down the track was to deny him havingness because he never attained the goals. So that when you do a Goals Assessment – just the assessment – the end product of it is havingness. And you've got three havingness routines. Now, all three routines – you have in these routines the inherent fact that you run O/W on a preclear and he gets havingness.

Now, why does he get havingness? Because the individual individuates from things because he can't have them. And therefore he develops overts only on those things he can't have. And when you get the overts off, he can then have.
Here's one of the tests: If you can't get the havingness of the Havingness and Confront Process to work, did you know that all you had to do was run some O/W and you will achieve the same thing?

Supposing we did this weird one: We had him ... This is just taking it straight from theory, you see? I don't say it's workable or anything else, but it's just theoretical. You look around and you say, "Well, notice that cupboard." And you say, "Well, have you ever done anything to a cupboard? Have you ever withheld anything from a cupboard?" And he recalls one. You say, "Good. Look at that floor; notice that floor. Now, have you ever done anything to a floor? Have you ever withheld anything from a floor? Oh, you have. All right. That's good. Now, notice that fireplace. Have you ever done anything to the fireplace – a fireplace? Have you ever withheld anything from a fireplace? Oh, you have. That's dandy. Very good."

You didn't force him, you see, to have actually done something to fireplaces, and so on, because some of these will draw blanks. He says, "No," that's right; you say, "We'll go on to the next one."

And all of a sudden that room will become the most fantastically real room he ever was in. You just – theoretically, that would be the normal outcome of it. You got it? You give him the environment.

But of course you have shorthanded ways of doing this with all of those thirty-six Havingness Processes that you run on a pc objectively in the room. They all more or less do just this. You see?

So your routines are all devoted to increasing the pc's havingness. And they are devoted to – Routine 1, applying control so as to get him into communication so that he can have; Routine 2, getting out of the road the fixed reactive buttons which prevent him from having things; Routine 3, getting out of the road all of these unrealized goals, each one of which has been a defeat for him at some time or another – any goal – all of which goals had as their end product havingness. You can't help but raise his havingness.

Now, running right along with this you run O/W and get off all of his withholds which are preventing him from having. See, he gets the impulse – he can now have, but he'd better not have because he's done bad things, and if he had these things he would ruin them. And therefore, if you don't get this out of the road, you've left him stuck with the idea that he now could have these things but he'd better not, and he's never noticed before now. And it becomes quite painful to him. He says shame, blame, regret, guilt – oh, he says all kinds of things, but that's what it results in. You got it?

So everything you are doing in auditing at the present moment has the end product of havingness. And, of course, if you could have the whole ruddy universe, I assure you it wouldn't be the least trouble to you, not the least bit of trouble. It's only those things you can't have you have trouble with.

Next time you have a PT problem, look it over – look it over. And just ponder this: "How many things are involved with this problem? All right. What blocks off my having of these things or people?" You'll see a problem blow up.
You see, individuation: individuation from the thing, from the object, from the universe, from the dynamic is what brings about the trouble, because you get into an obsessive games condition. And an obsessive games condition simply adds up to the fact that you can't have it; and it, of course, by your determination, can't have anything to do with you.

Had a fellow around one time who had a games condition going with fire. And my Lord, that fellow burned up couches and suits and fire just pursued him everyplace. He could stand in the middle of a street without a bit of fuel anywhere in view and have a roaring bonfire almost consume him. [laughter] And he was in this terrific games condition with regard to fire.

Now, if you'd improved his havingness in general, sooner or later along the road you would have hit the reactive button "fire", see? What has he done with and to fire? In some way he's made it discreditable, in some way he has made it guilty, in some way he's become irresponsible for fire.

All of a sudden, fire no longer has this obsessive chasing effect. Fire just doesn't pursue him up and down all the boulevards and through his whole life, you see? Because fire isn't pursuing him anyhow: he simply cannot have fire, he cannot control fire, and he can't communicate with fire. Soon as he gets into that condition, wow, he's had it. Because no matter where fire will occur, he has to retreat from fire and pull it in on him. See, he's part of the same universe this fire's in, only he hadn't noticed that.

All right. Now, the CCHs, then, are no different than the other two routines. Where an individual is having any difficulty whatsoever with their physiological beingness, where the individual has been obsessively abused, particularly in this physiological beingness that they find themselves in at the moment, the CCHs knock out individuation from the physical beingness. That physical beingness – individuation has been caused by duress on the part of the preclear toward his body and by, apparently, his body toward him.

He's having difficulty: he can't get in his head, he can't come near the body, he can't do this, he can't do that, and therefore, the body is giving him somatics and he's having trouble with the body. You've got the natural concatenation: he's just individuated, that's all. He's one thing and the body's another thing and he can't have it.

And of course the CCHs attack this one particularly, right on the button. It isn't necessarily the criteria for running CCHs, but it's its most immediate and direct result.

So you take somebody that's been given electric shocks. Of course, this has individuated him from the body, because of his own giving the body electric shocks of one kind or another. Well, what happens to this fellow? You start running the CCHs and his havingness on a body starts rising, inevitably. So he has to become aware of all these electric shocks. So as soon as he becomes aware of them, they start running out.

All right. But as soon as they start running out, if he himself takes no further mental step to find out what he's done to bodies and get rid of his overts against bodies, he's left with the somatics running out – but they stop running out – and his overts against the body in full bloom. Pow! This hurts.
So you've got to improve a pc's responsibility if you're going to improve his having-ness, because he won't permit himself to have unless he can be responsible for having. And that's the other philosophic button on which this rests, which we've known for a very long time. Now, you got this?

So the way you run the CCHs is directly, immediately and so on, precisely, and you pay very little attention to the pc's mental reactions. All you do is give him a demonstration that that body he's sitting in can be controlled; as soon as he sits in on this one and says, "You know, somebody's controlling this body. Heh-heh. Somebody's controlling this body. Maybe I can." And so he'll try.

Now, if you let him get up to a point where the body flies out of control and you say to him, "Well, that's all right. That's giving you some trouble. You want to rush out in the street and not come to session and so forth? Well, go ahead" — mmmm, you've shown him the body can't be controlled, haven't you? And he retrogresses like mad. So you mustn't do that to him, because it's a direct reversal to what you're trying to do.

You're trying to show him that his body can be controlled; a failure to execute the CCHs show immediately and directly the body can't be controlled. Of course the body wins.

Now, all you'd have to do if you're going to ruin somebody — I can tell you how to ruin somebody — is start the CCHs and if the guy says, "Oh, I'm tired of this silly process, 'Give me that hand.' What are we doing? Getting in practice to join the Elks?"

And you say, "Well, if you're tired of it, then we just will go off onto something else."

All right. And we go off onto CCH 2 and we march him up and down the room, and eventually he suddenly throws us off a little bit and says, "You know, this is getting awfully annoying to me."

And you say, "Well, all right. We'll go on to something else. Now, let's sit down here in the chair, and now, you put your hands up there ..."

"Well, I don't know that I want to!"

"Well, all right. Then here's this book. All right. Here's this book and ..."

Fellow says, "I never read books. I don't like books. Don't want anything to do with books."

You say well, there's nothing you can do about it, and you go and see the Instructor, the senior auditor, or call somebody long distance, or send them cables from Johannesburg, you know? [laughs] And you say... you say, "Well, we have this pc who we can't make any progress with, with these CCHs."

Now, do you know that you can take Routine 2 and Routine 3 and do — I'm being very hard on Johannesburg. Actually, Johannesburg is snapping out of it, and I'm very happy to notice it. I have noticed it. It was sure in the basement for a while.

But, anyhow, if you were to do the same thing with any auditing activity, and let the pc get out of control at each and every turn of the road, you of course are giving them the side
effect of proving it to him that his aberrations are so strong that they cannot be controlled. And don't be too puzzled if the pc eventually becomes practically unauditable.

Don't be too surprised, if you fail to exert heavy auditing control during a session, if the pc starts getting mad at you, chopping you up, doing this, doing that, doing the other thing; because by not controlling him, by taking his advice all the time, by asking him, "How do you run this process, anyway?" by doing this and doing that, you have shown him that you are not controlling him in the session. And showing him that you are not controlling him in the session, of course, results in the model of "no control" taking over and he himself is defeated because he sees that he cannot control his mind, he cannot control his body, he cannot control. That's true of any auditing process.

That might give you a new shading on this idea of control. Whereas you would look on it very bad – I've mentioned this to you just the other day. I was auditing a pc, actually on a think process, and the pc said, "Oh, I've had enough of that," and leaped madly out of the chair from a very, very calm demeanor, and actually said "I've had enough of that" while springing through the air like an impala. And was springing straight to the door, and in mid-flight I simply grabbed her by the wrist, turned her around in mid-flight and brought her back sitting down in the chair – its legs almost spraddled out into a total splash, you see? – and gave the next auditing command. And that pc began to run like a doll. Nothing to it, man. And we had that process flat just in no time.

And you say, "God, that's awfully harsh!" No, I wasn't being harsh to the pc; I was being rather decent about it. If I'd been mad at the pc, all I would have had to have done was not reach out and grab her wrist, let her reach the door, and then not audit her. Oh, pow. She's had it. She's had it! She'd go around now in the total belief, "Well, if Ron can't control this much aberration and so forth, it's uncontrollable," don't you see? And "Zzoooh! What can poor little me do about it?" You know, some kind of a stupid rationalization like this, you know, to herself. She'd go off hiding from herself in corners.

All right. So she did have a black-and-blue addendum. That was an awful lot better than having a black-and-blue psyche.

And if you for a moment think you're being anything but ornery when you fail to control a pc in session, get rid of the idea. Don't get this kindness all mixed up. I saw I didn't get through to you too good the other day on the subject of kindness, but that's right on the button now. By misguided kindness, you let the pc take control of the session; by misguided kindness, you let the pc off from finishing off the somatic; by misguided kindness you consult endlessly with the pc to make sure that he isn't displeased with what we are doing; and out of that misguided kindness, you practically drive somebody to the bottom of a well.

Be the most vicious thing you could do to a pc is to fail to control him.

The factor is so strong that even if the pc is right in his advices, you had better not take it, because he will suffer more from having been run rightly but out of control, than wrongly in control. Now, do I make myself clear?

Just the fact that the pc has said, "But this has been flat for days!" And you were just that moment going to open your mouth and say, "You know, I think this level has been flat
for days!" You were just about to say this. But the fact that he says it, that's enough, man. You have no choice but to run it. Why? Because his announcement of the fact throws him out of control. And it is more serious to let a pc out of control in session than it is to run the wrong process or to overrun a process. That can't louse him up, but letting him go out of control can practically kill him.

So if you ever want to err, don't err on the side of sweetness and light, man; err on the side of the heavy-handed parent; err on the side of the lion tamer; err on the side of the machine gunner. Keep the Auditor's Code, but keep control. And if you do that, your pcs will never do anything but recover, because the hidden factor of the CCHs are present in whatever you're running, even though you're doing formal auditing.

"Well, is it all right with you if I end this process?"

And he says, "No, it certainly is not!"

And you say, "What objection do you have?"

And he says, "Sa-rowr, rowr-rowr, rowr-rowr."

And you say, "All right. Okay. Thank you very much. Now, I'll give you two more auditing commands and end this process."

"Oh, God! What are you doing to me?"

And you say, "Have you ever shot the moon? Thank you. Have you ever shot the moon? Thank you. Is there anything you'd care to say before I end this process?"

And you know, about that time, if you've done the job right, he'll say, "No, as a matter of fact I don't have."

You say, "Good. End of process."

What happened to the ARC break you knew was going to occur? It wasn't that he was knuckled under and overwhelmed – that was not what happened. You say, "What do you know? This outburst is easily controlled. Look, pc controlled it."

Pe's controlled it. "Not only did the auditor control it, I controlled it, too. Heh-heh. What do you know? Tooh! Nothing to it." Got the idea?

All right. Wrong – wrong way: "Well, is it all right with you if I ask you two more times and end this process?"

"No, my God, I will say it isn't! I've got a somatic eight feet thick, and why don't you ever pay any attention to your auditing, and what is the matter with you anyway?"

"Well, how wide is this somatic? Okay. All right. Well, we'll carry on the process a little while longer then, and see if you get rid of it."

"Well, you'd better."

Fifteen minutes more auditing and you've got a real roaring ARC break. What's the ARC break over? You did what the guy said! You tried to flatten this terrible somatic; you were being nice about the whole thing; you were being reasonable about the whole thing. Well, the test is, did the somatic get better? No, as a matter of fact, it will always get worse.
Always. It's better to end the process wrongly on the auditor's determination, than to end it on the pc's rightly. Remember that. Of course, it's a happy chance that you end it rightly on the auditor's determination. [laughter]

Give you a new viewpoint of this sort of thing?

_Audience: Yes._

Yeah.

Now, the auditor is running the session, and if the pc starts running the session, expect trouble – expect trouble, man. It's not a kind thing to do; it's a rotten, mean, dirty, nasty thing to do to a pc. It's almost covert hostility to do that to a pc.

Pc says, "Oh, God, you're not gonna ... you're ... you're actually ... no, my God! You're not going to run any more 'failed can't'!" [laughter]

And the auditor says ... My normal response to such a thing is "What's the matter?"

And he says, "Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow! And yow, yow, yow, yow."

You say, "No kidding! All right. The auditing command is, 'What have you failed to can't?' 'Who has failed to can't you?' " And he'll all of a sudden – he's suddenly good as gold. He says, "Well, it (kmpf-kmpf) wasn't flat. Process wasn't flat."

The pc can steer a session wrong on me by being too informative of actually what is the exact situation, because he opens a gate there that you can't let him go through. And he says, "Well, this 'failed can't' has been flat for the last session. I know it." And you were just about to open your mouth and say, "This 'failed can't' has been flat for the last session, I'm sure."

And he says, "This 'failed can't' has been..." _Whooh._ Well, here goes a half an hour of "failed can't".

In the first place, I wouldn't believe it was flat if he was protesting against it. And the other thing, even if it was flat, it would do him more harm to let him start running the session than it would be to overrun a process or underrun one. You got that? It would do him more harm.

Now, many people have trouble ending sessions, and that's because they keep consulting the pc as to "what's the state of the pc," so as to determine when the session should end. And I'll tell you a good test sometime, is the next time a pc says to you that the session shouldn't end, or he has something undone, or he feels very bad about it, or he hasn't made his goals, why, that's just dandy; just nicely, firmly and pleasantly end the session – and find no ARC break. And you'll say, "What happened to the ARC break that we knew was coming?" It didn't materialize.

No, what happened to it was, this is an effort of a breakout, an effort at a continuance, and you come along behind the thing and you say, "You see? It wasn't necessary to continue it."

And he says, "It wasn't necessary to continue it."
So the next time you have trouble ending a session... This, by the way – a new auditor on an HGC almost always, has this difficulty. They say to the old-timers, "How could you possibly get your sessions ended by 6 – 3:30? How can you end a session by 3:30?" And the new auditor is staggering out of the auditing room, you see, at 6:45.

Well, that's a sure indicator that the new auditor does not have his pc in control, because he's said to the pc, "Now, how do you feel now? How do you feel about the process we've been running, and so forth? How's your general health?"

And the pc says, "Well, it's pretty bad, actually. My aunt Methuselah matildaed the other day, and it's pretty bad." And the new auditor would say, "Well, the poor fellow. Why, we ... the best ... the best thing for him to do is to carry on here and get this matildaing out of the way." And so he does that, and then he'll find something else, and he'll find something else and it goes on and on and on. And the pc as-is less and less, and makes less and less progress, and is slowed down more and more, and the auditor's getting into more and more trouble, and he wonders, "What on earth is happening to me?"

Whew. The only thing that's happening is, is back there at 3:30 with the tone arm moving – it could have been, you see, as bad as this: The tone arm was moving on a rock slam – the tone arm was rock slamming, you see, not the needle. And 3:30 was about to come around, and he just had time to get in his end rudiments before he reached 3:30, and he said, "All right. Is it all right with you if I give you two more commands and end this process?"

"All right with me? My God, I'm just getting going!"

You say, "All right. Thank you very much." Give him two more commands.

"Is there anything you'd care to say before I end this process?"

"Well, there certainly is. My God, I never saw such horrible bad auditing, and you're doing me in," and so forth.

And you say, "Good. End of process." And then you run your end rudiments. "Now, is there any ARC breaks?" And you expect immediately that you're going to get your head taken off, before you get used to this kind of thing, you know? And you're sitting there all ready for the meter to blow up. Ah, there's a little twitch.

And you say, "What was that?"

"Well," he says, "you didn't end the ... you ended it. You ended the process, and I don't know if I can ever get back into it or not."

"All right", you say. "Well, is it all right with you if we take that up tomorrow?" And you say, "Okay. Now, do you have any ARC breaks?" And there is none. And you say, "All right. And here we go", you see, and run off the end rudiments and that's it. The pc goes out whistling and everything's fine, dandy.

But the new auditor, the new auditor at 6:35, you see, streaked with sweat and coal dust, comes staggering out of the auditing room, you know, and he says to the others, he said (who have now assembled for an evening briefing session or something of the sort), "How do you people do it? You must be terribly cruel. You must just chop the pc off in the middle of nothing, you know, and you must just be thinking about yourselves and nobody else, and ..."
They say, "Well, I don't know, we end it, and it never seems to do any harm." And that's the correct way to go about it, that's all. You run the session.

Now, that's very, very observable in the CCHs, but, of course, it carries over into the remainder of auditing. In the CCHs it is so observable that if you let the pc start running the auditing session, he will practically spin, and in the others he just has an ARC break.

You want to know what an ARC break is? Sometime or another the pc went out of session and you lost control of the pc. And it sometimes takes as much as an hour to an hour and a half for that ARC break to materialize in the physical universe. That is so true that when I get a pc who is ARC breaking (which doesn't happen very often, because I do this other one), I say to them, "What happened a half an hour ago?"

"Half an hour ago? Oh, a half an hour ago. I'm not interested in a half an hour ago. It's what's happening right now. I mean, I'm ... after all, I feel these bayonets in my chest and so forth, here."

"No, what happened a half an hour ago?"

"Oh, I remembered a half an hour ago, I -- yeah, that's right. There was something there. I ... I remember about a half an hour ago I'd forgotten to phone my wife at noon and she's probably furious with me." There was your ARC break; didn't have anything to do with what you were doing in auditing.

Now you, not understanding what ARC breaks are, or how to take ARC breaks apart, find your auditing apparently under criticism all the time from the pc, and then you try to put your finger on what it is that you are doing wrong in your auditing so as to set it right. And the truth of the matter is, the only thing you're doing wrong in your auditing is not being pigbullheaded. And a half an hour after you have broken down and relinquished control of the session, you get an ARC break and get all this criticism from the pc of your auditing. And that happens an hour and a half an hour after you have committed the "fox pass"1. And you let them "foxes" through and you've had it. [laughter]

And that's what occurs. You got it now?

_Audience: Yes. Hm-hm._

Try sometime to be overbearingly, stupidly domineering about a session. Just try it sometime, just for the hell of it! Have the pc make a perfectly reasonable suggestion, such as "Could I have a break so that I can go to the bathroom?" and look at him as though he has suddenly stolen the crown jewels, see? And say, "Well, we'll get a break in an hour or so", and note the peculiar lack of an ARC break.

And then sometime have a pc say this to you, "Well, actually, I don't quite feel up to running the process at the moment." And you say, "Well, we'll do something else," and watch the ARC break materialize in an hour and a half to a half an hour.

You see? And because it's an hour and a half to a half an hour afterwards in most cases, you don't associate cause and effect, because it's such prior cause that you haven't no-

1 Editor's note: pun with "faux pas"
ticed where you lost control of the session. But the best way to patch up an ARC break is to find out where you lost control of the session and reassert control of the session, not Q-and-A with the ARC break! Now, there's a real way to patch them up.

So you're very graduate in the way of auditors, and you ought to learn that one, and you ought someday, just for the hell of it, just to find out that it's true – as you're auditing, just be pigheaded about something sometime or other, just utter pigheaded. Pick out one of the cartoons they used to draw of the German army back in World War I, you know, and put it on.

And the pc has made a perfectly reasonable request. The pc has said, "Can we end the session by 4:30, because I have a date with a millineuse?"

And ...look at him pityingly, you know, and just disregard it utterly. Just make as if – pointedly – he'd never said a word. You're going to be charitable; you're going to disregard this terrible thing he has obviously done.

Now, to your way of thinking, that would cause an ARC break. No, the way the ARC break is caused, you must also do this one – do this other one, see?

Sometimes a pc says, "Oh, I don't know if... I ... you ... God ... God almighty! I ... I don't ... I don't have to run this. You say you found a present time problem on that meter. Well, look, I'm so tired of having all of my auditing time wasted on present time problems! Can't we just skip the present time problem for once?"

Go ahead. Skip it. Just knuckleheadedly skip it, pleasantly, and just say, "Well, all right. Well, if you don't want to run it, we won't run it. Okay. Now, let's take up the next one here." And watch it start to arrive. You can actually measure it on your clock. The maximum time you will have to wait is one and one-half hours of auditing, but somewhere – certainly, certainly within an hour and a half, and in certainly not less than a half an hour, you're going to have an ARC break on your hands.

"Your fingernails are dirty. Your fingernails are dirty. You know, you really ought to get some training at the local Academy, because if you ran your confronting a bit better, I'm sure I could make some progress or something. Do you realize that you have crossed your legs?" Any kind of an ARC break you can think of that has nothing to do with the price of fish. No, it was right back there.

And you say, "Well, naturally. We had a present time problem. That's making him edgy." No, that is not what happened. You let the pc run his own bank for a moment and showed him that you were an incompetent, weak schnook. [laughter] And showed him that his bank was not controllable, and you've proved this to him conclusively that his bank was not controllable, so what materialized? The simplest thing in the world materialized: the bank, having been demonstrated to be uncontrollable, of course becomes uncontrollable. And you get what is commonly called an ARC break.

And auditors who have constant, continual ARC breaks with pcs can be rated just exactly this: no control of pc. Pc says, "I am schnooking today", and the auditor says, "You poor

---

2 Editor's note: probably meant as female form of milliner.
fellow, so therefore we're not going to schnook." You know, he says, "It's schnooking. Naturally, we'll avoid schnooking then. We won't get into that nasty field.", or the pc says, "I keep hearing these violins in my ears", and that sort of thing. And the auditor is sitting down there just to do one thing, which is to run an assessed level of the Prehav Scale – get the rudiments in order to run a level of the Prehav Scale. And the pc knows very well what's going to happen. And he says, "Violins in my ears", you know, "all the time!" and so forth.

And the auditor says, "Well, is this a present time problem with you?"

And he says, "It certainly is."

And the auditor just goes right on down the line and gets the rest of what he ought to do and runs the assessment, and we don't hear anything more about it. And the violins turn off because they were part of the level.

But, this one: The auditor says, "Oooh, violins. Well, we'll have to do something about violins. Now, what trouble have you had with violins in your life?" and just throws the session away. And you've got an ARC breaky pc from that point right straight on. You got it?

Learn that one well. Because it's the difference – no matter what tricks you learn, that one that I've just been talking about, which is very much in keeping with the CCHs, that one is the difference between auditing and no auditing. You've got a black and white: auditing or no auditing. Auditing, the auditor's in control of the session with a capital C and a capital T. Got it? All right. Auditing takes place. Auditor not in control of session, reactivity takes place, because there's nobody now in control of the session, so there couldn't be any auditing.

And the easiest way in the world to get rid of auditing is to delete control from an auditing session. Then the auditor isn't controlling the session, the pc can't control the auditing session, the reactive mind damn well won't control the auditing session, so where is the auditing?

Actually, a lot of your feeling about auditing, or some of your flinches that you occasionally get about auditing, simply stems from times when you have not controlled an auditing session; and only then did you come under heavy criticism from the reactivity of the pc. Only then.

The only thing that could ever be criticized about any of you as an auditor is that you do not control a session heavily enough.

So take your cue from the CCHs and control the rest of auditing the same way, and the results which you get will be five to ten times as fast as they are right now. You want to know how to speed up auditing results? Just try it. Okay?

Audience: Thank you. Hm-hm.

Righto. Said my piece.

Thank you very much.
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Thank you.

Okay. Well, we have arrived at a Friday. And I think the last time I looked it was the 24th, wasn't it? The 23rd. It just shows you: You start looking at the time track, and no telling where you'll land.

All right. Well, here we go. What questions do we have today? Oh boy, I'm happy you really got it taped. Oh man, I'm happy you've got it really taped.

Female voice: I had a question of at what age would one give Joburgs?

At what age can one give Joburgs? Well, I'll tell you, that below thirteen or fourteen, a special Joburg should probably exist, and it should probably go down to the age of about six. And then another one should exist down to the age of about three. And it should be compartmented in that direction. A Joburg would simply stir up a kid under twelve on the whole track. Okay?

Female voice: Yes. Thank you very much.

All right. Any other question? Yes.

Another female voice: Will a properly assessed Havingness command ever cause the needle to tighten, say within the first eight commands, and then loosen?

Well, you're asking would a properly assessed Havingness command first cause the needle to tighten and then loosen? What you are looking at is what will tighten a Havingness needle? And what tightens a Havingness needle is an ARC break. Your Havingness is working on Tuesday just dandy, and on Wednesday it suddenly tightens the needle. Well, it isn't necessarily true that the Havingness Process is now defunct. It is true that the Havingness Process is being run against an ARC break. And your rudiments aren't clean on it, that's all. And it will make the Havingness Process look momentarily invalid.

There is another method by which this happens. A Havingness Process run too long creates an ARC break. And you start running a Havingness Process fifteen, twenty, thirty commands. About that time your pc, if he has any inkling that this is wrong, develops an ARC
break and the havingness needle tightens at that moment. And the overrunning of a Havingness Process, then, will tighten the needle.

Now, in a case where it tightens and loosens, what you had is a pc with a rudiment out, and the havingness took care of it. And you're looking at this kind of a spooky situation where you didn't really realize what was going on.

You get the idea? A havingness needle, however — your stable datum on this is, the Havingness Process has been running and now suddenly doesn't run; two things are wrong — could be wrong. The first one is the most common, that you have a rudiment out. And you are actually merely distracting somebody's attention madly. And it upsets him.

So, so much for that. You got it? But an ARC break will tighten the havingness needle. The other method by which happens, of course, is the Havingness Process has expired. That's less seldom and in fact it's sufficiently rare that you should always suspect the ARC break. Okay?

*Female voice:* Is it ever unusual for — as case gets advanced — the exactly right Havingness Process will tend to repair their havingness in just two or three commands?

Oh, yes.

*Female voice:* And run any longer than that will then suddenly ...

Well, that's why I've said eight to twelve ...

*Female voice:* Yeah.

... commands. That is very safe. And their havingness actually repairs with great speed. The havingness will repair on one command.

*Female voice:* That's what I'm thinking of. Yeah. Okay.

I wouldn't trust it. I'd still go on running it five, eight commands.

*Female voice:* Mm-hm.

Okay?

*Female voice:* Yeah.

All right.

Okay, any other questions? You know a lot of you people that just arrived, I know there's an awful lot of things you don't know yet and you're sitting there being very, very quiet about it. Is this quietness a symptom of you don't know enough to ask a question here? [laughter]

All right. It's a case of, I'm afraid, you don't know what you don't know. Yes?

*Female voice:* I know something that I don't know. On what you talked about yesterday, on running the CCHs 1, 2, 3 and 4, did you say you should run each one twenty minutes and then shift to the next one, and on and on and then, you know? Twenty minutes of 1, twenty minutes of 2, twenty minutes of 3, twenty minutes of 4 and then start over again?

Hmm.
Female voice: And on and on? And then...

I say?

Female voice: Well, I'm asking...

That's the way it works!

Female voice: I know...

That's her job. Go on.

Female voice: I'd like to have it run on me.

Go on.

Female voice: And then you do that for an hour and then you shift to an hour of Joburg and then back again to the CCHs for an hour?

Uh-uh. Uh-uh. Uh-uh. No, no, no! No! No! No, no, no, no, no, no. This is why they don't ask questions, is because I scold them and chop them up, see?

Female voice: I've seen it recently in auditing Will you straighten me out?

All right. No, it's one for one, which is if you have run two and a half hours of CCHs or five hours of CCHs, you should do two and a half hours or five hours' worth of the other. But you don't ever expect anything to happen with CCHs running them for a whole auditing period of a whole hour.

CCHs are not an endurance contest. This question has too many ramifications. In the first place, it infers too many things. You have said if you run the CCHs twenty minutes and then twenty minutes and then twenty minutes... No, my God. No, no, no, my God, no. No, no, no, no. See? That's what I'm saying no, no, about. See? Don't run the CCHs twenty minutes apiece. Run a flat CCH only twenty minutes and if it is flat... Now, get that one right. Because, boy, you can lay an awful egg with the CCHs, see? Got it? Get that one real good. You run a CCH that is flat for only twenty minutes. It's got to be flat for twenty minutes before you leave it.

Now, if CCHs are not biting, then you discover this oddity: that you'll be running a CCH for twenty minutes and the next CCH for twenty minutes. But that's only if they're not biting. You got that?

Female voice: Yes.

Yes?

Female voice: But I don't have it real well.

All right. Now, your CCHs are run only so long as they produce change and no longer. And they are run constantly that they produce change.

Now, your CCH is run as long as it produces change. Now, have you ever had CCHs in the Academy?

Female voice: No.
Ahhhh! Here's what's happening We're going up against a battery of processes which are unknown.

Female voice: I have had CCHs run on me, all of them.

Oh, no, but you've got to be trained in running CCHs. Assign somebody to train her running CCHs. Okay. Because there's a lot more to it than having them run. Yeah.

Now, a CCH must be run as long as it produces change. And you cannot get auditing compartmented into time brackets without observation, which is what I see the tendency is here. And we mustn't do that. We audit a pc. And the only reason we say twenty minutes is because that is the period of observation that is safe. That's a safe period of observation. That's not too long, that's not too short. Got it? All right.

Now, when a period of twenty minutes has elapsed without any change, if we exceed that, the pc feels he is being punished. He's doing the auditing command, and he's apparently being punished for doing the auditing command by the auditing command continuing to be run on him as though, then, he is not doing it right.

The biggest danger in running CCHs is invalidation of the pc. And to run an unflat process flat is not an invalidation. But to run a flat process, consistently and continually, operates as an invalidation. And the only trouble we've ever had with the CCHs is an invalidation of the pc.

Now, the way that CCH 3 and 4 can be run would stand your hair on end. Let's supposing we didn't have that little clause in there of "Did you do that?" on 3 and 4, you see. The idea of asking the pc if the pc has done it. Get the idea? All right.

Now, supposing that we had the auditor – this is what's happened countless times – we've had the auditor deciding whether or not the pc did it. And immediately the CCHs become totally unworkable. As a matter of fact that was the first great invalidation of the CCHs and why we tended to come off of them slightly.

The CCHs were working just wonderfully until all of a sudden a bunch of people got ahold of the CCHs, and they would make a motion with the book which the devil himself couldn't complicate, and which they themselves couldn't have followed immediately afterwards. And they've said to the pc, "Now, you didn't do that", you know, in effects and grabbed the book back and take the thing away into the air and give it to the pc and ... Pooh, you know? I've watched it man, I mean, it's grim! The auditor takes the book and goes flip-flop and hands it to the pc, and the pc takes the book and goes flip-flop. And the auditor sighs, and takes the book back from the pc and does the same flip-flop again. And the pc takes the book and goes flip-flop. And the auditor sighs and takes the book. And then I finally would say to the auditor, if I was observing it, "What the hell is wrong with you? The pc did it!"

"Oh, yes, but the title is reversed when he does it."

And you say, "Man, just knock off of this auditing and go get audited, will you?"

But it's just using the mechanism of invalidation – mechanism of invalidation. All right.
A pc, if they're invalidated while running the CCHs, tend to go *mmmm!* And it can be done by an auditor. He can actually invalidate the pc by a misrun of the CCHs. They've got to be pretty flagrant. But we ask the pc then, "Did you do that?" or "Are you satisfied with that?" You've gone flip-flop with the book and the pc scratches the back of his neck with it. And say, "Did you do that?" and the pc looks at you cunningly and says, "Yeah, I did it all right." And you take the book away from him; that's all right. You're through; you've had it. And you do another motion.

It's whether the pc thinks he did it, and you would be absolutely amazed, gazing into the quicksand and morass that some people call a mind, what they think they have done and what they think they have observed. It's marvelous. Do you know that some 20 percent of the people who are walking around in the streets right this minute never see a wall and never see a curb, ceiling or a person. They only see their own facsimiles of the wall, curb and person. They put them up here driving automobiles and give them medals for killing everybody. They can't even *see* the object; they see a facsimile of the object. And you very often will see this cease to exist in the CCHs.

You'll all of a sudden say – the person will say, "This wall is terribly bright. There doesn't seem to be anything between me and the wall." Well, man, that's right! Hitherto, they've looked at a picture of the wall that was on the wall, and they see the picture and there's the wall.

Now, here's one of the things you can have somebody do. You say – there's a bird going tweet-tweet outside, and you say, "All right now, make a picture of that bird out there. Now bring it in and look at it. What is it?"

They say, "It's a crane." [laughter]

And they hear an automobile going by in the street, and you say, "Now, put out a picture – you know, make a picture of that automobile. Now bring it in the room and look at it. And what is it?"

And they say, "Steamboat." They say, "What the hell is wrong with me?"

Actually, they will get the facsimile they're stuck in duplicated, if they do that.

Now, that symptom goes forward considerably further. It goes forward to the fact that the person doesn't ever see the wall or the carpet or the ceiling or the floor or anything. He sees a picture that he has made which he has interposed between him and it. You can generally detect this person because their depth perception is fantastic – awful bad. You know? They run into walls and door sides, and so forth, and then they go to the oculist and get fitted with specs, and then they run into more doors and more windows. Of course, the specs don't help you to see facsimiles. They never *see* anything, you see?

All right. Now, you take that person. Now, he's very easily invalidated. Because why is he doing this? He makes a facsimile of the wall and looks at his facsimile of the wall because it is not safe to look at walls. In other words, this fellow is nervous. He is upset. He is – he's quivery, you see? He's real shaky about the physical universe. So this thing's liable to bite him at any minute, you know. And lions and tigers would be quite an – wouldn't be unusual at
all to have them just jump out of the fireplace at any minute, you know, or suddenly materialize from nowhere. And this sort of thing's liable to happen.

Now, he starts to get a spark of confidence, you see, in actually having observed you, and then he did it. Now, this tells him he's in communication with you. He must have seen something, otherwise he couldn't duplicate something. So the auditor begins to be real. All right. Now the auditor says, "You didn't do that" in some way. Of course, the auditor ceases to be real at once, because the fellow's whole protective mechanisms go up, and he thereafter makes pictures of the auditors, and he can't do the auditing command and it all goes to pieces, don't you see?

In the first place, all you're trying to do is convince him the auditor is real. Now, if the auditor becomes part of the dangerous environment by tending to invalidate the pc, by over-running a process ... The process is perfectly flat; the pc to the best of his knowledge and belief has done it for a long time all right. Yet the auditor continues to run the process. The auditor is tending to say to the pc it isn't all right. So the pc all of a sudden doesn't know what's all right, and the pc gets nervous and doesn't want to come to the next session and so forth. This is all auditor invalidation of the pc.

All these various mechanisms occur to retard the use and operation of the CCHs. Now, if you know those basic mechanisms, you know why you're running the CCHs which – the basic goal of the CCH is to make the auditor, the physical universe and present time real to the pc, to show him that he can observe the auditor, the auditing room and present time. That's all it's doing. See, it isn't doing anything, really, more significant. It's familiarizing with these things. But it uses these various mechanisms of duplication and so on, on up the line, auditing commands, the control of the auditor, the communication of the auditor. All these various things all add up to additives, so that this reality on the auditor and the auditing room by the CCHs far exceeds anything you would get this way:

"Look at me. Am I here? All right, that's good. Now look at the wall. Is that there? Ah, that's fine." Now we've run a thousand hours of the CCHs, you see? It's just – it wouldn't work, that's all. Because there isn't enough duplication and there isn't enough anything.

Now, let's take this fellow that we're gradually bringing out of his chrysalis. He's getting fairly confident, he's getting downright cocky about it, and he's giving you his hand, and we don't look adequately at what's going on in his mind. Actually, one of the first things he knows very often is that you don't exist or that you are a figment of his imagination, or something of this sort. And all of a sudden he says, "Hey." It begins to be very, very evident to him that there is somebody else alive, and that there is an other determinism somewhere in the universe. And his scarcity on other determinisms is fantastically low. That is the scarcest scarce people get. So they even start mocking up thetan bedbugs to keep him company at night and so forth. And they don't know any other determinism exists anyplace.

But through the process of the CCHs, you get – this condition finally appears that somebody else exists and that a universe is here. And that's the only result you're going to get out of the CCHs.

Now, at any time that you introduce into it this factor, is "I may be real, but boy, you're sure be wishing in a minute you hadn't found it out." Ah." This room may be getting
awfully real to you, but we'll just make it as horrible as we can. Because it's really – you're really not doing right, you know; you're doing wrong." Now, this is how you can run the CCHs wrong.

Now, any time you settle down to a timed routine that has nothing to do with the pc, you're in instant trouble. Instant and immediate trouble. We know more or less on the average what the safe margins of anything are. But I will tell you that twenty minutes is an awfully long time for a child. It's safe for an adult. But it's quite a long time for a child whose attention span may very well be only ten minutes.

And the child in the course of that twenty minutes may get to feeling terribly invalidated. They're doing their level best to give you their hand and be obliging, and they're liable to feel terribly invalidated. So as you shut down the line in age, when you're running it on a child – well, call it something like seven or eight minutes. And if the child did the process consistently seven or eight minutes – call it 7.5 if you want to be precise – [laughter] the child won't feel invalidated.

*Female voice:* I find a big difference in children, timewise.

_Hm?

*Female voice:* I found that there was a tremendous difference in how long was long enough between children. I ran it on two different children age three, "Give me that hand," and one just did real well for about twenty minutes, and the other one, about six minutes was ...

And then what happened?

*Female voice:* Well, then he just fell clear, clear, clear apart.

And then what did you do?

*Female voice:* And then I just kept on and kept on ...

_Yeah.

*Female voice:* But I only – after that I shortened the length of the sessions. But for the first time, I stayed with it for the time – the whole twenty minutes that I had done with the other child. After that when I arranged the time I made shorter times and he did better after that.

Shorter times for what?

*Female voice:* Like ten minutes ...

For the process changing or the process being unchanged?

*Female voice:* For running the process. I'd say ...

_Oh man, look, look, look, look, look. We're talking – you just better talk this over with Mary Sue, because you got this backwards and inside out. I see that clearly. Because look, you don't run a CCH by the clock. You run it on the pc. It's the pc's change that determines this. Now, you're talking about a ten minute flat area before the process begins to bite. Ixnay. There is no flat area before the process begins to bite.
Female voice: Non that's not what I was talking about.

Huh?

Female voice: I was talking about length of sessions.

Oh, the length of session. That's incredibly short. That's nowhere. If you run the CCHs – if you don't run the CCH that is biting at least an hour, the kid practically spins in.

Female voice: On a three year old?

Huh?

Female voice: On a three year old?

Oh, man! Teach her!

Another voice: Good.

Teach her some fundamentals here. We're discussing them now. Okay. I imagine... Now listen, you'll do better with them if you run them right. Okay? All right. I didn't mean to invalidate you for asking a question, but it makes me nervous sometimes when I see how far off these processes can get.

A CCH on a child that is only run for ten minutes, the auditor ought to be shot. If it's biting, you see, and the auditor quits the process at the end of ten minutes – oh, man! He's giving the kid something like a headache for the rest of the day or something like this, or he's driven the kid into some of a propitiative state. No, a CCH has to be run – that is biting, actually has to be run for about an hour, at least, before anything could be expected to occur. You got it?

Female voice: Okay.

All right. Okay. All right. Any ARC break?

Female voice: No.

All right.

Female voice: That's why I came.

All right. Okay, any other question?

All right. Now, let's take a look at auditing in general, shall we? Auditing in general is an activity which is engaged upon by an auditor on a pc, and it is regulated and monitored in its attack and approach by the pc, behavior of.

First thing that establishes what you do as an auditor is the pc's condition. What has just come out in a bulletin is not what establishes what you do with the pc. It's the pc's condition that establishes what you should do with the pc. But in view of the fact that a tremendous width of randomity, activity and upset can occur – tremendous – you have to have a standardization, because you get too many ideas mixed up in what you're doing in the way of auditing, and the clear view of what happens or should happen in auditing tends to go fizzle, and has for about eleven years. Particularly in California. Dear old California.
We just had another blowup today out in California, so you needn't feel bad, Johannesburg. [laughter]

So anyhow, there are certain things that work, and there are certain things that don't work. Now, when you've had as much work put in on what works, and as much understanding and research background as has been invested in this particular activity, you can't help but come up with some right answers. So there are right things to do with pcs and there are wrong things to do with pcs. And if you don't know the fundamentals, I'll lay you a thousand golden sovereigns to a crooked halfpenny that you won't pull any of the right ones. Because the laws of averages, if they were so rigged that pcs or patients or people would have become Clear or well in the last fifty thousand years on this planet – if the laws of averages would take care of it, it would have happened. And we can show you clearly that it has not happened. So therefore, random running will not get anybody anywhere. That you can make pretty sure of.

Now, we have to know first and foremost how the mind goes together. Man didn't appreciate this before. He was busy trying to save the thing and send it to heaven. Or he was trying to get it nullified or he was trying to get various things, and he was working with the spirit. And from time to time did work with the spirit. And he got no place.

We probably got further in 1952 to '55 on the subject of exteriorization than man had ever gotten before. And we learned quite a bit about it. And one of the things is, is the sudden change of exteriorization is such a sudden change that it deteriorates rapidly as a condition. Quite remarkable how fast it deteriorates. We can do today all of the things we did then. You can blow people out of their heads and suddenly have them talking when they stuttered before, and have them seeing when they couldn't see before, and all kinds of weird odd phenomena occur. But these things are all unstable phenomena.

I spent some time trying to stabilize these phenomena and make them into something that was highly useful. And then I found out that before a thetan can experience a sudden change – like the total loss of his body – he has to be up to being able to have a body first. Before he can walk out of a body, he's got to be able to have one. And the people who most easily present themselves to be bunged out of their heads are people who wouldn't have anything to do with a body if you paid them. The person who wants nothing to do with the body at all exteriorizes at the drop of a skunk. All you've got to do is say to this person, "Phhff!" and there they are, heading past Arcturus.

Now, how the Buddhist, the Lamaist, missed this, I don't know. But he patently knows nothing about it. The mystery of the East has been exploded. Man, anybody who would be stupid enough to sit still for twenty years and regard his navel so as to exteriorize should have his thetan examined. [laughter] You don't have to sit still for twenty years. Get somebody to say to you something on the order of – the first exteriorization process is "Try not to be three feet back of your head." Wham! There they go, you know? Well, Buddhism is accomplished. That was the end of track as far as Buddhism is concerned, and that one little set of English words took care of everything they were trying to hand out. Oh yes, they were also trying to hand out "Peace, peace on you too, brother," and so forth. They were trying to hand out various other principles, which got into other religions, and we had people being quiet.
And the whole subject is devoted to how to keep people quiet. It's a police operation, a whole track police operation.

You're always getting space jockeys and space-opera people who are sailing in, saying, "Let's see. How are we going to quiet this down? These people are moving. These people are dangerous. They move. They walk around and they whistle and they sing and they move. And therefore, they're liable to do things. So the thing we'd better do is introduce some peaceful philosophy of some kind or another that'll just stop all this tendency toward motion." That's a fact.

And you get things like Buddhism, Christianity – the quiet philosophies, I call them. And of course, how quiet can you get? Dead. And you might say it's a covert effort to kill everybody off. And it's true that if you get somebody falling totally – well, I can trace the background, in some pcs that have done so, the most amusing concatenation you ever had anything to do with. Say, "Well, when did you begin to feel bad?"

And the pc says, "Oh, about 1941. Something like that. I began to feel kind of bad. I was young then, but I began to feel kind of bad and so on."

"What happened then?"

"Well, uh, nothing much happened. I just felt that I'd – You know, well, it was about that time I felt I'd rather – I'd better take it easy. I might do things, and I might – you know, kind of put myself under restraints a little bit, because something had happened then that was quite dangerous and quite upsetting, and so forth and, yes, I became quieter. I matured."

You'll find these spots of sudden change of pace to be the spots which broke the person's life. Those sudden changes of pace. And what do you find sitting in the midst of them? All kinds of collisions and upsets and accidents, most of which resulted in the advice "Take it easy now and you will be all right." Whether they gave it to themselves or it was given to them exteriorly, they got the idea that if they just took it awful, awful easy, they'd be all right. And from that time on they were all wrong. They were all wrong, and they could not figure out from there on what was wrong with them.

They were being asked to confront motionlessness. And man has a rather difficult time confronting motionlessness, as any space-opera boy can tell you. All you have to do is persuade somebody to be totally motionless and to take it easy, and he's had it. He gets sick; his life goes wrong; he ceases to be able to communicate; he has an awful time afterwards.

So therefore, these philosophies that wait for a fellow to hit a disaster so they can then tell him to take it easy, are all of them very much in use, and very active use, on the part of people who mean nothing well for man.

Now, amongst those philosophies are included medicine and psychiatry. The reason they give drugs is so that the person will be quiet. The reason they give electric shocks is so the person will be quiet. The reason they do prefrontal lobotomies is so the person will be quiet. A lot of the times the reason they give a medical operation is so the person will be quiet. You never heard of so many reasons why people should be quiet.
Well, unless a person can confront motion, he's had it. He's dead and done for. That is your first condition of life and livingness. If a person cannot confront motion at all, he can't work, and you have the background of a criminal. You've automatically made criminals.

And don't wonder that the whole Roman criminal population joined the church en masse. They did. And don't wonder at all these fellows who have just gotten out of stir and who have suddenly embraced religion. Natural consequence. It's the motionless philosophy adopted by somebody who can't move. I dare say if you held somebody in straps in a chair or up against a wall or in a bed any undetermined length of time, you would eventually find he'd gotten religion or he'd become a Buddhist, [laughter] or almost anything. And you never would have had to have talked to him about the philosophy at all.

If he'd never heard of it on the whole track, he would probably invent it. You see this? All you'd have to do is introduce the factor of motionlessness into his life, prove to him that movement was bad, and you've had it.

The reason we are having more and more accidents, and the reason I resigned, I think last week, from the Road Safety Committee, in England, was because all propaganda in all teachings will wind up in more accidents. And I can't go along with something that is as stupidly destructive as that. There is no emphasis on deleting the fellow who can't drive before they license him. There is no emphasis on putting on the road cars that can travel on the road. There is no emphasis in trying to take the trucks and passengers and freight off the roads and put them back onto the railways where they belong. No part of any of this program makes any sense, because it's deteriorated into "Teach them to be quiet. Don't drive so fast."

I doubt speed has very, very much to do with it. Because you start looking at accident tallies, and you'll find it's mostly the old ladies who were driving safely in the middle of the road at ten miles an hour. [laughter]

Now, your general situation, then, is that a philosophy of quietness, of motionlessness, has been introduced into this sphere of reducing traffic accidents. And with a great certainty, the more this philosophy is introduced, the more criminal actions will occur on the highway. Driving will get worse and accident statistics will rise. And that's just about all there is to it. There isn't anything further to it than that.

The more you make a populace quiet and non-motionless, the greater crime rate you will have. The influence of TV, for instance, on the general crime rate around the world has been remarked upon many times. But the program material is what is being blamed, not that the child is being pinned motionless. And that is what's happening. I don't care if you showed them Little Orphan Annie sighing over the dog in just one pose on a non-moving picture and so forth, with maybe some violin music playing in the background. And if this was all there ever was on TV and the children still sat in front of TV at an active time of life when they should be moving, you'll get a higher crime rate. It's inevitable. See? All you've got to introduce is motionless, you get aberration. Because you're preventing people from taking over the situation.

Now I'll give you something interesting with regard to this, talking about how the mind works. I very busily spent my hobby time, which has now become – my hobby time now has become relegated between 3:00 and 7:00 A.M. – that's the rest of my day, you see –
and I've lost any time much to sleep in now. And I'm now trying to find some sleeping time. And I think there's another time track around here someplace so that I'll take care of that. Anyway, last night, up at about three o'clock, four o'clock, I was studying some pictures for a boat, on this theory: That people get seasick because of motion. That was the theory.

And I went along blindly with this, not on inspection or examination at all, because a man who has had a lot of time at sea and so on tends to become rather conservative about the sea. In other words, "It's this way, and that's the way it is", you know, and everybody has said that it is motion which has caused seasickness. So therefore, I thought it'd be an awfully good idea to put, 'tween decks and in people's cabins and in the dining salon and so forth, pictures of very quiet scenes. That that would be the thing, you see. If you put some pictures of very quiet scenes around – nice, pleasant, quiet, still scenes – a person who feels queasy could look at one and feel better.

So I spent some time looking in some – various publications for – which advertised prints, you see, and old masters and things like this, for some proper pictures, in order to take care of this condition. There are various things. It's like the sweep of light back and forth across the ceiling, reflected from the waves outside, and all of this sort of thing, is what has been blamed for seasickness.

So I went ahead, and I chose all of these pictures which were very silent pictures. They were very motionless pictures. They were very unmoving pictures. And I was sitting there at my table up in my bedroom looking over all these pictures and thinking about all the seasickness this was going to save, you know. And after a little while I started to get a little bit seasick. [laughter] And I wasn't quite seasick; I felt an odd constriction on the front of my body, and I wondered "What is this all about?"

And about 3:55 A.M., I had to revise this whole theory. So the list, although it's been picked up now, and the pictures will probably all get bought – I'll have to give half of them to the medical association. [laughter] About 3:55, I realized what this was all about: that if you gave people pictures of motion, it would give them a chance to sort of accustom themselves to the idea of motion. But if you gave them a stillness, you gave them a total motion of the ship and sea against the total no-motion of the picture, and they practically would have had it. You've given them a terrific thing. And boy, have you pinned them aboard that ship. If I want to keep a crew, all I've got to do is put up those motionless pictures, because here will be the horizon going up and down like mad, you see, and inside the vessel here will be all these pictures of stern, solid oak trees standing there, you see.

One was called "Dawn". It was an oak tree reflected in the mirrorstillness of a river at dawn. And boy, that picture was really quiet. And when I first picked it out I says, "Well, that's going to take some girl or Scientologist that's aboard at the present moment, and they'll look at that, and they'll say, 'Thank God for the tree'", you see?

No sir. No. Much kinder to give them a racing sloop throwing spray in all directions, don't you see? Much kinder, because they at least get a chance to look at the motion in pictorial form. And it gives them a gradient. Got the idea?

Yeah, the cure for motion is motion, not stillness. Well, that's quite interesting as an observation. Has nothing much to do with this, or you, but there it is. I got a good reality on
the thing. And of course, after I'd looked over several of these pictures of days of adventure – and there's one ship of about 1757 just shooting the living daylights out of another ship, you see, and her sails are all full of holes, and the deck's on fire in a couple of spots and so on, and cannon balls flying all over. It's good enough so as you can practically hear them whistle, you know? And I looked at that after looking at all these still pictures, you know, and I looked at that and I said, "Whooo!" and instantly ceased to feel a little seasick. Got the idea?

So the philosophies of motionlessness are not safe philosophies to imbibe.

Because they lead people toward illness and inability to work, criminality and an inability to control their environments. Philosophies of motion, on the other hand, have not necessarily led to noncriminality. Witness space opera.

Show me an honest rocket jockey who has never bombarded a planet in a loose moment and who has never raped a town, and I'll show you somebody that's never been on the whole track. He's just never been on the whole track.

We don't know where he's been [laughter] for the last few hundred trillion years, but he's ...

No, the worship of motion, the worship of speed, and the worship of motion itself is no guarantee. Because there are periods of rest between them.

If you could keep it up at the speed of light from there on out, you'd probably never be affected by motion. But how about going quiet between them? I remember every time a submarine crew used to come in, they used to put them to rest. They used to give them a rest.

And I know my mother used to come up, and typewriter keys and file cabinets and so forth would be flying out of my studio left and right, and some circus music would be playing on the tape recorder, and it would be noisy, you know, and active. And she would come up and she would look at me and she would say, "I really think you ought to take a rest. You are look working much too hard."

And I used to wonder, "Now, I wonder if she's got an operation going here, somehow or another. I wonder if there could possibly be an operation connected with this." And there was. There was. Never affected me very much because she actually never talked to me very much. But I'd notice that people that didn't quite like me quite ordinarily are advising me to get some rest. Check it over. I think you yourself will have a subjective reality on that sort of thing.

Now, as soon as you become incapable of handling the shift and change of things, you become incapable of withstanding the duress of life and begin to experience pain. And the experiencing of pain is – actually comes about after one has lost a tolerance for motion. If you want to know why somebody is hurting as you're running a process, you are running out their intolerance for motion.

Now, you can run motion, or you can run no-motion, or you can run what you please along these various lines. But motion which is predictable motion, of course, is better – that's from the pc's point of view – to unpredictable motion. So unpredictable motion is something that is intolerable. And the person doesn't know what to confront. Something is happening in
front of his face and then something happens behind his face. And he doesn't know which of these things to confront and he gets into a fine state of affairs.

But first, he must consider that there is something unconfrontable about it or that it is bad not to be able to confront everything at once. And as soon as he gets the idea that it is bad not to be able to confront everything at once, he starts to butter all over the universe and stick on the track, and experiences and all this sort of thing begin to occur.

Now, there's another phenomenon which occurs about the mind, is every time a person has been hit hard by life – and he could be hit hard because he has hit others, and he now gets the motivator for his overts and so on – as soon as he's been hit hard, or as soon as he begins, as they did in Arslycus, a program for coercing people into working harder... Well, you get how that is. Working harder – that means you produce more or you will be shot. You know, that kind of thing. The Russian philosophy. You get – people will obsessively start producing.

Production follows defeat. Production follows defeat. Germany and Italy have outstripped all other European countries in the production of goods, just in the last few years. That is because they were the defeated countries. And the countries that won the war don't much now look like it. And that's a result of defeat.

This is rather consistent. Any defeated area can be counted on to produce. And any defeated person can be counted upon to be putting up more bank than a person who feels victorious. Bank and reactive mind is the result of failures or defeats.

So you're eradicating mechanically on the one hand a person's intolerance of motion or their intolerance of motionlessness. And on the other side, you're eradicating their failures or defeats. And between the two of these things, the bank disappears. Just that; the bank disappears.

Now, today we don't erase a bank. The bank is not erased. A person is, as we did at the beginning, accustomed into not needing one. Takes over the automaticity of creation, in other words, one way or the other. He takes over the automaticities of doingness. And we have beingness – the person he should be in order to survive. We have doingness – what he ought to be doing in order to get creation or do creation or something of the sort. And we have havingness which is the result of creation.

Havingness is apparently more important because it's harder to arrive at, but you can see from the rationale, is the result of a defeat. That's not a philosophic ambiguity. Most havingness is the result of a defeat of some kind or another. Man couldn't walk on water, so he began to push logs out into the surf, see. And we get the whole cure sequence, so that everything in the universe practically is a cure for past failures. Quite remarkable but very true.

Now, in addition to that, we have another factor which enters into the situation, and that is that every goal is the immediate and direct result of not having done. So we get these various combinations of intolerance for motion, the feelings of defeat. And your next one up the line, of course, is your ability to have without having defeated. And if you can remedy those various things in somebody's mind, you have then produced a completely new being. He is not the same as an old being who has never had the experience. He's not somebody who
has been in a plastic container for the last two hundred trillion, you see. He's been over the jumps.

Now, his knowingness, his knowledge of what has happened all the way along the line, doesn't leave him. He still knows. But the consequences of having done, with a renewed ability to do, makes him, of course, not a virgin that has drifted along for a couple of hundred trillion now, and is innocent and steps out of the auditing room as a shy, giggly girl would, or something like this. That is not the condition in which he emerges. He emerges in the rather interesting condition of a totally rehabilitated, hard-barnacled warrior who is a veteran of innumerable campaigns but doesn't show any of the marks of any of them.

And that's an interesting state of beingness. And when we say Clear, we are actually saying about the weakest statement we could make on what we are doing. See? We just – it's a very weak description of what we are really doing. But the other description would be far, far too frightening, I'm sure. [laughter]

I heard a fellow say one time, "Gee. When I think of my days back there in high school – a coeducational establishment – when I think of all those pretty girls, and if I'd known then what I know now, oh wow, you know. Wow, you know!" Interesting. Interesting point of view. Because you're setting somebody up who theoretically would know then what he knows now. So he knew it now then, but he'd carefully forgotten it all, because he knew what he was liable to do. His best mechanism was to become stupid. That's a fine mechanism, isn't it? That's a very fine mechanism.

You at the same time don't get the tremendously dangerous situation of the fellow who is – has a high level of wisdom messing up an area in which he is in. He doesn't. I tell you, if this fellow, knowing all he knew on the subject of the second dynamic, were to appear in a high school amongst all those girls, they would probably from there on all live better lives. That's probably the net result of the introduction of such a situation, because the fellow doesn't have the covert aspect of criminality hinging on every action, you know?

Oh, he might get in trouble. But nobody would get him in trouble very thoroughly, I guarantee you. First time they came down in the basement and found him giving a lecture to the girls on the second dynamic, they might – the principal might be horrified. But the principal at the same time would probably find himself being run on Routine 1 very shortly. [laughter] See, all sorts of new complications occur.

Now, that which strips the game from the universe or strips all games from the universe or cancels all games or ends all games, of course, would normally result in motionlessness. But how about ending certain games for somebody who doesn't have the consequence of ending in motionlessness? You've broadened a person's aspect and ability to play a game and recognize what a game is and have some fun out of life.

Now, the second that you have broadened his view with regard to this, you of course have put more games into the universe. Because most of the games they're playing were invented so long ago and are so moth-eaten and so moldy that nobody even knows they're games anymore.
I ran into one the other day which was very interesting. Just yesterday I think it was – yesterday morning I was running into some stuff and going over some things, and an old version of "I'm-supposed-to" suddenly turned up. An interesting old version. It's the difference between play and work. And that's an interesting difference. I finally found out what play was. Play is unreal or delusory motion about which you're not supposed to be serious. So you're not supposed to as-is it.

So an individual eventually gets trapped in this thing called play, because everybody tells you, you see, that play is something which is not serious. You see, you're not really playing – you're not really running a train when you're running a toy train. So therefore, the facsimile of the toy train doesn't get as-ised as a train. It doesn't get as-ised as a train either, because all the time you're playing with it you're saying it's a real train. Well, as a matter of fact, it is a real train that is a miniature train that you are doing something with, and play is a dishonest doingness. It's a delusory or dishonest doingness.

And work is not a serious activity. Anybody who says work is a serious activity is also opening up the bear pit in the middle of the trail. There's no reason why a fellow shouldn't work at a sport. And there's no reason why a fellow shouldn't have fun at his job. But some barrier got added in here, and the operation simply consisted of "play is a delusory activity," so therefore you don't as-is it. And you might say a lot of people walking around in delusions have played too hard. Get the idea?

In other words, they weren't doing what they were doing; they were doing something they were pretending they were doing. So of course then, this really got them – really got them hooked up and short-circuited.

Now, as we move ahead a little bit and look at this as a further consequence, we find out that a fellow who decides that work is hard or that he can't work is getting into the interesting thing of every time he plays, he has to say, "Now I'm supposed to." Every time he works he says, "Now I'm supposed to." Now I'm supposed to what? "I'm supposed to be doing something else."

So we get another method of not as-ising anything. Did you ever read a book and have a guilty conscience because you ought to be doing something else? [laughter] Well, you know, you'll sooner or later hang all such books up on the end of your nose. Because you're not doing what you are doing. You're doing what you are doing when you were – at the same time should be doing something else. And you aren't doing something else; you are doing what you are doing. And probably one of the heaviest marks of a person's disappearance of aberration is on this particular facet of motion. Which is to say that the person does what he does, whether he is supposed to or not supposed to be doing it. And if a person did what he did, and it wasn't work, and it wasn't play, and it wasn't ramification, it wasn't "I'm supposed to," and it wasn't an "I'm supposed to be doing something else" – if he did all of these – paid no attention to those things but just did this one, he did what he was doing, he would live an entirely different life. What he was doing was what he was doing, you get the idea, without further qualifications.

Now, the morality of existence is once more a test of the play-work thing. Morality is a now-I'm-supposed-to. So that these fellows that run around committing very immoral acts
are saying to themselves all the time that they shouldn't be doing them. So they never as-is
them, so they continue to do them. Well, I think it's the most – the most weird mechanism
anybody ever saw. It's a certainty that one gets a persistence, then, of the things he doesn't
want, or gets a tanglement of the things he does want. And eventually, all the things he does-
'n't want is what he's got, and all the things that he does want are completely confused, delu-
sory and tangled. And then he wonders why he feels odd! [laughter]

And if you wished to make a clear, clean statement of what auditing was, it is simply
straightening somebody out so that he has a tolerance of motion and a tolerance of motion-
lessness, and so that he can have what he should have or not, as the case may be, as he
wishes. Restore his power of choice over this fact.

But to do that, you have to erase the oddities of doingness in order to handle work and
play and motion. And motion of course becomes pain, and becomes all these other things.
And motionlessness becomes boredom and then apathy and all these other things. You have
to take the tremendous significance out of these states so that a person arrives at the situation
where when he does something, that is what he is doing. He's not doing something else. Got
the idea? And when he's not doing anything, he is simply not doing anything. He's not sitting
there not doing anything, while he's supposed to be doing something else.

In other words, he has a clear view of what he's doing or not doing as the case may be. Therefor,e
he never gets fuddled up with funny circuits telling him he ought to be doing this
or saying that or something of the sort. Where do these circuits come from? They just come
from the basis of doing things that he shouldn't be doing while he should be doing something
else, and not doing things which he should be doing. And of course, these automaticities
eventually get set up, and he has avoided them to such a degree that they become solid
masses. And he's eventually in a situation where, of course, he's dictated to from every corner
of his beingness.

He sits down to read a book and all the time he is reading the book he knows he ought
to be doing something else. So he goes over and does something mundane like straighten up
the – straighten up all of the ties and shirts and so forth in a desk drawer, and starts putting his
room in some kind of order one way or the other, like putting the shoes on the mantelpiece.
[laughter] And he wonders, "Now wait a minute. Why did I do that?" It's be-
cause all the time he is moving around pretending he should be working, you see. Actually he
knows that he would like to be reading a book.

So we get this dualness, half-heartedness, half-mindedness about all actions, which
comes down to quarter-mindedness, eighth-mindedness, no-mindedness, and the person be-
comes simply a dictate of these things because his power of choice can no longer be ex-
pressed.

Now, just from that you can see what the Prehav Scale is, very, very cleanly. It's the
thing that disentangles all the things from the things. [laughter] And you'll eventually run into
all these things. You'll eventually run into it all, because they're the key and principal doing-
nesses that a person gets mixed up. Okay?

All right, then in trying to accomplish that, if you yourself, in auditing the pc, make
him intolerant of motion, then you reverse the process. That is to say, by your actions and
unsmooth auditing and dropping the ashtray and throwing him out the window or something like this, you've fixed him up to a point of where he can no longer tolerate motion. All right, now, at the same time, let's make him sit still when he can't, and give him a bunch of sit-stills when he can't do it at all. And this makes him intolerant of being motionless.

Now let's go further than that and take the next factor of wins and loses, and let's fix him up so that every time he does something right we convince him he has done something wrong, and we add a new lose on top of his bank full of loses. All right, your win-lose factor now is gone because he's getting failures in auditing. We keep handing him failures; he'll go out the bottom.

Now, you're next one up, if you don't duplicate things and don't make them duplicative and don't square him around on the subject of havingness in general, he'll wind up not being able to have anything. And you could just reverse the whole process by doing those things, you see, just exactly backwards.

Now, what he should – what you should be doing in auditing is making it possible for an individual to be still or to be in motion, to win on the things that he wants to win on, to accomplish the things that he thinks he ought to accomplish. And one of the things you do this with in Goals Processing is take out of the road all the other things he should really be doing. Goals to a large degree are a do-something-else. You'll find somebody working in an operation, and they're going along and they're doing this job all the time, and all the time they're saying to themselves, "I ought to be a singer. I ought to be a singer. I ought to be out studying singing. I ought to be out studying singing. I ought to be out studying singing." You finally get tired of it and you say, "Why don't you go out and study singing?" They sit at their desk and say, "Well I ought to study singing I ought to go out and sing" You get the idea?

Just the fact of sitting at their desk makes them feel they ought to sing. The second you put them out there to sing, as a professional singer, they know what they ought to be doing, they ought to be sitting at their desk. [laughter]

By straightening out, then, their various goals, they know what they are doing and they don't have these absorbing impulses that take them off of what they are doing. Because anytime a fellow is sitting there with a real hot, desperate goal which is totally unrealized and unrealizable, of course, he doesn't know what he's doing. He can't be doing anything he's doing, because he's got to be doing something else that he can't do.

Now if you upset the environment for the one way or the other by running his Havingness in various ways, and running his Havingness backwards, forwards and upside down, making him allergic to the walls and so forth – you know, run the wrong Havingness Process and so on. "Now, all right. Take a look at this room. Now make sure – doesn't it seem rather small to you? [laughter] Oh, it doesn't? Well, it seems small to me. Maybe you're just putting up facsimiles and looking at them far out, because the room really is small."

Any kind of a gag of this character, you say, "All right. Now look at that nasty wall over there. [laughter] Now get the idea that that wall – get the idea that that wall, if you got totally cleared up on the wall, would be a terrible enemy of yours. Supposing you knew all of the secrets of the universe, wouldn't it be terrible if they turned out to be terrible things that would make you unhappy for the rest of your life?"
Isn't that an interesting operation? And yet that interesting operation runs along in the field of philosophy continually, and I have heard it mouthed by high-school girls in this lifetime: "Well, you'd really better not know too much about existence, because what if it turned out too terrible to know about?"

All right. So when you familiarize somebody with it and let him make up his own mind about what it is, he finds out it isn't so bad. He can have the stuff. Therefore, he can do what he is doing, and therefore, he can be what he is being. And when you – when he's in that frame of mind, his mental activities are not so completely absorbed with all of these reactive computations that he cannot decide what he wants to be, do and have. So the individual can make up his mind what he wants to be, do and have. But because he doesn't have any particular barriers in it, of course, he can be them and he can do them and he can have them. And then that is a very peculiar state of mind, and everybody will find something wrong with that sooner or later, particularly the Catholic church.

But you have defeated, not the motionless philosophies nor the motion philosophies, nor have you defeated particularly all the working philosophies or nonworking philosophies, or the various doingnesses and moral philosophies and immoral philosophies, or the can't-have-must-have, communist, capitalist, socialist, laborist, Lord-knows-what-ist philosophies – you haven't defeated any of these philosophies. You have picked people up to a point where they can inspect them. You're not interested in guiding them away from these horrible evils. The truth of the matter is all they would have to do is inspect them – I don't imagine if it'd take more than twenty or – thirty people to inspect all of one of these philosophies to have it disappear. You know? I mean, really clear-sighted people. I don't think it'd take very much.

Because it's awfully hard to make a lie continue to exist. It takes some real trickery to make a lie persist, although lies apparently persist with the greatest of ease. Look how fast the aberration of a pc folds up when he finds out what is the alter-is that is causing it. As soon as he really finds what that is, it will fold up. If it doesn't fold up and he thinks he's found it out, he hasn't found it out. He's got to look a little further. And then it'll as-is. That's what you're trying to do with auditing.

Now, we lay down rules, we lay down routines, we lay down various things that you can get away with and you can't get away with, and so forth; but actually all those things are supplementing what I've told you in the last half an hour here.

We've gotten a lot of experience on the track now on this subject. And we know certain things you can get away with and certain things you can't get away with. And most of these things are applied to a specialized being known as Homo sapiens.

Now, you start auditing grasshoppers, you may find another set of conditions of how you handle grasshoppers to immediately take place. There'll be another set of conditions of auditing, but the principles of auditing will be invariable. You will be trying to do the same thing with a grasshopper you were doing with Homo sap. But I imagine Hand Space Mimicry with a grasshopper is not quite [laughter] – not quite as easy as CCH 3. So the processes would be different, the targets of the processes would be the same. The routines and activities that you would go through would be different, but the exact auditing targets would be the same. The conditions would be the same. Do you see how that works out?
Okay. Well, you've got a long weekend ahead of you, and nothing at all to do in it. And so I think I'd like to add a little additional work. A little additional work. And I want you, over this weekend, to review this fact – these facts. Ask yourself this burning question: "Do I know the TRs? Do I know Model Session? Do I know how to administer the CCHs? Do I know the Prehav Scale and how to assess on the Prehav Scale for general levels? Do I know how to security check?" And this brings up burningly, "Do I really know this E-Meter? And do I know how to assess for goals?" Seven things there. Only one has been added which is old, which is the old CCHs. And I want you to ask yourself those questions over the weekend, and come up with the answer, and tear into those things which you feel shaky about on Monday, okay?

All right. Thank you.

Thank you.
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Thank you.

You know, give her the applause. She's the one that's doing all the work. [applause] It's very funny. It's very funny. She never takes over as D of P anyplace but what they don't stack up pcs in all directions, you know. And all the cases crack brrrrrrrrrr and so forth.

We haven't told people out in the field their cases would be personally supervised by Mary Sue in the running or we wouldn't be able to hold the course. That's – that's the truth. I'm not... She's just depreciating now because [laughter]... She's running – I think the level she's running at the moment is "Failed Depreciated." [laughter]

What is this? Twenty-sixth of June 1900 and AD 11. Okay.

I want to say a word here at first about tactics and strategy with regard to anti-Scientological activities. It might be of some benefit to you to know this. After all, I've been fighting this war now for eleven years, very often without very much help. Every once in a while Scientologists tell me how reasonable it all is that somebody has a casus belli or something of the sort. It isn't true.

Our people are trying their best and they're doing their best and I'm very proud of them. If we had anything at all to hide, we long since would have been blown out of the water with various salvos. All we had to do is have a few Achilles' heels and we would have had it. Well, we don't have Achilles' heels, so recently the Better Business Bureau of Washington, DC wrote a letter, which is the most backwards letter anybody ever heard. Although many government agencies have tried to get something on this organization, none of them have ever been able to turn anything up and – can you imagine somebody writing something like this, you see? And as for Lafayette R. Hubbard who is a principal in this particular organization, well you can look him up in Dun and Bradstreet. And they just dismissed the whole thing.

Well, they used to run an entirely different line of approach. They used to say, "Oh, they shoot people and kill babies. And they've been well known to throw people off top of St. Paul's Cathedral. That is their specialty." Anything ridiculous or stupid. The British – that medical association, by the way, has written letters to its doctors urging them to tell patients how bad we were and so forth. We've not had whispering campaigns; we've had loudspeaker campaigns going. But that type of backfire is inevitable.
I call your attention to an essay on the circulation of the blood by a fellow by the name of Harvey, who was a graduate of the Royal Medical College of Physicians. He was I think a physician to the Crown. I think he was everything you could think of. And this man dared come up and say the blood beat, not because of the tides of the body but got pumped through a bunch of tubes. And he very carefully carried on a lot of experiments this way. And promptly the whispering campaigns and so forth which rose up around this were fantastic. It tore the whole medical profession to pieces about 1620 or thereabouts. Tore them all to pieces. Ripped them up one side and down the other. And one doctor was heard to say, "I would rather err with Galen than be right with Harvey", which I – is the most marvelous, I think, statement ever made in a controversy.

Let's go back a little earlier. A short time ago I was standing outside the prison of Soc-rates on Phynx, I think the name of the hill is, in Athens. And it rather struck me as very peculiar that the story they have about Socrates in Athens is quite different than the story which we hear about Socrates in our own textbooks. And of course, there's always local information about various things which has a sort of a verbal tradition when they come on. And apparently Socrates said that those gods of stone and marble and so forth didn't have much to do with the regulation of the universe; that man was basically a spirit. And so they finally tried him for heresy against the pagan religion of the day and had him drink the hemlock. That's the local tradition about Socrates. It's not the story we read in the Encyclopedia Americana, Britannica or anything, you see. But everybody got upset because here was a new idea. But let me show you something.

Today people feel a pulse. They don't look at the sun to measure the tides of the body. They know very well there's body circulation. When somebody gets his arm cut, they put a tourniquet on it. Got the idea? This is very well accepted theory. Actually, it became a well accepted – don't think these things take a long time – it became a well accepted theory by about 1628. There was hardly a ripple by 1632. In other words, this had become an accepted idea, but in the first early years of its advance, there was an enormous amount of upset.

Now, Socrates was henpecked and unfortunate in his choice of wives. And being so, of course, the man was emotionally unstable to some degree, and worrying all the time that he daren't be out talking in the club or the – or the groves, you see, because he ought to be home and he shouldn't be wandering around like this; he ought to be making a living like honest men do and all this sort of thing.

But anyway, he decided to give it up. And he gave it up. And the charges of heresy and so forth that followed with his relegation to the prison and all that sort of thing – Well, it is interesting that about a quarter of the people of Athens, that particular night that he was put in jail, were standing there with tickets bought on the nearest ship to Crete, see. People all over the place were trying desperately to get Socrates, who was not under very close arrest – his guards were very, very happy to turn their backs – they were trying to get him simply to walk down to the dock and walk up a gangplank. And everybody thought that this was what he would do – and he didn't. He stood around and said, "Well, for the principle of the thing, I ought to take this hemlock." He really made the government of Athens guilty, because that sort of thing ordinarily, you see, didn't happen. They'd condemn somebody to death, and then
the fellow would walk out the back gate and over the hills, and that would be it. It was actually a charge of banishment or something of this sort.

But in his particular case, he had so many friends who would have paid his passage, who were trying to pay his passage that night, who were trying to get rid of his guards, who were trying to help him out, that they went into a total dismay. What is wrong with this man? Well, as I say, you make wrong marriages, and you're liable to get all sorts of repercussions and suicidal impulses. [laughter]

So this thing about Socrates hasn't anything to do with the price of fish at all. Fact of the matter is that promptly and immediately everybody in Athens practically was talking Socratian philosophy and have continued to do so ever since. His critique stayed as one of the primary philosophic modes right on up to the time when Kant overdid it.

And this – this is a new idea, however, in a society. Not necessarily attended by fatality at all. You hear a great many martyrs, but every time you find yourself a martyr, you find yourself somebody who is bound and determined, you see. What happens is, well, on the whole track you may have been a tyrant yourself at one time or another, you see. And this fellow kept going out in the public square, you know, saying, "Regulus the Third is a schnook and he eats herring. And he does this just to popularize it so that the populace will eat it and he can collect the duty, you see. And herring is actually very bad for you and will rot your teeth, you know", and so on.

And this fellow kept prowling around and telling people things like this, and I dare say that for, oh, I don't know, for maybe months and months and months, you'd keep getting ahold of somebody or sending some of your police or something like that to go see him and say, "Look, son. Just lay off, will you? You know, skip it." You'd probably offer him a free passage to Gaul or almost anything you could think of, you know, and say, "Just go away and get lost", and so on.

And eventually, why, he just kept saying, "Well, kill me then if you believe this", and you had to. You got the idea? I mean, there's this idea of being so stuck on the idea that you have to get stuck on the spears, you see. But it's perfectly all right to be dedicated to a thing, but when one consistently fails to advance an idea, he feels, then, that he must commit suicide to fan – to further the idea. You got the idea?

In other words, it's a failure to advance the idea which brings about this suicidal frame of mind. I imagine if anybody at all around Galilee had bought the Nicene Creed, I'd imagine Pontius Pilate for – for a split sesterce would have knocked that whole thing off, you know. But it was a failed idea, and – he made it stick by proving it with suicide, right?

I've never been in a very suicidal frame of mind; must be something lacking in my makeup or something of this sort. I believe first in making the idea effective. I don't believe in the idea that you should fail with an idea, you see? If you're carrying something forward, you're standing for something, you shouldn't be ineffective about it. You should go forward and carry out the idea.

The object is not to fail at the idea and then make everybody guilty because they kill you. You got this? I'm not putting us in any category of any religious or philosophic lineup.
I'm just showing you that new ideas are very often attended with tremendous success, although we are taught carefully that people should martyr themselves for new ideas or sacrifice themselves for new ideas. And that's to prevent new ideas, don't you think? Would do so rather effectively, wouldn't it?

So if you got enough philosophy abroad whereby, that anybody comes up with a new teaching or a new idea is then martyred – if you got that philosophy abroad, of course, the old ideas are protected. And somebody sooner or later – Socrates or somebody – will fall for it. You know, you'll say, "Well, this is the thing to do", you know. "I seem to be failing in getting this stuff across, so therefore I'd better commit suicide."

Harvey, on the other hand, lived to a ripe old age, revolutionized the whole field of medicine. A few years later, why, his worst enemies were patting him on the back saying, "Good boy, good boy. You remember when I was right in there with you." [laughter]

Now let's come up to more recent times. Of course, I'm talking about magnitudinous ideas because it's something about which we all know something about.

Let's take a fellow by the name of Albert Einstein. Of course, Einstein should have done some of his thinking in a private notebook. He shouldn't have been writing Franklin Delano that he could blow up Earth, which was in effect what he did, and then years afterwards worked all he could possibly do and then gathered up all the funds he could gather up to wipe out what he had done with atomic fission. He organized organizations, societies; they maintained offices every place. The man – old man worked himself into a grave through having actually made a discreditable creation.

Nevertheless, the actual course of history of Albert Einstein is quite interesting from our viewpoint. The man advanced a brand-new theory of mathematics called "relativity." There might even be some truth in relativity. Who knows?

At one time a fellow by the name of something or other in the University of George Washington was holding his job as the Chair of Mathematics, simply because he was one of the twelve men in the world who understood the theory of relativity. I went in to see him one day to interview him for the college paper. I wanted him to tell me something about this theory of relativity this fellow Einstein was kicking around with and so forth. And I never had such sneers, contempt or was turned out on my ear quite so fast, you see. I turned out one on our Mathematics Department instead. "Mathematics: Has It Come to Stay?" I think was the name of the article. [laughter, laughs himself]

You probably don't know the theory of relativity too well. You think you have a talking acquaintance with it because everybody's dressed it up now so that it fits with modern atomic physics. And you'll read textbooks and pocketbooks off the bookstalls all about the theory of relativity and so forth.

Actually, the theory of relativity is that c is a constant. You can't go any faster than light. It brings up all kinds of wild surmises, such as if a man went the speed of light he would then be the – as big as the universe, you see, and that time would not exist if you were going at the speed of light. I mean, it's a whole bunch of fantasies and fairy tales is what this thing originally was, you see. Well, it had "MGs equal Jaguar squares", or something like that as its
primary modus operandi. And nobody could, of course, prove this fellow wrong because this "c" that he keeps throwing into all these equations, of quantum mechanics and so forth, is not a constant.

The speed of light is not an exact constant, so therefore, all these equations go a little bit wrong. So you never can quite prove it. It's very interesting. When they developed the atomic bomb, they did not use Einstein's theory. They put stuff in and out of a pile until they found that there was something called "critical mass." And they thought "That's very fascinating", and they took it from there. And every atomic bomb you've got today was developed empirically. None of them were calculated. But he led the way, and it was a new idea, and so forth; the old man was sorry he did it.

But what is actually the history of the Einstein theory out in the public? In 1928, a paper was read before the combined societies of mathematics in Germany – and you can imagine how many people that was. The paper was the wildest piece of slander and libel that anybody ever heard. And it condemned the Einstein theory as the greatest mathematical hoax of all time.

Einstein was in trouble with this theory for years. He was practically hounded out of jobs in universities, and everybody was on his back, and he finally went to Princeton and wrote Frankie, and we've got the atomic bomb. That's the history of the Einstein theory. But look-it-there. In spite of the fact that it was a discreditable creation, the old man died with his boots on, and the – and the old retainers weeping around the bedside, you know. Why, he was actually totally successful. There's no martyrdom connected with this at all except he was sorry for having developed the atomic bomb.

Now, what about many other creations of this character? Take Freudian analysis, for instance. Old man Freud, he got thrown on his ear by the medical association of his day. And they just gave him the yo heave, and they wouldn't have anything to do with him, and they just raised the devil down around Vienna and it just went on for years. And finally, about 1894, why he made some startling statement and made a breakthrough of one character. He announced his libido theory in 1894 and from that time thereon, why, all was good roads and good weather. And look, the man would – had practically nothing to go on. He practically had no results, he practically had nothing but a dreamed up theory and so forth. It was terrific, I mean, that he'd go so far.

But he did have a new idea. And that is that man's physical ills could be assisted mentally. And that was a new idea. And that was the idea that Freud put into the world. But the old man died with his boots on surrounded by the old retainers who were weeping to see him go, you see. Sung the world around and very successful. This man was a very successful man in spite of the fact that just before he died, he wrote a paper called "Psychoanalysis: Terminable and Interminable." And he had learned that some people go on and on and on and on and on, and you can't seem to do much about it.

The paper and this sort of thing is now a woof and warp of our existence, and it isn't even true. Eighteen ninety-four, and he was totally over the top by about 1933. That's very interesting, isn't it? There's an idea the breadth of the world.
But don't think the idea in its early stages wasn't fought. Harvey's ideas were fought. Galen, Socrates: any new idea gets fought. That's the nature of man, is when he sees something new, it threatens change and man is a great believer in no-change while he obsessively changes. While obsessively alter-ising everything in view, he believes in no change. And of course, that's why he obsesses everything of this character. That's why his alter-is is so obsessive, is because his basic belief is on a zero.

All right. Now, I'm just talking to you about this, just looking coldly and dispassionately. What's the chances of Scientology, of success? Well, we've been told it takes a hundred years to get anything done. And we've been told all sorts of discouraging tales, that it's martyrdom, that it's this, that it's that, it's the other thing. Nah, we're over the top. We're over the top. But we still get fought; and we're still in a period of being fought.

And you can be fought with the velocity that you are right. Because then you are terribly dangerous.

You think of the thousands of philosophies that must have come up since 1950. There must have been just libraries full of books written by people all over the place detailing theories about life. Where are these books? Where are they? They just don't exist. And right now the psychologist is changing his own textbooks; and all sorts of weird things are happening in the world. The medical profession now will tell you most glibly about prenatals, and we've long since forgotten them.

But the point is, is we've made our incursion, but we threaten to upset far more than somebody's belief in whether or not the god was of marble or lightning, you see. We threaten to upset far more than that, if you're looking at it in terms of upset. The only reason it's safe for us to do any of this is because we can undo what we do. And Mr. Freud couldn't undo what he did. And Mr. Einstein couldn't undo what he did. And Socrates couldn't undo what he did. Let's take a look at this, you see.

And they're all kind of sorry for it. And they got into a suicidal frame of mind. But we're in a very safe channel because we can undo what we did. Do you know that you can take somebody that's been very thoroughly badly audited and simply run the auditor off? And the auditing disappears. Why do you suppose that I include and will continue to include in any Security Check – there's two reasons – questions about overts against myself. This seems an odd thing to do.

Actually, there's two things: One, if a person has a lot of overts against me that he thinks is bad, he won't get any benefit from Scientology. That's quite obvious. He's got overts against the source. That's the thing. And you think basically that's the only reason that's there. No, there's another much more subtle reason why you have to keep these overts off. The only way you could acquire a forceful, overwhelming valence called "Scientology" would be by piling up a bunch of overts and motivators on it. Think of it for a minute. Isn't that the way, basically, you got into any valence you're in? So this would be the first time that anyone was going along the track saying, "All right. Here's what I say. Try it out. Run me out." Don't you realize that? So there's no overwhelm mixed up in this.

In the early days, people who had been all mixed up with Taoism, and all that sort of thing, they kept telling me that we needed tremendous aesthetics. You know, we needed a
swinging incense pot and all that sort of thing. And these tremendous aesthetics which we were supposed to have something to do with, of course palled on me in the very earliest stages, because I've said you can always overwhelm a thetan with aesthetics and we haven't the least desire to overwhelm a thetan.

So if you wonder why Central Organizations don't hire the Empire State Building or we're not flat out to make a totally overwhelming ritual of it all, don't you see, that's all part of the same picture. If it's true for you, it's true. It's not true for you because we have overwhelmed you. Get the tremendous difference there? This is the first time this has happened to man so, of course, it appears very dangerous and very strange. They could understand it if we were simply trying to overthrow the established church, established science or established governments. Then they would understand this and you'd probably find that we weren't being hard fought. "Oh, well. Oh, yes. Oh, those people? Yeah, we understand them. Revolutionary group. Revolutionary group. One of the things which they're going to do is blow up Buckingham Palace and the White House. Yeah, that's what they're going to do." That's right. And you'd probably find the cops coming around and seeing you, being quite chummy – I'm not kidding [laughter] – and understand you.

But to understand somebody who was – basically has no evil motives ...

Every man who has been overwhelmed by what he considered evil valences, asks himself this question: "What's the pitch? What's the pitch? What's the pitch?" He's just totally frantic. You know? "Well, you audit this fellow, and he gets more intelligent and he gets more able and he's happier and he – what's the pitch?" And, of course, with running Security Checks all the time on pcs that come up the line, what's the pitch? Well, there his question becomes totally unanswerable, because we're running ourselves out as auditors, philosophers, teachers or anything else. Of course, if you can't make a thetan commit tremendous numbers of overts against you or set him up in a situation where he can commit tremendous overts against you, and then remove any possibility of his ever running the overts, that's the only way you can actually overwhelm him and get him so stamped down with a valence that he can't thereafter wriggle. You see that?

So these former efforts were entrapments, and this is not an entrapment. This is not even a total freedom. I've even told you occasionally total freedom would be existence without barriers, and I think you would find everybody very miserable.

All right. We're an incomprehensible factor. This is the first time, actually, a high-powered, rather selfless philosophy has hit Earth which didn't at once demand of its practitioner or in – the person who embraces it, that he totally subjugate himself utterly and become enslaved by the philosophy, don't you see; and which didn't say that the originator of the philosophy must then be carried as an un- ... an imperishable valence from there on to the end of the track, and everybody should bow down to this, don't you see. That alone is incomprehensible amongst the – the works of man. These are different. These are different.

And these are the differences that man becomes alarmed at, because he's certain that if there's this much and you neglect these obvious factors, which he sort of senses you neglect, there must be some much deeper, much more vicious motive mixed up in all of this, you see.
And they can become quite excited. And recently some chap out in California took his finger off his pc and probably didn't flatten the process. The pc went out and assaulted her husband on the street and had him arrested and tried to have the auditor arrested, and signed a check over to him. The police raided the building and took his E-Meters and tapes and made the usual mule's south ends out of themselves (because I like horses) [laughter], and went ramming around madly, you see. Now look at the hysteria. Look at the *hysteria*. They sent a telex to every police department in the state of California about this terrible case which they had just uncovered. What terrible case?

Well, with a good attorney on the job and this thing sorted out and everybody keeping calm about the thing and not fighting it violently but just putting up a consistent and continual effective pressure against that particular attack angle, ... and it will not wind up in 30 days, I assure you. Courts are not rigged that way. Nor will it wind up in 60 days, nor a 180 days. You will *still* be hearing about this in about three years. And there is never any reason to rush anywhere and do anything about characters like that. What you do is just put up a steady pressure in that particular direction. Just take the effective actions and let it coast. Do not become absorbed in it, because it is out of *terror* that the attack is born and people who are in terror make mistakes. And all we do is just don't make any mistakes and continue to put up an effective pressure against this sphere.

And investigate loudly is one of the things we do. We have a regular modus operandi and these people become more and more terrified because they now begin to feel guilty of an overt act. I saw the president of a law university who had me arrested one time as a witness in a bankruptcy.

You see, in the United States, if you're a witness in a bankruptcy in a Federal Court, you can be arrested. Because you're liable not to witness, you see. They even fingerprint you, you know. It's very degrading. Witnesses in bankruptcies – that has to do with money. And after all, all the money in a bankruptcy belongs to the attorneys and the judge. [laughter] And you can't – you can't go around – you can't go around being a witness lightly, you see. And these fellows – the only way they could be coaxed and the judge could be coaxed, and everybody could be coaxed, was to issue this silly witness in a bankruptcy warrant. You see, that's totally meaningless, you know.

You watch – you see an accident happen and in New York City the cops can grab hold of you and put you in jail for three days. As a consequence, accidents and murder happen in broad daylight in New York City and you just ask anybody around you what was going on, and they look at you rather searchingly and don't answer. And you say, "Is there anything that happened on this corner?" And the fellow said, "No. I wasn't here" – his twenty cigarette butts littered around his feet you know. [laughter] He wasn't there. He just arrived. You can't get anybody to interfere in New York City or witness anything in New York City, just because of these silly witness rules.

Anyway, the president of a law school had been employed to obtain this warrant and the Chief Federal United States Marshal – I think they have a sort of a feeling like they're still western marshals or something. They go around with big guns hanging on them and so forth. The only trouble is they normally pick people off skid row to have these jobs, and it's rather
incongruous, you see – And this fellow, he was utterly mad-dogging because he was sure that I had just beaten up two of his marshals.

Actually, I hadn't beaten up a marshal. I had taken the gun away from one and told him how to use it and put it back in his holster, because I thought he would get into trouble. I explained it to him. I said, "You'll get in trouble waving that about and so forth; and this is the hammer, and this is the trigger." And he handed it over to me, and I said, "These are the butt plates, and there's the ammunition", and so forth, and slid the cartridges out of the chamber and told him to put them in his pocket, and put the gun back. Don't – nobody was picking on him, and it was all all right, and he did it. You think I'm kidding you, but he did it.

People that walk up to you shaking and nerves with a drawn, cocked gun – you don't – you don't monkey with that sort of thing. Teach him – teach them how to use it! Anyway, this was pretty wild. This was years and years and years ago. It was clear back in 52. Anyway, these guys began to realize that, one, they were not dealing with a criminal, that somebody had told them some lies.

And they gradually ran up little white flags, and they became more and more apologetic and more and more apologetic. And in the course of about three or four days, finally took me down to the court where I was supposed to give my testimony, and I sat down, and I said, "Yes, I knew of this company. Yes, my relationship with this company was so and so. No, I didn't have any money from this company." And that was it. Oh, yes, and I said, "I don't even have any money now."

And that was it, and that was the end of my testimony. The judge, however, he'd heard some rumors, you see, that two US Federal marshals had been beaten up and so on. And he said, screaming (and I won't blast the microphone), "But isn't there anything on which I can hold this man? Isn't there anything?" You see, he had been told by everybody that this fellow had a new idea and therefore ought to be shot, you see.

And the Federal marshal and the president of the law university ran – they did not walk – they ran up the aisle to the front of the judge's bench. And they said, "No, no, your honor. This is a perfectly decent man. You've got the whole idea all wrong", And they were just interrupting each other and, "No, no, your honor. You don't want this man. He didn't have anything to do with that. And you have been improperly informed and so forth, and this whole thing is a mistake! And you must let him go right now. There's nothing else you can hold him for, and there's no reason to hold him."

And they came back, and they said, "You know, you ought to do something about it. You shouldn't let people say bad things about you like this because this is a terrible mistake." And they escorted me out and took me down to my airplane, by the way, in a gold-plated limousine (as near as they could make it), you know, and shook my hand and so forth. Sure was terrible what mistakes people could make, namely them. [laughter]

So when they run that many overt, they get propitiative; and when people are in terror, they make mistakes.

Now, let me tell you the denouement of the last attack on Scientology through the law courts in Washington, DC. The witness in this particular case would not state – would not
state – that he had not been financed in all of his attacks on Scientology by the APA (the American Psychiatric Association) and the American Medical Association. This was the one question he wouldn't answer. He would answer questions to the effect of, yes, he had been in jail. Yes, he had been in insane asylums. Yes, he was wanted for this or that crime in various states. Yes, he'd answer these questions, but he wouldn't answer this one question. Was his whole attack financed by the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association?

That question he refused to answer.

Now of course, in a regular trial, he would have to answer that question.

But his witness deposition was simply being taken in open court. And he could not be forced to answer all the questions, but when he was – finally, when the whole thing came up for trial, he would have to answer those questions. Now, he was attacking us. We weren't attacking him. He was suing us for false arrest. He kept calling up the office and doing various things around and about the place, having swindled the organization out of about fifteen thousand dollars. I took my finger off my dollars for a second, and there – the organization's dollars – and there it went. And then, because he was arrested for pulling this, he was arrested in the wrong county or something. There are several counties and nobody can quite tell which county is which there at that corner of Maryland, so they arrested him in the wrong side of some line. So therefore, he had this fantastic charge of false arrest that he could bring about, don't you see.

Look, this kept going for nearly three years. Well, there were nerves during all these three years. There were people investigating things and calling things up and doing all kinds of things. For three years. There were people – you were hiring attorneys and hiring detectives and listening to reports and so forth for three years. The man's name, by the way, is Et
ttleman. And the Et
ttleman case is very much in point. Three years this goes on!

Every principal in the Washington organization was being sued for a minimum of a hundred thousand dollars cash. Why, you say, that ought to make you nervous, man. That's a lot of money. Three years. Marilyn and Sue and myself, and anybody else connected with it. Everybody was sued for a hundred thousand dollars cash.

As a matter of fact, the only one that got any satisfaction out of it was Susie, and she, I think, knocked the attorney silly. He tried to attack me in the lobby, and I knew better than to hit him. It was a great temptation, you see. He was not very big. And they were serving a warrant, you know, right in the middle of a congress, and it was a great temptation, and I was gripping my hands rather tightly in my pockets so that I wouldn't succumb to it. Because all he needed, you see, was an assault charge; then he would have had it, you see. He would have had it made.

But evidently even he realized it was silly to bring a suit against a woman for assault. [laughter] Mary Sue wouldn't have anybody talking to me that way, and she clobbered him. About three times. He sort of looked at her like, "You shouldn't have done it", you know. [laughter] Wrong attacker.
Well, anyhow, after all of this nonsense and cops and robbers and everything else that you could think of, you see – three years worth of it; considerable expenses in courts and all that sort of thing – finally it comes up the great day for trial. The great day for trial has now arrived, and Ettelman is there spitting as usual and being paid to say this and that and the other thing and everything is all set and raring to go. And the judge who should have dismissed it – he should have dismissed it two years before, because they kept altering the bill on him. You see, they kept altering the statement of charges – Ettelman's attorney did. And it was very illegal, but he still didn't throw it out. Everything had gone wrong.

And we were all there – that is, I wasn't there, but the representative of the organization was there. Marilyn, actually, was there and our attorneys and all this raised and waiting on the fall of the gavel. And we look everywhere in vain, but Ettelman's attorney has failed to turn up [laughter], and has forgotten that it was this day [laughter] that the trial was supposed to be held. Of course, the judge dismissed the case and the attorney, Houston, couldn't even get it reinstated again. After three years. If you wait them out long enough, they sooner or later will make a mistake. That's all it amounts to. If you just go on being effective.

Now, the only thing that can be done to a Scientology organization or a Scientology personnel is to be worried to a point where he doesn't do his job, either in an organization or an individual auditor.

Now, remember that. That's all that can happen to you. You can be worried and harassed and upset to a point where you are made ineffective. And the whole gain of the people who oppose new ideas is then, by making one or more organizations or Scientologists temporarily ineffective. You got it? All the time you spend on this, of course is lost time. And the more you worry about it, is lost worrying.

Go ahead and be effective. But remember the only thing they will ever gain in the long run ... They have never yet thrown anybody in the clink, you know. I mean, it's just all yippe-yapple. They never can. They never have any evidence. It's just the amount of time you lose in worrying about it. You understand? And the amount of despatch time you absorb and the cost of cables and attorneys. You got that? That's the whole loss. That's all that ever happens. It is the lost time of a Scientologist, one or more, being rendered ineffective for a period of time and being tied up and worried because he's involved in some kind of a yickle-yackle. The way to fool them is go on and be effective with regard to them and go on being effective as a Scientologist. Go on being effective in an organization. Go on running things effectively – keeping the show on the road, in other words – and just don't fall for the only loss that you can be thrown for, which is to lose your own time and forward pressure, you see, and a little money one way or the other. That's the only thing you can lose.

Well now, if you go ahead and concentrate a thousand percent and put everything on a high, high, high, high emergency priority basis, of course all that is wasted motion and action. And the more you indulge in it and the more you worry about it, the less Scientology you get done, so it's only to that degree that the enemy wins.

They get a negative gain. They take one organization or one personnel or one auditor or something, and they move him out of the lineup for a short period of time, and maybe blunt a little bit of his enthusiasm because he says the world is an evil place after all; and that is the
sole thing they can win. They can't win anything else. And of course, if they're going to play a
game like this — and we have no other choice than to play some of this game ... I always ask
myself, by the way, "What game is this that is being played?" Sort it out pretty well. Find out
what game is being played here; and then find out if it's our game. And believe me, ladies and
gentlemen, if it is not our game, there are no marbles of mine lying in the ring, there are no
cricket bats out there on the green that have my name on them.

They can go ahead and box with their own shadows and climb mythical ropes and do
anything they want to do, but they're not playing a game with us. Do you understand? But I
will go ahead and do the effective things. In these effective things you usually get very com-
petent assistance and get it fast. Force people to accept our assistance. That is to say, if some-
body is being attacked, don't let him avoid our help. The only time we lose or the only time
anybody loses is when they avoid our help. You know, they say, "Well, really I probably
ought — shouldn't have any help from HCO or something like this, because it's all possibly
very bad, and it'll all wind up bad." And they do. They lose.

There have been one or two minor little cases of where they did lose badly. Or they
don't say anything that is at all bright. If it's totally outside of our perimeter of control, some-
thing like some... a knucklehead one time down in Phoenix keeps going in and saying, "I
practice Dianetics; I don't practice Scientology." He wasn't. He hadn't practiced Dianetics in
his whole lifetime. He didn't even know how to run an engram. The only thing he could be
cuffed around for or told not to practice was Dianetics. So he keeps telling everybody that he
practices Dianetics.

We keep telling him, "For God's sakes, shut your mouth. Tell people you practice Sci-
entology." No, no. He couldn't do that, so we couldn't help that man. And there was a fellow
out in Australia — a fellow out in Australia around Perth and so forth, and he wouldn't even
accept an attorney, he wouldn't accept anything. All he got was a small fine. But he just
wouldn't accept a thing. And we even knew — we even knew — things about the person who
was bringing the charges and the doctor bringing the charges and so forth, that were practi-
cally unprintable but very provable. And he wouldn't let us enter any of these things — nothing
like that — so we lost in that particular sphere.

Now, how much time can be developed by one of these attacks? That is how much
time can be involved by one of these attacks? Plenty. Morale can be shot. Various things can
happen, and so forth. For instance, we've never had a day's worry really about the government
since I told the Food and Drug Administration in Washington, DC to go fly a kite, if they
knew how, if they had intelligence to read a book about flying kites.

And the way I did it, is I read their law and I found out that if you manufactured any-
thing that came under their purview, then your whole organization was under their authority,
which is quite interesting. That is, if we manufactured an E-Meter, they were in charge of all
E-Meters, because obviously an E-Meter is both food and drugs. [laughter] That's the way the
law reads. That outfit passes psychiatric machines which kill people. Murders them. I'm not
lightly stating it now; it does. They have shorts in them. They're ineffective electrical equip-
ment. Completely aside from being a shock machine; they are badly made. And the Food and
Drug Administration has a purview of those things, and they let them go on killing people, but that's all right with the Food and Drug Administration.

But somebody has an E-Meter. They said the E-Meter was a diagnostic, therapeutic instrument and it was used to cure people of things and the small current that went through it titillated or agitated the brain and made the brain cells well or something. I don't know what they had figured out. So we just stopped selling E-Meters and we stopped selling these Dianazene antiradiation bombs because people kept asking for them. You know the little pills.

And we just quit that and the Food and Drug Administration said, [in a whining voice:] "You shouldn't have done that." But I also caused him an enormous amount of work and I imagine our name is an anathema to him. Because every time I turned around I had him writing letters to senators and congressmen explaining why he was attacking this church.

The poor man, the head of the Food and Drug Administration, with all of his administration had to write additional letters all the time. We turned them out on Robotypes ourselves. They all looked like personal letters. They weren't. And then the senator would write him and say, "What is this?" and then he'd have to write a long explanation. Part of his text was "You'll remember, of course, L. Ron Hubbard because he's the one that's had so much publicity in recent years." He always included this phrase in his letters to the senators and congressmen. They, of course, would instantly forward his letters to us. We just set it up on an administrative line. It just went off one, two, three, four. We were worrying them to death.

And then all of a sudden when I found this clause in the law, that said that they had no purview over you if you didn't manufacture anything out of which they had any purview, see, but if you did manufacture, then they could run your whole organization for you. So I just said, "Kick these items out of our immediate sales bill," and that's why they're not there anymore, and the Food and Drug Administration had to go away and get lost. All right. And they did, because it wasn't our game.

So my cricket bat was no longer lying on the green. Don't you see? And their poor, unemployed agents had to wander and go to movies in the afternoon instead of in... [laughter]

But the only thing you can lose – the only thing you can lose – is your time and your equanimity. That's all; that's all. And if you rig it up so these things are not disturbed and you have gone on being effective the whole time and taking very effective steps to handle this all and square this all around and realize fully that there's nothing wastes as much time as the law...

You see, the law has overts against men's time. It puts them in jail.

Overt against time. Overt against time. So of course the law has slowed down to a point of where to get a civil suit tried of having bought a package of biscuits at the store which was moldy, and you're suing the store, that will be heard in two or three years, you see. That's the way the law goes. But – because it's overt against time, it goes this way.

All right. Now, don't worry for a minute about the future health of Scientology. It is going through these exact periods that every new idea goes through. It is actually being fought much less expertly than many things have been fought in the past. There are tremendous things which could be done, but I've begun to realize that nobody is going to do them. So I never bother to provide against them anymore to amount to anything.
But there are some sleepers back on the track. If anybody tried to attack a Scientology organization and pick it up and move it out of the perimeter or go over the hills with it today – this happened to us once – why, they would find themselves involved in the most confoundedly weird mass of legal – well, it's just like quicksand. Quicksand. It's an interesting trick. Every time they shoot at you on the right side of the horse, you're on the left side of the horse; and then they prove conclusively you're on the left side of the horse, you prove conclusively that you're on the right side of the horse.

They go mad after a while. This is what the basic legal structure is. Furthermore, Scientology is so fixed up these days that if any one continent shut down, the enemy realizes much better than you do – because it's happened – that any area so closed off, could be flooded from an exterior source. You understand? So it doesn't do any good to close any area of Scientology out in the whole world; and no agency exists which could do so. You see how that would work?

They might close them all out in the United States or they might close them all out in England. But their apathy comes about at once by the fact that if they closed them out in the United States, they would be bombarded from England. And if they closed them out in England, they'd be bombarded from the United States. And in the United States, the difficulty is that if they attacked in one state, they'd find you operating in another state, don't you see? That isn't the same corporation that you're attacking, you see. It's all very involved, but ...

[laughter]

And this drives, by the way, the Better Business Bureau berserk. They know what they want. They're mainly subsidized, by the way, by the American Medical Association. They're always putting out tracts about quack medicines and all this sort of thing. They blackmail you. And we never buy blackmail, is another one of our defensive mechanisms. We never pay blackmail. Drive us to the wall, shoot us down, but we won't pay blackmail. That's it. And people realize this and it's very upsetting to them.

So the upshot of all this is, is there is an unpleasant side to the business of dissemination and that is the backflash. And it's a very interested backflash, but a very terrified one. It used to be a ridiculing backflash. But now it isn't; there is fear in it. There is more than fear in the United States in it. I had a fellow investigating Scientology for the government. He was told to by the White House, so he didn't dare do anything but actually investigate it. Finally he was looking more and more whipped and more and more whipped and more and more whipped and he finally picked out one profile showing a bottom to the top gain and he said, "If just this one profile were ever published in the American Journal of Psychology, it would upset the whole field. Do you realize that?"

And the other fellow says, "Yes, well, we don't really blame you for keeping it all to yourself and keeping a monopoly on it." Yeah. Keeping it all to ourselves. Just let anybody stand long enough to listen and a Scientologist will give him the works, you know. [laughter] And yet psychology was upset because we kept it all to ourselves.

No, at no time – at no time have we ever really faltered now since about 1953, we're – been going pretty good since '53. Up to that time, we had no corporate control. People say what I did before 1953. Well, what I did before 1953 was try to keep the show on the roads
and fight them off single-handed and after a while, why, we got enough people in line so that it wasn't quite this tough; and that's really what happened. And now, on a present time, our modus operandi is so well worked out that an attack in one quarter of the United States brings about a certain series of actions in an entirely different quarter in the United States. And suddenly, why, the enemy is looking at all kinds of attorneys and looking at various backflashes. And now an investigation has been started of the people who were behind this attack on Scientology; and that investigation will go forward and these people will be very discredited before we get through.

Don't think that this is an enttheta operating atmosphere. It is not one. I'm trying to tell you what we do to fight back; and what we do to keep going. And that is to say, above all else, we keep on doing our jobs, and we're effective in combating the attack. And if you just remember those two factors, why, you've got it. Be effective in combating the attack. Don't let it keep you from doing your job. That's the only thing the enemy can win; and all else is of no consequence.

Frankly, not for years has anybody been hurt in one of these attacks. Not for years and years and years. I first laid down the modus operandi of what to do about it – various ones have been laid down – about 1955. And they have been uniformly successful since that time. I haven't got any wood to knock on particularly, but I do have a lot of faith on Scientology and Scientologists. I've got a lot of that to knock on and that's good.

All right. Well, that's a long dissertation which you probably feel didn't have too much to do with you. [laughter] But it's something for you to look at and realize that you would be as nothing; What you would be doing would not even be important if nobody fought you, anywhere. If nobody disapproved of what we were doing anywhere, do you realize it would be like reaching into a soundless void?

Think of the thousands of philosophies that must have been developed in all parts of Earth by two and half billion human beings in the past eleven years. There must have been quite a few. There have been rivers of books written, all of which had new, startling and strange ideas. None of these are ever fought. Not one of them; and nobody's ever heard of them. But we have the enemy – aberration, ignorance, enslavement – we have these things on the run. And the hallmark of having them on the run is that somebody gets excited about it.

Right now the American Medical Association – I don't know what their mood would be today if you walked in – opened the front door, and walked in to the receptionist, and said, "I'm a Scientologist." I'm sure you wouldn't be unknown. They might try to pretend they didn't know you, but that's it. Yes?

Male voice: A couple of years ago, Ron, a man who didn't want his girlfriend processed, wrote a letter to the American Medical Association. Got a letter back from their secretary saying, "These seem to be fine, earnest people who are in a totally different field from the field of medicine, so they give us no trouble and we give them none."

Oh, is that so?

Male voice: Right.

That's how far it's gone. I wish I had a copy of that letter.
We've just received the surrender papers of the Better Business Bureau.

*Male voice: Good.*

They're sort of written backwards, but they're nevertheless that.

But there's the point. As you move forward in life, and as you move forward across the face of man's thought fields particularly; think of the hospitals, think of the vested interests, think of the utterly wha – billions of dollars and pounds that are undoubtedly invested in education and all these different spheres – the facilities. Why, I think if you put together all the electrodiathermy machines that won't cure anybody out here in this ten-acre park, they'd probably make an awfully nice mess of a mountain. When you think of all this vested interest, when you think of the electronic organization, when you think of the drug people, when you think of all these vested interests, think of what they'd lose. It's fantastic. I think they're being gentlemen about it, myself. I think they're – so on. They eventually will turn over their sword and that will be the end of that.

But if you weren't fought and if you didn't have backflashes and if you didn't hear wild rumors of one character or another running around the field, start worrying. Start worrying. Right then, start worrying because you're not getting through. What do you think the highest level of approval of the human race is right now? What would it be?

*Male voice: Communicate.*

Yeah. But when you don't hear any of it, know you aren't being heard. Okay?

Well, I didn't mean to give you such a lugubrious talk on this situation, but it's been a bit on my mind, and I thought you might know something about it; how we are alert to these things, and what we do concerning them, and why you don't find me tearing myself wrong side out every time somebody jumps up. But where you do find this, you do find us doing something effective. We move in rather rapidly. Our communication lines are much more rapid than the enemy's. Much more rapid. They're very fast.

The speed of HCO's communication lines is your best guarantee of defense, and that's why you must keep the speed of HCO lines up. They must be rapid and there mustn't be any comm lags on them. Whether there's anything important going over them or not, keep them up.

Because this alone is very discouraging to people. Very upsetting. They think we'll hear about it in a month or two and maybe do something about it. When within something like hours after this incident happened, anybody who – in authority in Scientology knew all about it within hours after the thing occurred. And of course, they just started moving up various artillery units and that sort of thing and lining up things one way or the other. And you've got some isolated unit that was making an attack on a Scientologist, and he's going to wonder what the hell cooks after a while.

Now of course, the backfire is going on the basis that in view of the fact every police agency in California has been informed of this terrible case and these terrible people, well, naturally they've made it inevitable that we have to get them investigated thoroughly. And so that is happening. And the next police report that I expect to come through on this line proba-
Dealing with attacks on Scientology.

Bly won't be through for almost a year. But it'll be somewhat on the basis of this: "You remember that case in Eureka?", "What case?", "Well, the case about the Scientologists up in Eureka, you know? How they were drugging everybody and so forth. Well, I think this case we're into right here in Portland", (which will have something to do with nothing connected with us, you see) "I think it's similar to that. Yeah, I think it's just similar to that Eureka case, you remember?" And they'll be using it as a model of comparison of how to subvert an organization, you see. Only we won't be the people they will be saying were bad, see. It'll be somebody else on this thing.

Well, those are good things to know. I'm giving a talk about it because I see that once in a while your judgment can be startled on something like this. You hear some fantastic rumor of some kind or another. And you say, "Well, there must be truth in it. Couldn't be, otherwise." No, the only truth is, is we're making progress.

You never get rumors when we're being ineffective. If we're not getting wins on cases, and HGCs and Academies aren't good and that sort of thing, you know we never hear a thing about us. It's all of a sudden, though, we go into a wild wingding of clearing them left and right and straightening out organizations and so forth, and the enemies say, "Oh, my God, there they go again", you see. And I use as a positive indicator of the strength of a Central Organization whether or not it's got any backflash. Is anybody yelling about it? Is anybody complaining about it? Is anybody screaming about it? And if there is nobody, I say they must all be sitting there doing nothing! They can't possibly be getting any results in the Academy. They can't possibly be getting any results in the HGC. They can't possibly be doing a blessed thing, because nobody's worried.

But you give me a big flood of letters coming in from someplace saying "Those dogs down in Sydney are just doing the terriblest things and everything is bad in Sydney, and Sydney is terribly bad..." Oh, I'll forward it through for information. I'll even look into it a little bit. But the basic thing that registers with me is somebody in Sydney is being effective. That's the thing to remember on these things. And I received a letter today asking me to return Ken quite rapidly so they could do something about this; and I'm putting it in its proper perspective. It's much more important that Ken finish off some effectiveness.

You see, by withdrawing him from a course, we immediately make ourselves less effective. See, California would be less effective. You get how we'd lose that way?

In addition to that, people have a grandiose notion that this is going to take place, that something is going to happen. Nothing is going to happen. It's going to go on for months and months and months. It'll leave somebody sitting on the hot seat for months and months and months. Nineteen sixty-two will come and go. Nineteen sixty-three will arrive; and still nothing drastic will have happened. Okay?

That's the status of rumor. That's the status of combat with the society. When there's nothing to lean on, there's nobody listening. If there's nothing flashing back, there are no ears hearing you nor eyes seeing what you are doing. So I don't care how much entheata you stir up. Just be effective.

Thank you.
CCHs – CIRCUITS
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Thank you.

Okay. Well, this is the 27th of June, or was the last time I looked. But it might have slipped.

You're apparently doing all right in a mild sort of way. The biggest difficulty people are having right now, although they don't know it, is CCHs: how they are done. What was that, way back there in the dim, historical past? You know, that sort of thing. Big conferences about it all.

The monitoring and regulating factors which lie back of the CCHs should be placed in your hands. There are some monitoring factors that answer all of these questions if you want to get down and figure them out. And that is simply, the CCHs are a physical activity. They are not a mental activity.

That tells you at once that they are not verbal. So if you go ahead and whistle "Yankee Doodle" and give the Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, compounded with William Pitt's lecture on the protection of colonies, what's this got to do with the CCHs? Got the idea? I mean, you could give the CCHs totally mum and they would work.

Look at what this answers as a stable datum, see? Therefore, do you ever ask the pc (and take his data) the following question: "How is it going?" And then do you take his data? Do you then use the data to determine whether or not the process is flat? No, I will say you don't.

Now, why do you say, then, occasionally to the pc, "How are you doing?" Why do you say this at all?

Well, I call to your attention – I think it's clause 16, isn't it, of the Auditor's Code, which has to do with remaining in two-way communication with the pc. And that is all that has to do with. And it wouldn't matter if the pc said, "I have eighteen bayonets protruding in my stomach." The pc has not visually been observed to have a single change of comm lag or physical twitch, jitters, screams, fusses, yammerings – there's been no change in anything the pc is doing for twenty minutes.

And you say to the pc, "Well, how are you doing?"

And the pc says, "Well, my stomach is full of all these bayonets. And I've had this somatic turning on and off in my left zorch, and so forth."
And you say, "Well, that's just fine. Well, thank you very much. All right. We're now
going to do the next CCH."

That sounds weird, doesn't it?

Now, two-way comm with the pc. Now, in CCH 3 and CCH 4, why do you say to the
pc, then, "Are you satisfied that you did it?" That restrains you, fellow Scientologist, from
pulling a gag I've seen happen too often. We don't care if the pc said he did it or didn't do it or
couldn't do it or hadn't been able to do it or was satisfied that he had done it or thought he had
halfway done it or if he answered you in Arabic. We would say, "That's fine," and we would
give him the next command. You got the idea?

Now, to keep the pc in two-way communication, we do the same thing, only we talk to
the pc. But talking to the pc in the CCHs, you might as well be talking to the birds. It has
nothing to do with your running the process. Just make up your mind to it. Because I'll tell
you what I do; and the CCHs work for me very well. And I tell you what I do.

Never with an invalidative statement or frame of mind or anything of the sort, I move
a book from the left to the right. See? My left to my right, you know? And the pc, I hand him
the book. And the pc picks up the book, and the pc scratches the back of his neck with it.

And then I say, "Well, are you satisfied that you did that?"

And the pc will say, "Oh, yes, I did that."

And so I take the book – and maybe not the exact motion – I turn the book on edge,
and I move it from my left to my right. And I turn the book upside-down the next time. (He
thought he did it that time too, except he stepped on it.) And I'll turn it upside-down, but I will
keep moving this book from the left to the right until the pc does it. Otherwise, it's a flub. It is
a flub.

It's a delicate balance between invalidating the pc, you see, and making sure that you
duplicate the auditing command that isn't flat, because the one from the left to the right is not
flat. Couldn't be. He hadn't a clue. You got the idea? He just didn't have a clue.

You moved the book from the left to the right and the pc picked up the book and
scratched under his armpit with it. And you say, "Well, did you do that?" And the pc says,
"Oh, yes. Yes. I did that." And you take the book back, and to keep from invalidating him you
turn it around the other way and you move it from the left to the right. And you faintly differ
it in the position of the book or something of the sort, or your hand or whether you extend
your little finger or something, but it's still a motion from the left to the right at the same rate
of speed. Got that?

All right. And I keep duplicating that type of motion until the pc is flat on it.

Hand motions, same way. Same way. I asked him if he contributed to the motion, and,
shucks, he was running halfway across the room, you know? And he says, "Yes. Yes. Oh, yes.
Yes, yes. I contributed to the motion all right."

That's good. He gets almost the same one again, and he gets it until I think he did it
too. You understand? That's a delicate balance.
If a pc starts feeling invalidated because you were repeating the same motion, well, a lot of things could be wrong. "But I did that", he says. Ah, yes, but a pc can say, "Well, I did that" if you moved the book from the left to the right, and then on the next motion of the book you moved it in a circle behind your own head. And the pc says, "But I did that." What did you do, pc? Yes, he just did that. He moved the book from the left to the right by scratching the back of his head with it. You got the idea? You'll run into these.

Well, so why plunge in that deep before it becomes idiotic, don't you see? The pc did it, he did it, and if he didn't do it, he didn't do it. But you mustn't be pedantic, because instead of an acknowledgment you give an invalidation. And as soon as you start giving an invalidation instead of an acknowledgment, why, the pc starts going downhill, not uphill, because you're giving him lose, lose, lose, lose, lose. And you've got to give him win, win, win, win, win. All right. He thinks he did the same one by scratching the back of his head with a book when you moved it from the left to the right.

Well, that gave him a win. You said, "That's fine."

Now I go ahead and move books from the left to the right, don't you see? I keep going on moving books from the left to the right, but not accusatively. It's a very delicate point.

Physical motion is all that counts in any of the CCHs. And it doesn't matter what the pc says. You're trying to keep in communication with the pc, and that is all there is to it. Follow? That's all there is to it. You'd feel awfully strange if a robot clanked into the room, sat down in the auditing chair and began to pump your hand. As a matter of fact, you'd feel a little queasy. And in view of the fact that this has probably happened quite often on the track that a robot walked in and started to dismantle you or something of the sort because you'd just had your doll body revoked – you react very badly to something that doesn't communicate. You probably wouldn't even object to the robot dismantling your doll body if he came in and said, "Well, I got an order here from the general council that you, having been guilty of mepery and dopery in high space, are herewith deprived of one doll body, and we're going to take it apart and leave it on the bench for seventy-two hours."

(Now, that's what I used to do. This is a different one.)

And you probably would have gone along with it. It wouldn't have been quite so bad, but some inhuman, unspeaking, unthinking, unfeeling set of cranes suddenly move in and start pulling the doll body apart, some uncertainty has entered into the situation.

So therefore, I keep the uncertainty out of the situation in doing CCHs. I say, "Well, this is what we're going to do." And I do it.

Now, you can make all kinds of mistakes in running the CCHs, but that stable datum will set you right on most of them. It's a physical action, it's physical observation, and those are where the CCHs live.

Now, there's another one; there's another one: No command in the CCHs is left understood. You don't clear a command and then insist that the pc do it from there on out. In other words, you don't say, "Now, you're always going to turn counterclockwise", and then we never thereafter give him an order to turn counterclockwise. That violates the rules of auditing commands. And the principal rule of an auditing command is, it is given now, in this unit.
of time, and nothing has any validity except this unit of time and the command that is just
given. You know that, as an old standby from way back when.

Well, don't violate it with the CCHs. Don't say, "Well, now hereinafter as aforestated
you're going to turn counterclockwise", and then correct the pc if he turns clockwise. Oh, no.
The pc has no orders to turn clockwise.

You say, "You give me that hand." If there were no designation of any kind, it would
be perfectly proper for the pc to give you either hand.

If you say, "You turn around", in CCH 2, and there's no designation of any kind which
way to turn around, then any way that the pc turns around is right. Right? There's no designa-
tion.

Now, if you want the pc to turn in a certain way, then before you give the auditing
command, put your hand on his shoulder and start to turn him and say, "Turn around." You
got that? That's a designation, isn't it?

And "You give me that hand": you nod at the hand. Pointing at the hand, you will find
if you practice it, is not feasible. You can't point at the hand and then pick up the hand and
then do this with the hand; it is just too much. But you can nod at his right hand and say,
"You give me that hand." It's a physical thing, anyhow, you see?

The thing is all actually done by theta communication and physical motion. The two
things are combined, and the English language has nothing to do with it. But we just stay in
communication with the pc. You got the idea? So that's why we have the commands.

Now, putting the hand back in the pc's lap causes a great deal of difficulty to one and
all. Now, what do you do? Do you put it in his lap or something?

Well now, if the pc's hand were to be very limp as he extended you the hand – if the
hand's very limp, you see; you've actually had to take it by the wrist, and it's out there in an
acute state of catatonia right now – and you drop his hand, if by some accident it were to
strike his knee or strike the edge of the chair, you would have been in violation of a primary
function of an auditor, which is to safeguard the pc from harm during a session. If anything
makes a pc scream – it's you preventing somebody from coming in the room, you preventing
him from lousing himself up. You get the idea?

Because it's your responsibility that the pc can be audited in that session, particularly
at that moment of the auditing command. And you go ahead and drop his hand in thin air, and
he knocks his wristbone, or something like this, against the edge of his chair, and so forth,
well, that's a silly thing for you to do, don't you see?

The same time, it is equally silly to take a pc's hand, when the pc is putting it decently
back in his lap every time – to call out a couple of destroyer escorts and have it escorted back
there. You got the idea? That again is silly. So the things that are silly in the CCHs or that
seem silly to you are probably wrong. You've probably got them wrong. You got the idea?

There really is no one-two-three-four-five-six drill. This was invented later while try-
ing to teach the people, you see? There really is no such drill. The pc is giving you his hand
quite nicely. Well, all right. So you take his hand. And he's removing his hand from yours
quite nicely, on an acknowledgment, and putting it in his lap or on the arm of the chair. Well, what else is called for at this point? Nothing else is called for. You simply sit there, give him the command, and take his hand, thank him. But then all of a sudden he's getting coy and he doesn't want to give you his hand, so you pick his wrist up and move his hand over and put it in your hand. Right?

All right. Now, at this time you notice that the hand, as it touches yours, is in a complete state of inertia. Well, you certainly are not going to drop it any more than you'd drop your watch. You've got to put it someplace, so you put it back in his lap. You got the idea?

So reason governs these things.

All right. Now, let's take this fact, which has got some auditors a bit loused up, because a lot of auditors knew 8-C, and 8-C is not Tone 40 8-C. 8-C is not a CCH. We only carelessly refer to CCH 2 as 8-C. It's not 8-C. It never was. 8-C goes something like this: You say to the pc, "Look at that wall."

No – not 8-C; not the first 8-C. The first 8-C is "Walk over to that wall." "Touch that wall." See? "Walk over to that wall. Thank you. Touch that wall. Thank you. Walk over to that wall. Touch that wall. Thank you." That's it. "Walk over to that wall. Thank you. Touch that wall. Thank you. Walk over to that wall. Thank you. Touch that wall. Thank you." That was old 8-C in, I think, in its most virgin original form before it got raped by misunderstandings. [laughter]

The next evolution on this line is unimportant, because it evolved pretty far. But frankly, Tone 40 8-C, unlike CCH 1, Give Me That Hand, improved through complication. It is better in the final form that it was in. But the final form of development I don't think was ever printed. And it was a you preceded each part of its commands. "You look at that wall." And the auditor would point to the wall. "You walk over to that wall." Now, there was a further point of complication, is "You walk that body over to that wall." Skip it. That's getting too complicated. But "You walk over to that wall. Thank you. You touch that wall. Thank you. Turn around. Thank you. You look at that wall. Thank you. You walk over to that wall. Thank you. You touch that wall. Thank you. Turn around."

Now, that was a high point of complication from old 8-C. Now, this point of complication went further. It's "You look at that wall. You walk that body over to that wall," or "You make that body walk over to that wall. With your right hand, you touch that wall. You turn that body around clockwise." Now, you see, that's going just a little far.

It is what works. It is what works. And that earlier one that I gave you, "You look at that wall": All right, the pc looks at the floor. Clank! Straighten your hand out on his jaw, and wham! he looks at the wall, see? That's it. You grab him actually by the back of the neck and his jaw, and he looks at that wall. If he squinches his eyes, that sort of thing, you've still got this hand ready and you pull his eyelids open. That's correct. That's a perfectly correct action. Got it? All right. And he's looked at the wall.

And now, "You walk over to that wall." And he walks over to that wall or he gets carried over to that wall, but there's some kind of action takes place where he transports himself from where he is to where you want him to be.
Now, when you say, "You touch that wall", you therefore don't pick out a spot for him to touch and you don't pick out a hand for him to touch with because it is not an understood proposition at all. You haven't said it in the auditing command, so therefore his putting his right knee against the wall is an adequate response to the auditing command. Correct?

All right. Now, in view of the fact that you actually intended him to touch it with his hand, after a while if the right knee seems to be just a little bit too insouciant or something of the sort, I have been known to add in "With your right hand, touch that wall" – not as a correction of my own auditing command, but on subsequent commands. But that's a change of the command and so it isn't so good. And you'll find out that if he will touch the wall even with his knee, it takes a little longer but it will run out his resistance to performing the maneuver. Do you understand? So there's no sense in being pedantic about it.

Now, I'll straighten you out quite clearly about this. It is "You look at that wall." He does. You say, "Thank you", Tone 40. And you say, "You walk over to that wall." And he does. And you say, "Thank you." And then you say, "You touch that wall." And he does. And you say, "Thank you." And then you say, "Turn around. Thank you." And that is about all there are to it.

That is a very simple evolution. Now, as I say, you can get too pedantic and so forth. But that factually – that factually – is a more operable command line than a complicated command line, and it is more effective than old 8-C by considerable.

Now, when you've got this fellow whizzing and dealing, you could hand yourself some loses if you said to yourself, "Now, I intended for him to touch the wall with the heel of his left foot by Tone 40 intention, unspoken, and he didn't do it. He touched it with his hand. Therefore, I've had a lose." Yes, you could fix yourself up to have some loses that way. But that's nonsense. It exceeds the process. It has nothing to do with the process. You want this fellow under control and you want him to get the communication, and you want him to gain havingness, and this is a very fine process with which to do it.

All right. As far as CCH 3 is concerned, this is old Hand Space Mimicry, and it just doesn't matter much what you say. There are a set of commands. They haven't become unduly complicated or anything of the sort, except you don't even tell him ... you don't dispose of the hands. You don't do anything like that. You give it one-handed with an unwilling pc. You only use one paw, and with the other paw you steer him through the motions. Okay? And the book, same way. You make one-paw motions with the book. And if the pc doesn't do it, of course, you tuck the book in his paw and you move the book in the motion, and you thank him for it and take the book back. All right.

Now, CCH 1, now, has as its additional ramifications – had the left hand, both hands, all kinds of hands. You understand? Well, why call it another process? Why call it another process? You don't have to do these things. You don't have to not do these things. But you do the process that isn't flat. That is to say, if you're saying, "You give me that hand" – pardon me, you don't have to say, "You give me that hand," just say, "Give me that hand" – the pc has been giving his right hand for about twelve, fifteen hours of auditing, and this is getting dull even to you, because he's been flat on it for some time, every time you went by it and so forth, start nodding at the other hand. See? Bust down his automaticities.
Now, I use these things that every time I come back through the CCHs I will break down an automaticity on this proposition. I bust up the installed machinery. And that's the only reason you flip over to the other hand or start saying, "Give me those hands", or anything of that sort. Now, there's another point here. It has value, in other words. It has value. And that is the only thing that regulates an auditing command or process. Does it have value? Well, it does. It has value.

Another thing I do consistently in running the CCHs you might be interested in is that I change my pace every now and then. It's "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you." (pause) "Give me that hand." (pause) "Thank you." (shorter pause) "Give me that hand." (short pause) "Thank you."

Now, originally, when this was being done in London, they were studying, actually, to give the same auditing command newly in the same unit of command, and they were actually building up machinery this way. And the guy could build up machinery against this thing faster than you could tear it down. [laughter] And the way to bust up machinery on CCH 1 is by occasionally varying the pace.

And the pc will jump it. I just sit there and look at him. You just never heard of his hand, you know? You haven't said, "Give me that hand" yet, you see? And here's his hand out there practically busting your chest open, you know? He's jumped the command – jumped the command one way or the other. It's a good control factor. And I will actually pick up a person's hand, put it back in his lap gently, something like that, and then give the auditing command. You got the idea? I'll refuse his hand if I didn't ask for it. But that's only when it's too pointed, and there's no particular reason to communicate it because the communication is usually enough. The person is made aware of the fact that they've jumped the auditing command, and they haven't been aware of the fact they've been jumping the auditing command, you see? The last five or ten that you gave them, they've been jumping the auditing command. Their hand is halfway over at the time you say the auditing command. Of course, it doesn't have too much to do with the verbalization of the thing, but you haven't even laid the intention into him yet, see? So you're not auditing the pc. He's gone on some kind of a machine.

Well, the way to bust that down is put comm lags in your auditing. Speed it up or slow it down slightly. You don't even have to do it extremely. And the pc is giving his hand at this rate: "Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you. Give me that hand. Thank you."

So you say, (short pause) "Give me that hand. Thank you." (short pause) "Give me that hand. Thank you." "Give me that hand. Thank you." "Give me that hand. Thank you." "Give me that hand. Thank you." (rapidly) "Give me that hand. Thank you." (pause) "Give me that hand." (pause) "Thank you."

Got the idea? You can practically see the cogwheels on the machinery fly off. You know, the guy – "What – what's this? What's – what – what's going on here?" [laughter] "Oh, there's an auditor here. Oh! Oh, oh. Something new has been added to this room. I hadn't noticed this auditor before."

Now, of course, the original of the CCHs was that the individual was given an auditor by the CCHs, and we found out the main thing that happened – we found some auditors, by
the way, who were never found by the pc. For some peculiar reason, the pc just never found these auditors, and it'd sometimes happen, factually happen, that pc after pc wouldn't find the auditor. And yet we found, when we taught this auditor to run the CCHs, that he normally could get away with this, and he called attention of himself to the pc.

But this wasn't when we had the CCHs. This was afterwards. This first mechanism was given to a pc ...

I think it is trait – well, it's actually traits B and C, I think, are the main traits, see?

*Female voice: A, B and Cs Ron.*

Well, it's A, yes, but it's C that I keep my eagle eye on; and if C doesn't rise during an intensive, well, I just conclude he never found the auditor, that's all. And if he never found the auditor, there's no reason to blame the auditor. It's just the pc has a rather poor power of observation. And you should have been running the CCHs, that's all, because they were the remedy for this sort of thing. When we'd see graphs of this character we knew something else was indicated, and so on, and developed some drills by which this could be done. There were a great many of these drills, and they finally peeled down to the most effective of these drills, which became CCH 1, CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4. Those are the most effective of these drills. These are the ones that seem to have an effect on almost any case.

Now, the purpose of those was to find the auditor, and therefore, if the pc goes on automatic, he hasn't got an auditor, has he? Well, a pc can go on automatic. Now, you needn't worry about it too much. It doesn't put any strain on the situation. You just run the CCHs right, and this automaticity takes care of itself. But I will call to your attention the fact that it is silly to continue to pace your auditing commands on an automaticity if you don't expect one to occur in the pc. See, if you want one to occur in the pc, always keep your auditing commands exactly the same pace.

On doing CCH 2, you'll find this pc is halfway across the room and you haven't said a word. And I am rather fond of making him look a little silly.

You know, somebody's been jumping the gun, I'll just stand there. You know? "What's this all about? What's this?" See? They normally come back to where they were. I don't even tell them to come back. They will, usually; they come back and stand there, contrite. It brings it home. It brings it home.

But, of course, these points make them find the auditor, don't they, without invalidating them terrifically; because actually you are not invalidating them, they're doing something weird that has nothing to do with the process. This makes them very aware of the fact, too. Busts it up quick.

Now, running the CCHs are then based upon what is doable, and making every auditing command newly, and based as well on the fact that they are a physical process. They have to do with theta-MEST.

It's a direct theta-MEST process. Your command is a theta command. That is to say, you're laying it into the guy. If you were real good, you could probably do the CCHs without opening your mouth. If you don't believe me, if you're running real hot someday, think the
auditing command to the pc. You know, in other words, transmit it to the pc. I'm calling this
to your attention because an auditor could really muck up a pc this way, you see? Puts the
intention into the pc's head, and then comm lags, and then gives the verbal auditing command,
and then criticizes the pc because the pc has jumped the gun. This would be a wonderful way
of invalidating a pc. You get the idea? You actually could do it.

Because in running a pc, it happens all too often. I mean, I'll be coaching or something
like that. I don't play fair on Upper Indoc coaching and that sort of thing; I start doing it Tone
40, and they'll eventually go straight into the process, bang!

What you can observe, however, is think the auditing command at the pc, you know –
I mean, put the intention there, independent of your verbalization. Put the intention in the pc's
head and watch his hand jump to touch the wall. It's quite interesting. If you're good at it, you
can make him do it. But that you can't do it is no particular reason for anything, because one
of the things that can make you fail to do it, the pc might be rigged wrong. And you put the
intention in his head to touch the wall and he stamps his foot, you see? [laughter] Doesn't
mean anything, except he's got his switchboards crossed.

For instance, I was very much invalidated one time. There was a fellow came to call,
and I didn't particularly want to see anybody that particular day. I had a lot of work to do or a
lot of loafing to do or something of the sort. I was trying to figure out something. So I thought
an intention into the living room, you see, that he would leave. And, by gosh, he didn't. And
you know, I thought, "This is very upsetting", you know; I mean, "What's the matter with me?
I'm slipping my cogwheels and I have failed utterly", and so on. I went about my work and
eventually the nattering and snarling and so forth kept on coming. Didn't have anything much
to do with what we were doing, you know?

Had some acquaintance with this particular individual a couple of years afterwards,
and I found out something very interesting: The individual was on an intentional reverse. See,
his was totally inverted on intentions. And thinking the thought into his head that he should
leave would glue him in the chair, you know? [laughter] Just stuck. I never did run the reverse
experiment on him of thinking he should stay glued in the chair, particularly, but I have, on
others, and actually seen them practically be catapulted out of their chair. Fantastic thing, you
know? "Stick in the chair" and wham! They're going, "Well, we got to go now." And they just
came for the evening, you know? Terrible, terrible situation.

So, you're actually ... actually, unless you were doing a whole-body control of the pc,
you could think – like you can think at a mest object and make an ashtray sometimes move or
do something weird. People running Upper Indoc sometimes have funny things happen with
ashtrays, and so on. They get quite upset about it and they think they'd better not do it, and
things like this. But the best thing to think at an ashtray is "You have gravity; you have no
gravity", you know, that kind of thing, if you want something funny to happen with ashtrays.

Anyway, if you're just thinking an intention at the pc, you're just as likely to activate
one of these crisscrossed ... It looks like the janitor relieving the switchboard girl during a
noon hour in which an emergency occurred, you know, and every wire is out of its socket,
and they're all in crisscrossed across the boards, and all phones are plugged to all phones and
all of them wrong. So, of course, you call up the president's office or something like this and
you get the electrical-maintenance shop, you know? And it's just all crosswired. And you run into that in running the CCHs.

So it actually isn't, quote, "all the pc's fault", unquote. The pc is not necessarily being recalcitrant when he doesn't follow your auditing intention or starts to blow up or wogs or does something like this. What you're actually doing is you're giving him the intention and the guidance to carry out that intention, not the intention then called upon by the switchboard.

If you want to have some fun sometime with an E-Meter, start talking to the entities in a body. There's all kinds of screwball phenomena that we've run into. We probably have more phenomena and nonsense that we have discovered about life and so forth in Scientology than they've accumulated in the whole of the last fifty thousand years – infinitely more. It's really, really goofy.

But if you ... You could sit down and start talking to somebody's circuit and just get the pc to relay what the circuit said. And for some peculiar reason, you hook in the circuit harder and harder and harder and harder and harder. And of course, the oddity is that a circuit hooks in on drop of havingness, and that you're making a communication line talk across to a circuit.

You are (1) validating the circuit, and (2) you are running down its havingness. Because a circuit has no livingness in it. It is simply a motivated mass.

And if there's anything running it at all, it is mass. So you get a circuit to communicate very much, and mass goes. If you want to pull somebody's circuits in on him, run his havingness down.

There's a funny experiment that goes with this, by the way. It takes rather special conditions to operate, and you have to be pretty sharp to get this thing. There's two or three of these. One of them is a problem. That's the commonest one and the easiest one to do, is the individual tells you he has a present time problem. So you say, "Think of a solution." And he gives you a solution. You say, "Good. Think of another solution to this problem. Good. Good. Think of another solution to this problem." And you wonder why this pc is starting to go wog, man. And he does. He starts to go wog.

Because you're doing something to the stable core of an area of motion, and you're leaving all the motion on automatic, you see? And I got the mechanism on this a few weeks ago, and it's in my notes somewhere – but what happens is actually the person is not confronting the actuality of that thing at all. He's not confronting what is actually going on, he's confronting a solution to it, which means he's trying to not-is what it is, and the problem mass moves in on him. And it's quite interesting to watch.

You can ask a pc, "Do you have a present time problem?" You're fortunate, yes, he's got a present time problem. All right. You say, "Now, do you have any masses anywhere in the vicinity of your body?"

And he says, "Yes. As a matter of fact, there is one out there about four or five feet."

You say, "All right." Now, here's the exact mechanics of this: You say, "All right. Now, what is this present time problem of yours?"
And he says, "Uh ... well, um ... actually, uh ... Joe and Bill and Pete uh ... have all ganged up on me and they won't speak to me."

And you say, "Where is this black mass now?"

He says, "Well, it's eight or nine feet out there."

And you say, "Well, describe this problem you have to me."

And the individual says, "Well, it's uh ... it's Joe and Bill and Pete, actually, and uh ... the problem is, is I don't seem to be able to get along with them. I don't talk their language well."

And you say, "Well now, all right." You say, "Well, where is this mass now?"

And he says, "Well, it's fifteen or twenty feet out there." You're liable to get this type of response, you see? All right. You say, "Well, good. Good. Think of a solution to that problem." And he does. You say, "Where is this black mass now?"

And he says, "Well, it's out there eight or nine feet." "Good", you say.

"Well, think of another solution to this problem." And he does. And you say, "Where is this black mass?"

And he says, "Well, it's out there about four or five feet."

And you say, "Well, that's good."

You say, "Think of another solution to this problem." And so he does, and you say, "Where's the black mass?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, what black mass? Things have gone black."

All right. Now you say, "All right. Now, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." He does. You say, "Where's this black mass now?"

"Well, it's out there about a foot from my face."

"Good," you say. "Think of another problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. All right. Now, where is that mass now?"

"Well, that's – it's five or six feet out in front of me."

You say, "Good. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Where is it now?"

"Well", he says, "it's out there about twelve feet."

"Good." You say, "Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Where is it now?"

And he says, "Well", he says, "it's way out there."

You say, "Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." And he does, you know, and so forth. "Where is it now?"

He says, "It disappeared."
You say, "Well, that's good. Good. Think of a solution to that problem. All right. Where's that black mass?"

"Well, it's over there on the horizon." "Good. Now think of a solution to that problem. All right. Where is it now?"

"Oh," he says, "it's out there about twenty feet."

"All right. Think of a solution to that problem. Where is it now?"

"Well, it's out here about four feet in front of my face."

And, "Good. Now think of a solution to that problem."

"Well, it's gone black."

And you can run that silly problem... For some reason or other, people who have problems who are capable of seeing at all visually will always tell you that there is a black mass connected in the vicinity, and solving the problem brings it in, and getting problems of comparable magnitude pushes it out. It's a matter of confrontingness, is the clue to this. If they're not confronting the problem – they're avoiding it, you see – it, of course, on any vacuum arrangement at all that's bringing it in, of course it just moves in closer.

And then if they are looking at it, it tends to move out, don't you see?

Now, you can do the same thing with havingness. You say, "Well, what problem have you got?"

"Well," he says, "Joe and Bill and Pete and they won't talk to me anymore."

You say, "Good. All right. Now look around the room and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around the room and find something you can have. Thank you. Where is that black mass now?"

And he says, "Well, it's out there about nine feet."

And you say, "Good. Look around the room and find something you can have. Look around the room and find something you can have. Look around the room ... Where is that black mass now?"

And he says, "It's out there about twenty feet."

And you say, "Well, look around the room and find something you can have. And look around the room and find something you can have. Where is it now?" He says, "Well, it's disappeared."

You say, "Good. Think of a solution to that problem."

Back it comes.

And you can just play hurdy-gurdy with this problem, you see? Out it goes, in it comes. And it's within your control to move this black mass in on the pc or move it off of him, just on whether or not you have him gaze at the stable datum in the middle of it: solutions ... You see, that stability alone is being held there by the motion, the unapparent motion in the mass. That's all confusion, you see? You're getting him not to look at the confusion
when you ask him to get a solution, you see? And you've got that mechanism. Then you've said the same thing as when you — "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem", you've said the same thing as confront it. It's a similar statement, in other words. "What is the problem?" you see? Well, you've said confront it. You get the idea?

"Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." What if you had him doing that? Well, you've taken the automaticity over of his bank creation of that black mass, except people don't for some reason or other do well on this. I do all right on it and a lot of pcs do, but enough people don't that we don't use it anymore. No creates. That is to say, we don't run create loosely. If it turns up in the Prehav Scale, run it. So it half-kills the pc – he'll run out of it.

Here's the crux of the matter, however: that you can move around, by the regulation of problems and solutions – or mass and no mass, which is havingness and no havingness – you can move around black masses in the bank.

Now, that is a simple one, and anybody can do that particular set of experiments and achieve those results, more or less. Of course, the pc has to be able to see a black mass. Sometimes they see only invisibilities and this and that, and sometimes they're so snarled into problems that nothing can move off.

But on the average pc, you could probably run this experiment.

Now let's take the next experiment that proceeds from here – I said, the more difficult one. The pc has a circuit. You say, "Do you ever have voices? Ever have any voices talking to you?" The psychiatrists have been worried about voices ever since there's been psychiatry. It's practically synonymous with insanity if somebody has voices talking to him. Well, gee whiz, they ought to look at my collection, man. They ought to really look at my collection, because – it isn't so much voices, but I usually compose piano music by listening to it. And I will set up a circuit that plays piano music and then forget to take it down, and a half an hour later all of a sudden here's some piano music, you know? I'm never startled about what it is. And then I say, "Well, that's it", and that's the end of that piano music, and will take it down. You get the idea?

I wonder, for instance, how wind will sound in a certain rigging rig, you know? Is this going to be a real noisy rig, you know? And I'll set up a ship and some wind and let her howl, you know? And that's how it sounds, too. And then say, "Well, I've found that out now," and I will set the whole thing aside and skip it, you see? I just cease to create it and it's no longer there.

I can set up moments of force – moments of force, tension, compression and that sort of thing – and check something out visually, rather than set it up mathematically. Just set it up and – well, give you a problem in a derrick, something like this. Now, when the derrick is stayed at certain points, and the stress is added at certain other points, which way is the derrick going to bend? And actually will build the derrick up and push the points to give it the stress, don't you see, and see which way it's going to bend and that sort of thing, and it works like that. And it sure saves an awful lot of woodcarving and string tying and all of that sort of thing. And these things are usually right. And this is just methods of setting up situations synthetically to find out how they will operate in the real universe. And that is not uncommon.
The weirdest one I ever heard about – it was Nikola Tesla, when he invented alternating current, set up an alternating-current motor. He had set it up so it would work, you see (and we've had the same motor ever since; nobody's even changed a bolt in it. And it's too bad he didn't set up a better cooling system in it). And he let it run for two years to find out ... his problem was will it last, you see? So he set this thing up in mental imagery, you know? He set it up in the bank and let it run for two years, and at the end of two years he decided that it was pretty well designed, so he built it. That's Nikola Tesla. That was the way that boy invented everything.

Now, I'm not above doing a mathematical problem on an abacus. You know, put an abacus up out there and shuffle the beads on the abacus back and forth, carrying over decimals of one character or another, and keep carrying these decimal setups, and finally add it over on the left and right side of the scale.

An abacus is a very ... interesting piece of machinery. It's almost an adding machine or a multiplying calculator. They give it to little kids in school and I see these little kids in school going wing-wing with the beads, you know, and they're counting one, two, three, four, five – learn how to count on it or something, or add. That isn't the way you use one. You use them on complicated septisignal systems or decimal systems or something like this, and you keep carrying them over from one side to the other. I suppose you could write a book four feet thick on the use of an abacus.

Anyway, set one of those things up. Well, of course, that's a very easy thing to set up. It's a very easy thing to set up a column of figures and find out whether or not the figures are right. It is actually much more fun to simply set up a computer that, after you've done the problem, will verify the result. This is tradition – people like Lecky and so forth. I think it was Lecky, the guy that wrote probably the basic text on navigation for guys that didn't like pedanticism. He said a navigator is no good unless – when he calculates the position he doesn't have a sixth sense to tell him that the answer is right or wrong. He said a navigator is no good who can't do this. Actually, very few people can do this, but the best navigators can all do it. They'll add up columns of figures, and so forth. Suzie's seen me do this: go down the line on – not navigation – go down on the line and get about halfway through a problem and say, "Well, that's wrong. That's wrong." You see? You got six columns of figures or something of the sort, but the answer is wrong, and just throw it out and do the problem all over again. Sure enough when I get down to that point, something was off, see?

All right. This simply is an establishment of rightness or wrongness, and it's also done by circuitry.

I'm talking now about useful circuitry. Let's go a little bit further over into useful circuitry. Common circuitry – this is not obsessive circuitry. This is just ordinary, run-of-the-mill voices in the head, you see? But this is the way they are really set up.

We get into a situation where we want to know what it's going to be like tomorrow – weather. We call the Weather Bureau, and they give us a lot of calculations all based on the rudimagoojits and the wingdings that are going whizzle-whizzle on top of the mutt-wutt. And this all calculates with the dice-o-therms and the cat-a-bars, you see?
Man, there have been more aviators plowed into fog banks and so forth by these dice-o-thers all twisted around the cat-a-bars. I wouldn't be seen dead with one of them myself.

They finally got a practical method of investigating hurricanes. They fly an aircraft patrol over the area all the time, and when they see one, they take its latitude and longitude on Loran bearings and report it. And then they plot its course and speed, and they say where it is going. And even then they predict its destinations wrong.

Weather is not something that is trustworthy. Actually, do you realize that if you plotted out for England "Tomorrow will be fair", that you would be 50 percent right? [laughter] Did you know that? And you know the Weather Bureau only hits 38 percent? It's interesting, isn't it? So if they just took it at random and told us every day tomorrow would be fair, at least they'd be giving us hope. [laughs]

But the science of weather prediction is – well, let's be kind – it's in its infancy, and they figure out what the dew point is on the rye up in North Manchester, and that gives us the Sussex coast, you know? I mean, it's real nice. I've studied with these boys, and they have a very serious approach to life. Let's say that. But what I used to twit them about was their tremendous overweening confidence in the things that were going hurgle-gurgle and their total avoidance of ever reading yesterday's prediction [laughter] – the only way they could keep their morale up, is the way they used to inform me.

Well, you can set up a circuit that will give you tomorrow's weather. Very easily. I wouldn't go to sea without one.

Now, some people do this and then blame it on the rheumatism, because they hook it into the rheumatic circuit, you see? And then they say, "Twinge – bad weather tomorrow," you see? But you needn't get that drastic. There's no reason to set up an alarm system just because it's going to be foggy, you know?

The facts of the matter is, is what you set it up is out here, and you say, "What is the weather going to be tomorrow?" So you take the increment of time known as tomorrow and you observe it. And that tells you what the weather is, of course, because you look around the scenery, having looked at the increment of time which is tomorrow, having looked around and found whether or not it is raining, windy, foggy, cold or hot, you are then pretty safe, providing you can with equanimity look at tomorrow. That's how simple a circuit is.

Compare it now to all these substitute calculations. If you could simply say, "All right. Let's take a look at the weather tomorrow ... " In view of the fact that the weather hasn't got very much consequence to it – almost all of you have lived through rainstorms without melting – this is an element of tomorrow which almost anybody could mock up, or almost anybody is willing to observe. There's no great danger in it.

Oh, quite something else: We are in a tremendous emergency with regard to court actions or something of this sort, and we want to know, man, because our whole life is hanging on the rim of the precipice, what is the judge going to say tomorrow, see? Or what is ... who is going to win – is Greasy Knees going to win the third at Pimlico, see? We've got the family jewels on it, and we haven't bothered to tell anybody that we put the family jewels on it, you see? Now, there's lots of pressure connected with this sort of thing. So we say, "Let's see."
Well now, look, with what confidence are we regarding tomorrow, you see? We're regarding it with no confront, because there's tremendous numbers of confronts mixed up in tomorrow that we don't want to have anything to do with. We won't look at the bad decision the judge is going to make or the fact that Greasy Knees is going to live up to his name, and... [laughter] See? We won't look at those consequences, so we get a one-sided view of the increment of time known as tomorrow. And then that becomes very untrustworthy because we are postulating at the same time that Greasy Knees is going to win the race and the judge is going to put down a favorable decision. So we wind up looking at our own postulates, not looking at tomorrow's weather. And then, of course, we get a wrong predict about 90 percent of the time. Get the idea? So you can predict to the degree that you can confront. And if a person's confrontingness is very bad off, never trust their prediction.

Wanda the psychic reader ... All of a sudden I was going down a boulevard in Phoenix, Arizona, driving along minding my own business. I must have had some kind of an overt that day (probably thinking bad thoughts about Purcell or something), and I got halfway down through the middle of the block, and Wanda the psychic reader suddenly diverges from a stream of traffic on a four-lane highway and drives casually, not even rapidly, this way across the street and runs into me. [laughter]

**Male voice: She "wanda'ed!"**

You said it! And her father got out and gave me her professional card. I don't think I would have had any confidence in that girl.

Now, her confront was a thing to be horrified about, you see? Nobody got hurt, nothing happened, but this is pretty weird. But her confront was terrible. We found out she was trying to turn a corner, [laughter] but that was half of one of these five-hundred or six-hundred-foot blocks behind her! She was turning a corner where there wasn't any!

Now, wouldn't you think her confront was rather poor? All right. Now we're going to base a lot of reliance on her prediction. Ah, but her prediction is directly related to her ability to confront.

Now, people who can't or won't confront anything don't even confront present time, much less tomorrow. But they will try to confront obsessively tomorrow or yesterday in the hopes that they won't have to confront today. And, of course, there isn't any tomorrow that they're confronting. That is a totally goof tomorrow, you see? And the yesterday probably isn't right either. Ask them what they had for breakfast, and they'll give you the awfulest ramifications, which is just a total not-is substitute of what they really ate, you know?

Now, here's the situation. If you're in fairly good shape on the subject of confrontingness, you could rise well above weather.

But let's supposing that hiking up into tomorrow was of no great consequence to us. You know, we didn't particularly want to go through the ritual, you see, of saying "Let's see. What is the date? All right. What is the hour? At what time will we be doing something tomorrow? All right. Now, let's confront the area in which we're going to do that thing. All right. Now let's see. Are they cirrus, cumulus, 'altocastalatus', nimbus," you know? And do a
complete catalog of the situation. Take out our wet-and-dry-bulb reading, you see, and so forth, and get the whole thing straight and write it down. Seems a little bit arduous.

So what you do is set up a secondary circuit. Not because you can't confront tomorrow but because you don't take time to confront tomorrow, you set up a secondary circuit and make it look at tomorrow. It's a prediction circuit. Now it looks at tomorrow, and you set it up to look at tomorrow instantly and give you only one result: yea or nay. You can set up these instantaneous circuits with the greatest of ease, so long as they're just yea-or-nay circuits or something like this. They're not going to give you any complex result, you know? You know, you could even set it up for tomorrow and if it's going to be nice weather, wave a green flag, you know, and if it's going to be bad weather, why, wave a red one. I don't care what, see? It's just boom, you know? And you eventually find yourself possessed of some kind of a circuit that tells you the weather tomorrow.

And one day you're scrambling around, doing something else and you suddenly look up and something is waving, you know, a brilliant red flag.

Now, where you go nuts on circuits is when you say, "Who put that there?" – no, "Who else put that there?" and "What does it mean?" And we can get quite a game out of this. It's a big game of mystery and so forth. Well, all you got to do is find out the purpose of the circuit and it'll ordinarily blow up, or you can set it up.

Now, pcs that haven't got control of their circuits or haven't taken over their circuits for many, many years, haven't inspected them – I say many years, I'm talking about many billions of years; they've just let this bric-a-brac accumulate and they've not done anything about it, and so forth – you start auditing them and something waves a red flag. They say, "What's this? What's this thing?", you know? Or a little train goes by on the track with a sign in each car. You know, a little sign in each car, and it says "It – Will – Be – Bad ... ," and the next three signs are blurred. [laughter]

And the pc says, "I'm going round the bend", you know?

Or you ask a pc, "How did you know the answer to that question?"

He said, "Well, this little train went by and it had a word in each car." That's the answers to the question.

You'll find some people go around on circuitry auditing, don't you see? Only their circuits are so old, so forgotten, so neglected, and were put up in such an anxiety of not-to-confront that of course they can't confront anything about them now. And any time they get in the vicinity of them, then the circuit tells them what to say and do. And you're running into this in auditing all the time, that's the anatomy of the circuit. It's just a no-confront of any kind whatsoever. Therefore, running Havingness and Confront along with processes actually improves the circuit.

How does it improve the circuit? It improves confront; naturally, that improves the status of circuits, because circuits go... only go bad when an individual refuses to confront an area and puts a circuit in it instead. He first did it to save time; later on he began to believe that he couldn't confront that area, there was something very unconfrontable there. Why is it
unconfrontable? Well, he has a circuit doing it, doesn't he? So therefore it couldn't be possibly...

It's like the fact that they put a television camera in the atomic blast furnace, you know? Because they can't put a nuclear physicist in there, they know that. They've tried it, you know, and they just can't make it. I don't know why not.

Anyway... Anyway, that's remote viewing, or remote knowing.

Now, it's this other thing I was telling you about. You hear a bird chirping outside, ask the pc to make a picture out there and then bring it in here and look at it to find out what kind of a bird it is. And my God, you get anything from a rhinoceros to a three-tailed whoosis, you know? Hasn't anything to do with this cuckoo that is out there; nothing to do with a cuckoo. And you very often ask an individual this. This is an interesting diagnostic question.

You talk about bric-a-brac that we know in Scientology; we know so darn much that it's... I tell you, the boys... if we were handling this as a scientific activity which cataloged everything we knew, you see, in relationship to it, and then took a paper down on everything there was there; when you realize that a preclear is capable of an infinity of differences, you just multiply infinity times the number of preclears there are and you got that many papers we'd have to file, and I don't like to file papers.

Somebody will curse me someday for not having written everything down that we ever knew and put it in a library file. But let me call to their attention that people have been doing this for a long time and they still didn't know anything. There might be something suspect about the method. All right. You tell this pc, "All right. Now, your primary aberration, and the exact terminal we want to run now: All right, that's what we're interested in. We're interested in your primary aberration, the exact terminal we want to run. All right. Now, over there where it is, or wherever it is, make a picture of it. Good. Thank you very much. Now look at the picture. Now tell me what it is."

And you know, they will tell you some of the most remarkable things. It may or may not be the right answer, but they certainly are remarkable. They're certainly remarkable. They'll get some pictures of childhood influences.

A psychoanalyst would go absolutely drooling mad. The absolute deliciousness of this particular modus operandi would have thrown him into a tizzy, you know, like tigers get when you put perfume on them. Man, that would be marvelous. He'd just have an unlimited data. He wouldn't have to depend on dreams anymore; he wouldn't have to depend on anything anymore, anyplace.

All he'd have to do is tell this person, "Now make a picture of what's wrong with you. Now look at the picture and tell me what it is."

And the fellow says, "Well, it's a picture of my grandfather sitting in front of the stove. And I seem to be in the stove."

(I did that myself one time – surprised myself half to death.)

"Now what's this? What's this?"

"Yeah, well, that's what it is."
"What's this?"

In the first place, you told him to make a picture of the bird that he heard and you heard outside the window, and then bring it in the house and take a look at it. And he didn't get a picture of a bird, he got a picture of a rhinoceros. Or it was a different kind of bird, is the 'usualest' thing. It's an alter-is.

Well, naturally it's an alter-is, because this action of taking the picture of the object and then looking at the picture is of course an alter-is of confront. You didn't tell him to take a look at the bird and say what it was – You told him to take a picture of the thing and say what it was. You got it? So you've removed it that much, so therefore he's just that far from being able to confront it. Okay? All right. Our next point, then, as we're looking at this is, is a very simple one, is that you're trying to get individuals to look directly at things, and their circuitry encourages them not to look at things because it's normally set up to spare them the trouble of confronting, or to avoid having to confront something, so they confront it on a via. And as you audit the pc, these things go live.

Two things make them go live. His havingness drops, so therefore he becomes a little anxious, so therefore he starts relying on circuitry to predict and that sort of thing. Or his confront drops. Or his confront improves, or his havingness improves, and either way these things can go live. In other words, his havingness or confront drop, they go live, on a deteriorated basis. His havingness and confront is improved, they go live because he's coming up through it, don't you see?

And all of them are observation on a via. So everything he's trying to do basically is characterized by alter-isness or observation on a via. Auditing on a via, everything on a via – it's just on a via. That is the motto of the thetan.

It's not direct, it's on a via. And your methods of getting him there are to walk him up rapidly so he has less and less vias, less and less vias, less and less vias, which means less and less circuits, less and less circuits, less and less barriers – you get the idea? – more and more confidence, more and more assurance. More and more ability to confront, actually, isn't it?

That's why you don't have confront on your main list, because itself is a result and an end product; it itself isn't a doingness, it's an ability.

All right. That explains to you, then, some of the oddities that occur, particularly in running in the CCHs. And these oddities are considerable. Because you're activating circuits and you're knocking out circuits, because the direct control and communication brings about a continuous shift of circuitry in terms of havingness. And then because you've got him in PT and he is confronting another body, another being, his own body and the physical universe, of course his havingness is also coming up on that particular basis and you shift through lots of circuitry. And it's a way of plowing straight through circuitry. And you get all kinds of things going live and shutting off, and so forth.

Now, if you were to turn around and talk to these circuits, and said "Well, how do you think the pc's doing now?"

"Oh, you think it's going to rain tomorrow. Oh, I see. I get it. Hm. I understand. Hm-hm." If you're plowing somebody rapidly through circuits, what are you trying to do? You're
trying to plow him through circuits and raise his havingness and his confront, basically, with the CCHs, which is communication and control, improve his havingness.

Well, what's your end result if you suddenly go into communication with these circuits? Because circuits are coming live and circuits are going out and circuits are coming in and circuits are going out, your pc's liable to say anything.

This is a beefy process, you see, your CCHs. And your pc at any given moment is liable to tell you anything. He's liable to predict anything. Anything is liable to happen. So the less attention you pay to what the pc is saying or what the pc thinks or what the pc feels while you're running the CCHs, the better off you're going to be. And that's why you never end a process just because the pc thinks it's flat. And as you're plowing somebody through circuitry of one kind or another, as he is moving up the line, he gets somatics, he gets comm lags, he dopes off, he does this, he does that. What's dope-off? It's just a no-confront of magnitude, you see? And it means that something is happening to the confrontingness of this pc. It's a good indicator.

Comm lag means something is happening to the confrontingness of the pc. Dope-off also means something is happening to the havingness of the pc. Dope-off also means that something is happening to the confronting of the pc. There we go. I mean, it means all those things.

Also there are many other manifestations. All of a sudden a circuit that was set up in cave days in order to remove him from the path of snakes – that when he saw a snake he was supposed to leap violently eight feet to the left – and all of a sudden he starts moving and this old circuit goes into action. And he'll may... try to explain it to you in fifty dozen different ways but he hasn't even confronted the circuit. The trouble is, he's moved eight feet to the left, or he's tried to, or he feels he should, and therefore he doesn't look that he should move eight feet to the left. What he thinks is there's something dangerous under his feet. You got the idea?

So he's getting all kinds of (quote) "survival mechanisms" (unquote), which are coming in and out, and prediction mechanisms are coming in and out, and series of forebodings and that sort of thing will all operate. Why? Because it's all on this basic circuitry.

Now, you, as you sit right there, use circuitry of one kind or another. As long as the circuitry isn't out from underneath your control and you haven't parked it on the basis that "I will never be able to confront this, I will never be able to cope with this sort of thing, so I'll set up this machine to cope with it because I myself am incompetent" – and when that is totally the basis of circuitry, from that time on, that circuit gets hidden. When you're running the CCHs, that circuit is liable to spring out. But what end of it springs out? It's liable to be "It can't be confronted", or "I will never be able to confront this", or "It is impossible to confront this." And the pc thinks it's the circuit that is impossible to confront, when, as a matter of fact, it's the fact that elephants spray water all over you in circuses, and that mustn't be confronted because your mother gets mad at you and spanks you.

This kid goes out and he says, "I'll get even with my mother. I'll set up this circuit and ... " or any kind of a computation, don't you see?
And these circuits are absolutely infinite in their purposes. They're as infinite as a pc can make postulates. And they run out and a pc is liable to tell you anything in any kind of auditing, and therefore it's only up to you to tell whether or not any of these CCHs or anything else is flat.

I don't think I've ever talked about this at any great length – circuits – but they appear, actually, in Book One. I've never said this much about circuits before. It isn't a matter that circuits are all bad. What gets bad about circuits is somebody sets up circuits because he himself is unable, he says. And when circuits have this type of postulate mixed up in them, why, they get very haywire indeed.

As you get on up the line, you all of a sudden find out that you will set up and knock out circuits just for the hell of it. You wonder what you should eat for lunch. Well, you do this right now, undoubtedly: you wonder what should you eat for lunch. Well, set it up, set it up in front of you and taste some of it. You know, that's quite a common action.

And don't, however, go through this oddity of having finished lunch at a Howard Johnson's or something of the sort, and their pickled pigs' knuckles that day happen to be sour and rancid or something, and don't then take your eating circuit and set it up so that it'll be impossible after that ever to set up pigs' knuckles. Because then something infinitely bad is evidently wrong with pigs' knuckles, so you even smell pigs' knuckles and you feel bad, you see? Where, as a matter of fact, the pigs' knuckles were a long way back. You put them in the bank so that you'd never confront them again, which seems to me to be an odd rationale. But a thetan is very capable of it and does it consistently.

My apologies for making this an overtime lecture, but I thought you might be interested.

[Audience: Thank you very much. Okay.]

Thank you.
This is the 28th of June 1961, AD 11, and you are in the throes of having now established that you know everything there is to know. I'm very glad of that and so on.

But I want you to think for a moment. I want you to think for a moment of Aloysius Q. Schnook of Lower Ambovia. And he's going to ask you, he's going to say, "Well now, you've been to Saint Hill, so you know all the answers. Now, why is it that you stand the pc on their head before starting Routine 5?" I want you to be thinking of what you will tell him. Or what you will do with him. Because you'll be embarrassed. You will now be in the horrible situation of people knowing that you know. The question is, do you? Do you?

All right. I'm looking at one person who's going back to a part of the world as the first pioneer to practice Scientology in that part of the world: Riverside. [laughter] And another one where Scientology is going to be tried. It's been attempted: Los Angeles. [laughter] And another one where they had every opportunity but forgot to read the subsequent bulletins: Johannesburg. [laughter]

There are quite a few like this. I wouldn't call you all by rote, but one of these questions came through from as near away as London, which is almost on our backs. Although, sitting down here in the beautiful calm of Sussex, you would never really suspect London existed if you didn't have to go back there. And it came burningly and screamingly through the wire. A bunch of questions about the CCHs that apparently had nothing much to do with the CCHs that I could figure out. So my answer to it was as follows: that I was writing a whole bulletin rather than answer the telex.

Now, the reason I can't tell you what this said is I myself couldn't figure out what it said. But fortunately we have someone amongst us who will be going back to London very soon, in the organization, will be able to answer all these questions sharply, glibly and with enormous permeation. Isn't that right?

Female voice: Yes. [laughter]

Now, you may be in the throes of absorbing knowledge, but let's not forget the fact that somebody is going to want to know about it from you. And there you are on cloud nine being very proud of having actually gotten through and endured the Saint Hill Briefing Course and so forth. Let's make sure you don't get yanked off that pinnacle and look at them, you know, as they ask this question, your jaw drops slightly and a sort of a blank look comes
in your eyes. And you say "The CCH 1. Now, let's see, what is that?" Or "Let's see, uh-uh – the needle, I think the needle of the E-Meter… Yeah, yeah, the E-Meter has a needle." [laughter] Let's not do that. Let's not do that. Let's be able to speak up quickly, loudly and authoritatively and, above everything else, correctly. The time to find out about that sort of thing is here and now. And if you don't ask questions about that sort of thing, of course, you won't find out. And you'll be in a bad state. Now, I didn't mean any slurs on Riverside or Johannesburg or something. It's because we're friends of these areas that we want to help them out.

The number of questions I've been asked lately on these lectures are very few, so maybe you have one now. Yes, Bob.

Male voice: Ron, if someone comes in who is raw meat from the street, and you want to decide what routine to run on him. How would you make that decision?

All right. That's a very good question. Raw meat walks in off the street. What do you decide – how do you decide what routine to run on him? All right. There he is. You have several criteria. Your first and foremost criteria is to give him a battery of tests. And if you're not able to give and correct tests, you will find yourself denied this particular rule. They can sometimes look very reasonable, and yet their profiles come out all wrong.

Now, in view of the fact that the profile is much more reliable – much, much more reliable – than any other single means of determining what's to be run, it'll be a very good thing if you knew how to administer one and grade one.

All right. They come in. Make them do a test. I'm assuming, now, a field auditor in operation. Well, make them do a test. Actually, this is a fairly professional thing to do. All right. They do this test. Now, you take the test and you evaluate it in this fashion: If it is riding all the way along the bottom or if several points of it are at the bottom of the graph, it is inevitably CCHs, so therefore it's Routine 1. All right? That's inevitably Routine 1 – inevitably. Don't let anybody fool you. That is the only thing that'll get this case on the road with great certainty.

Now, there are many things that might get the case on the road, and we know lots of things that might do it, and we've wasted more time being hopeful than any other thing. Because we bring hope to people, we are apt to dramatize it ourselves a little bit, you see. And we're very hopeful that this or that will occur, and the thing we know will make something occur is a properly run Routine 1.

Now, what was missing and why the old CCHs didn't move this one, by the way, this low-graph case – the reason for that – was that nobody was pulling the overts off. And they could run in the overts faster than you could pull them off. So CCHs work on that very positively if properly run. Run 1, 2, 3, 4 – just the way you're running them now. All right.

If the case is riding very high on the graph, extremely high on the graph, and when you get them on an E-Meter particularly, the needle appears to be a little sticky, that's Routine 1. Now, as you look at a graph with the graph facing you, you'll notice that over on the left-hand side of the graph you have your A, B, C, D columns. Those are the important columns. That part of the graph which goes from the left to the middle. That is to say reading horizon-
tally A, B, C, D – whatever the letter that occurs in the middle of the graph. That whole section is the vital part of the graph to pay attention to.

The rest of the graph mainly hinges on current havingness. Even though it might be pretty well pinned down, and it might be kind of unchangeably so, you, by simply neglecting to find the pc's Havingness Process, can actually depress that side of the graph, without actually messing up the case at all. So you might say that the left half of one of these profiles or graphs is the important diagnostic area. And if columns A, B or C are either very low or very high, you can then expect the pc to have a great deal of difficulty following an auditing command. So therefore, Routine 2 is really not possible.

They alter-is the commands obsessively. There's another way to get around that, and that is to take the Prehav Scale. You can get around all these things, but you have to be clever and tricky and so forth.

You can take the Prehav Scale and assess the Change Scale, the Secondary Change Scale, and keep running the pc out in that area, and you'll take off this obsessive alter-is. It could be done. There are lots of things that could be done, but your safest bet, your easiest bet and your fastest bet is Routine 1.

Now, the person who is at the very, very top of the left-hand side of the graph can be expected to come on at the very bottom of the graph. That person is actually worse off, more overwhelmed than the person who is low on the graph. So don't be fooled. Don't be fooled. That is not necessarily derogatory. That means simply this – there is no connotation to this – it's simply this:

When you first find this person's terminal on SOP Goals, you see, assuming you ran SOP Goals on a person, you would find that the terminal assessed way, way, way up at the top – 63, 62; level 63, 62, 64, see, way up. That means the terminal that has overwhelmed them is in a terrific state of high serenity. And that terminal deteriorates as the pc is audited and will deteriorate. And you very often don't register that terminal anymore on your next profile, but get the pc, who is now coming on at the bottom. And that's the pc's graph that comes on at the bottom.

Now, because you're not giving them one every few minutes or every few hours or even every few days, you actually fail to note the gradient scale of progress of the pc as measured by the graph. And that, of course, would be off the top and on the bottom and up. But remember, something else is going to happen here at the same time. The left side of the graph is going to deteriorate as this valence is discharged and dismissed. It actually is going to deteriorate. And it'll look, offhand, as though something bad is going on in auditing.

Now, the way we determine if something bad is going on in auditing is to look at the right side of the graph. If the right side of the graph depresses that is, from the middle letter on up to the end letter of the graph – if the right side of the graph depresses, you know that ARC breaks are present.

The rudiments are out, you see, because the person's havingness is deteriorating. So if that right side of the graph drops, this is an index of deterioration of havingness, and it only has one source in auditing, and that is ARC breaks with the auditor. Remember that now. It
only has one source in auditing: ARC breaks with the auditor. That's terribly important. You look over on that side, you see that in one week the pc had it at about twenty plus on the right side of the graph, and the next week we audit the pc, and then we get another graph, and it is now fifteen minus on the right side of the graph. I'm talking about these column figures, now, up around H, I, that sort of thing, see. That area. Ahhh, if we were to take the pc at that moment and put him on the E-Meter and say, "Have you got an ARC break with your auditor?" Clang! Clang! Little flags wave, and the needle plays "Yankee Doodle." Yes, he's got an ARC break with the auditor.

If you wanted a pc to wipe out all liabilities to havingness doing auditing, you would clear up ARC breaks with a rough-off pc about every ten minutes. That's how fast they occur. Usually the auditing itself wipes it out, and you don't notice it. But you should sometime, just for the fun of it, clean up an ARC break with a pc. Just insist he has one and find it every time. You know? "What is it now? What is your ARC break?" It's mirrored in the deterioration of havingness, and so you get a drop of that side of the graph.

All right. Now, supposing the right side of the graph remains constant, and you get no change on the right side of the graph at all. It is neither up and it's not down. Ho-hooooo. That pc was being audited with a present time problem. There was a present time problem. Another rudiment was out all the time he was being audited. Only that will also reflect on the left side of the graph over in the lower letters A, B, C, D and so forth. Present time problem will blow straight across the graph. In other words, you're getting no progress at all.

Now, that the left side of the graph deteriorates is meaningless, see. That's meaningless. But that the right side of the graph deteriorates, that's very meaningful. That the left side of the graph remains unchanged is very meaningful – present time problem. That the right side of the graph remains unchanged – present time problem. Got it? That the left side of the graph deteriorates under auditing simply means the decline of a valence. It does not mean a criticism of the auditor. I'm talking about left and right sides now as you have the graph in your lap looking at it.

Now, these are the determinations as far as a graph is concerned. And that is the best way to measure up what is going on with this case.

But let's suppose this case was running at about minus seventy on the left side of the graph. Now let's get to Routine 2. It was running about minus seventy or a bit above and was middle grounded or high or low on the right-hand side – we don't care what. Now, let's supposing it was somewhere between minus seventy and the center line (the zero line of the graph) through the left-hand side of the graph. You can run Routine 2 on this pc usually with the greatest of ease. This is what you've known as a mean graph. It's not an average graph. It's just a graph that a person isn't in too bad shape. I mean, they're just sort of loused up, but they kind of know it. You got the idea. You can run Routine 2 on this pc.

By the way, you can also run Routine 2 on a low graph, a very, very low graph. Routine 2 does not work, hardly at all on a theetie-weetie high graph. It doesn't work at all on it. You can just beat your brains out. SOP Goals works on it, but with what complications do you have to execute SOP Goals when you're running it below the case level? It'll run all the way to the bottom. Any case could be run on SOP Goals, but now we get tricky. Now we get
complicated assessments. Now we've got complicated situations. Now we've got large numbers of goals. Not necessarily that large numbers of goals means the case is rough, but we – it's one of the things that happens as a liability when we try to run SOP Goals on it. Now Routine 2, in other words, would be the most effective process to run on somebody who was minus seventy up. No points lower than minus seventy and maybe some points up to plus twenty on the left side of the graph.

In Routine 2 this case would take off like a startled gazelle. As you see diagnostically, if you want to use that word, you are paying no attention at all over here to the right side of the graph.

All right. Now, supposing the person was riding up at the center line or above. That is, on the left side of the graph. The fastest thing to do would be SOP Goals. Now, we're not talking about what we can do to this raw meat off the street. We can do any of these things. We can do any of these things. We're not talking about what we can do; we're talking exclusively about what is the most effective thing to do. This is the fastest thing to do. Got it? And that actually answers in full the question which you just gave me: What are you going to do, how do you measure up, and what to run on this person?

Diagnosis on an E-Meter is – has the liability of the cans being improperly squeezed so your sensitivity is improperly set. Furthermore it requires a lot of judgment and adjudication. This judgment and adjudication is all done by the graph. Why worry about it?

There are other symptoms, however, which are quite interesting, and one is that you can have somebody at a misread on the tone arm dial or at exactly Clear read on the tone arm dial, but with a sticky or misbehaving needle – a very jerky or hectic needle or a very still needle or something like this. You're looking at somebody there who doesn't register hardly at all, and you're actually not going to get anyplace, really, running a thought process on this case. You can do it. It's going to take you a long time. It'll be successful at the bitter end, running Routine 2 or Routine 3, but my advice is don't do it.

Now, as far as the routines are concerned, you can run Routine 1 – which is remarkable about the routines – you can run them 1, 2 or 3 on any case that is still breathing. If you can get into communication, verbal communication, of any kind whatsoever, you can run Routine 2 or 3. Of course, if the case is unconscious completely, you've only got the CCHs. But that is – that's going a little bit below our level of adjudication. So you could run 1, 2 or 3 on practically any pc that walked in the door. If he could walk in the door, he could be made to have a gain on Routine 1, Routine 2 and Routine 3. And the sole criteria that you're reaching for is which one, the fastest. That's what you're reaching for.

Now, we're out then, of a total lose proposition providing these things are run right. And that is the other thing that enters into the thing, and that is to say if you have a couple of auditors and one of them just can't run CCHs – you know, this fellow just can't put an intention into things or something like this. They have a hard time with the CCHs, you see. Don't get much of a gain. There's this vagary amongst auditors. They practically don't do them when they don't run. But there is this: that some auditors do it better than others.

Supposing you had two pcs and two auditors, and one of these auditors ran very fine CCHs, and the other one could use an E-Meter. Then you'd better set up both pcs to be CCH'd
by the same auditor and swap the periods of the day or swap the consecutive periods around in such a way that both auditors would keep working, but one would be doing Security Checks and the other one would be doing the CCHs, don't you see? Something on that order.

Or supposing you were running a bunch of Routine 2 and one of your people there wasn't too hot at running Routine 2. Well, let's run Routine 2 – the same auditor runs both pcs on Routine 2, see, and the other auditor runs them both on Security Checks. You can split it up like this. In other words, you could take an HGC, you could take somebody who just comes in off the Academy, and you could set him up, doing the bit and piece work. Got the idea?

And this brings up: what is it safe to do? You said, "How do you determine what to do?" Well, if you wanted to carry the question out to its *reductio ad absurdum*, it had to include "What can you do?", you know. And that is part of being effective. So supposing we had this other kind of a condition whereby some of our auditors weren't very well trained. We were running an HGC, you see, and some of them weren't very well trained, and we were conscience stricken about, you know, putting them on the public, and that sort of thing. Well, there are several things that it's very safe to do. Oddly enough, one of them is SOP Goals Assessment, providing it's done even moderately correctly. Not running it. No, no. That isn't safe. Not letting him say that is the final goal. No. That isn't safe. But just digging up the goal and then digging up the terminal under some sort of supervision – yeah, that's a safe action. And very therapeutic and very good.

All right. That's safe. Security Checking is safe. You can let anybody Security Check. You can show them what the meter looks like and so forth. Even though they're kind of goofy and they – they don't quite – and they let the rudiments get out, and a lot of things – weird things happen, nothing is going to happen but benefit on Security Checking. Got the idea? So there are two actions that can be undertaken independent of all of the other actions. So you could set up people to have these things done, you see, by auditors that weren't particularly well skilled, and have them sort of get familiar with it all and that sort of thing, doing these two actions. So therefore, "What could you do?" has to do with, "Who are you going to do it with?" And there are certain elements in Routine 1, 2 and 3 which are safe to do by almost anybody. That's pretty good. One of them is Security Checking, and the other is actually assessing for goals and terminal. Not running them; that's different.

All right. Now, there are several things that are unsafe to do. And that is let somebody who just knows from nowhere attempt the CCHs – somebody that's liable, actually, to blow up in the session or leave the pc high and dry or skit out from under or something like this. That's dangerous. That's dangerous. So you'd pick auditors that you – were reliable to do that with.

Routine 2 requires a fairly accurate assessment, fairly accurate. But it's only the accuracy of a what? Of a significance. And therefore a person could be poorly run on Routine 2 without too much happening providing the processes got flat. That is dangerous, to leave the processes of Routine 2 – general runs, Prehav Scale – unflat. If you leave one unflat and go on to the next one and then leave that unflat and go on to the next one and leave that unflat

---

3 Editor's note: to skit, probably colloquial for to skitter
and go on to the next one – by that time, if your pc doesn't feel like he or she is spinning, why, I'll eat the E-Meter.

The pc will feel spinnny. Now, this condition actually can turn about in SOP Goals the same way. You leave a level unflat and then you go to the next level, and if that level were very unflat and the person is very queasy about it, you see, at the time it's left, and then the next level, the person starts in on this level, they will feel like they're spinning. They just feel spinnny, that's all. They've got two levels going at once here, and they're counterpoised, and they're all messed up with each other, and so forth.

So, general Prehav runs and SOP Goals terminals runs are limited by this factor: that a pc can be loused up. Now, SOP Goals has a further limitation: You can choose the wrong terminal. You can choose the wrong goal and then choose the wrong terminal. You can make the pc run the goal or terminal which ought to be run on the auditor or something stupid like this can occur. Really, I've seen it occur.

So choosing or deciding whether or not that is the right goal, and deciding whether or not that is the right terminal for the goal, is a job for an expert. That is really an expert job. You get that thing wrong and all hell is going to break loose. There's a test on whether or not you've got the right terminal. On the second assessment, when you go over the Prehav Scale, have you got about a dozen levels live. If there are a dozen levels falling on that scale, the probability is you haven't got the right terminal. Because the more you run the wrong terminal, the more you are avoiding the case and the more the actual terminal starts kicking levels live. And every level that you run or touch, kicks over into the main level which is then without relief and the correct terminal is getting stronger and stronger and tougher and tougher and meaner and meaner, and the pc can't tell which way he's going.

So that it is very, very dangerous – I couldn't impress this upon you enough – to choose the wrong goal and the wrong terminal and then run it.

Choose it – nobody's going to be harmed. But after chosen, run it – oh, wow!

If it's the wrong one, the pc has had it. There is only one right one. So of course, where does this put the actual running of SOP Goals when you say raw meat off the street?

All right, assess him. You could assess him. Almost anybody could assess him showing him the ropes. But running him? Ahhh, we're not so sure. Now, the other thing is, how well can an auditor keep in a rudiment?

How well can they keep in rudiments? And you can get around this by getting the rudiments cross-checked by supervision and one auditing team checking the rudiments of another auditing team and so – such mechanisms as this – and you also keep the case running.

Now, all of these things apply to "What do you run on a pc?" Well, what do you run on raw meat? It applies to whether it's raw meat. It applies to anything else. There is this addition. We have run into this trouble. A fellow comes in, and he says, "Well, I've heard of this Scientology and I would like to get some auditing." And you start running CCHs on him. You don't ask him anything. Ah, he's never heard of this. He doesn't know what you're doing. He doesn't know why. He hasn't got a clue. He's wrapped up and going nowhere. You got the idea?
All right. He will go nowhere faster and faster and faster, and the present time problem in this case is "What the hell are you doing?" So he gets no change.

So therefore, it requires this factor to give some attention to. You have to sort of run a tiny little bit of SOP Goals Assessment on this person when he walks in off the street. And this SOP Goals Assessment simply consists of this: "What difficulties are you trying to overcome?" It's the answer to the question, "What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" And he'll say, "Well, it's my memory. It's my memory. That's what it is. I realize my memory is going. And it worries me", and so forth.

Well, frankly – this is an exact case – we had a pc in Johannesburg; walked in and he was immediately run on Technique Zed, Q and Alpha, you see, and he was going nowhere in a hurry, and Mary Sue called this to my attention, and I said, "Well, for heaven's sakes," I said, "what's his goal?"

"Well, he just wants to improve his memory. That's what he wants to improve. That's all he wants to do: improve his memory."

I said, "Well, all right. Run 'Something you wouldn't mind forgetting' on him for twenty-five hours."

They did. His memory improved. He was tremendously satisfied. He was very happy about the whole thing. We used a slow process, don't you see. Now, he'd attained that goal, so now he had a reality on what was going forward, and the next time we had anything to do with him, we could've put him at once on Routine 2 or even the CCHs. You got the idea?

But to take a case who knows nothing about it whatsoever and just run Routine 1, Routine 2 or Routine 3 with no further introduction, explanation and without any reality on what is going on is very, very hard on the case.

Now, the one process that gets around this is an assessment for SOP Goals, which is very therapeutic. That would be a very good thing to do with this case, see. You don't have to think up the extraordinary solution like I had to, you see. Just assess him for goals. Just like you're doing, you see. You just go on. Oh, you'd be surprised. I mean, the littlest child or the oldest man or the dumbest medico. One of whom was just trying to kid me about Scientology. He said his leg got well because I had sent him a cable after he had gotten it broken, you see. And I kept telling him to be careful with it. I got even with him. Kept telling him to be careful with his leg there, and so forth. He was outside, parading around and giving me the all, and so on. And sure enough, when he came back, he was limping. I did get him, didn't I? I told him I wasn't really worried about his leg. I was worried about the psychic trauma driving him around the bend. Mary Sue came up at that moment, or somebody did. And he said yes, he'd been worried about it for some time – going around the bend. And he was off the subject, and so forth.

But goals, goals – they'll all respond to goals. Now, you could do something like this with him. You could get somebody running SOP Goals on him, you know. And then at the same time, run him on a CCH, you see. Mix the routines. He'd wonder what you were doing. But it was all right. He was perfectly satisfied with auditing, so he'd go along with this. And all of a sudden he'd go whir clank, and suddenly realize these CCHs were doing something.
And he wouldn't quite decide what, and then you'd say, "Well, if you're feeling bad because of that it's because you haven't had your Processing Check." And you'd give him a Security Check. And he'd realize that was confessing, which he realizes he should have done back there in 1492 instead of burning the church down, and he'll go along with this.

In other words, you could use SOP Goals Assessment, not run, but assessment as a break in on this particular case who was ignorant and from nowhere, okay? I have spoken on the answer to that question.

Male voice: Thank you.
You're welcome. All right. Yes?

Male voice: On trouble-shooting cases, what factors do you look at before other factors?

Oh, all right. Trouble-shooting cases. What factors do you look at before other factors? Of course, Ken would be very interested in this because he probably has – let's see, how many people are there in Los Angeles now? Anyway, there's that many impossible or stalled cases out in that particular area, and you don't ever audit in the Los Angeles area; you trouble shoot. [laughs]

Basically, somebody comes in and he's kind of going "Bleahp-glup, bleah bup, bleah-blup."

And you say, "What's the matter? What's the matter?"

"Well, I've been bloop audited lately, and bloo boop", and so forth.
And "You've been audited lately. You've been audited? Well, what – who audited you lately?"

And they say, "Oh, ah, somebody or other."
And you say, "Oh, yeah, audited. Well, now, what did they run?"

"Well, we were doing 'music processing'." [laughter]
And you say, "What is 'music processing'?"
And they say, "Well, 'music processing' is, you take several narcotic pills, you see, and you put Bach running at high volume in the bedroom, you see. And when you wake up, you're 'Bach-y.'" And something like this. You'd be amazed. So that question is well asked.

It isn't that I have a low opinion of the auditors in California. It's just that I feel for them. And they Q-and-A with the public that demands unusual answers. And it's very difficult to operate either in an HGC, where everybody is demanding unusual answers, or in an HCO office, where everybody wants something new and unusual, or in Los Angeles, where nothing else is salable. And you're liable to Q-and-A with it. I catch myself doing it once in a blue moon. Catch Mary Sue doing it once, twice, but less often than others.

Somebody sails in and they say, "You know that process you gave me to run on the pc? Well, that didn't work." So this is your first point of trouble-shooting. This is the first and most interesting point of trouble-shooting. I see you already know it. And that is "The process
that you gave me to run on that pc didn't work." And then you say, not "Gee, it didn't? Well, I'll have to think of something else." That's the wrong answer. The right answer is "What process did I give you?" And you usually find they don't know. That is, unfortunately, the usual response.

And then the first thing you do in trouble-shooting – "Well, what I told you to run the first time, you go and run." That's your first point in troubleshooting. Find out if what was supposed to have been run was run. That's number one. And it stands up something like San Gorgonio above the desert compared to all other points in trouble-shooting. See, there's this tremendous point: What was done?

Now, the way you establish what was done is this way: You put the pc on an E-Meter and you say, "What was run on you?" Maybe he doesn't remember. He will if you joggle him after a few times. And you're liable to find something fantastic has been going on. That's the first and foremost source of difficulty in Scientology. It is way up there. It's interesting that it is much greater than you would ordinarily suspect, until you start looking for it. And when you start looking for it, your eyes will pop, man.

What is done in the name of Technique Zed, believe me, is fantastic. So trouble-shooting? Find out what was really run. What was really run. Get the pc on an E-Meter and discover it. And don't let him sit there and malign the auditor either. Just find the facts, man. That's all you're interested in – like Sergeant Friday of the Los Angeles Police Force. I understand he was relegated to the suburbs recently. Yeah, he actually solved a crime. [laughter] They couldn't have that.

That's the first thing you find out. That's a piece of police work. What was done? What was really done? Because it's based on this fact: the auditing flubs today are of magnitude before they begin to upset a case. They are of magnitude. It's something on the order of the auditor never reported for the sessions. You get the idea?

It's something of this weird nature. And they're so offbeat and varied, but of such magnitude, that you very often won't look for them. You right away have made the assumption that the auditor sat in the auditing chair, that the pc sat in the pc's chair, and that something was run on the pc. You've made this assumption. You've made the assumption, you see, that Model Session was utilized or that the CCHs were properly run or that they were run at all, or that something was going on here. You see, you've assumed all these things, and you actually don't have the right to assume any one of those things when you're trouble-shooting on a case that is bogged from some kind of a D of P or D of T level. You have no right to assume those things.

So that your line of questioning sounds rather idiotic to somebody who isn't in the know. It's "Well, did you have a session?" Get the idea? "Was the auditor there?" "Were you there?" And they sometimes think you are being very sarcastic or sometimes very good for a laugh. But it prepares them to answer some more searching questions.

So that your trouble-shooting is not relegated only to finding out what bug has this pc got that these processes aren't affecting. That is the standard bug we had assumed existed.
The actual bug that exists is what has been administered to this pc that I don't know about? What has happened with this pc I haven't a clue on? See, that's your first and foremost action.

Now, you all have to do trouble-shooting. You think I'm talking from an executive standpoint. You all have to do trouble-shooting. What do I mean by that? You get pcs who have been audited before. And if you don't troubleshoot this pc, you're going to be in trouble. You should have been troubleshooting, so – and you didn't, so now all of a sudden you're in trouble. And you're going to assume that everything that has been run on this pc is flat.

I'll give you an example. There's a very noteworthy character in Scientology down in Australia, who had this interesting thing wrong with her case. And she was in a very important position, and her case was making no gains whatsoever, and I wasn't troubleshooting it. I was actually running an extraordinary solution. I was running a new process on her of one character or another, and in running it I all of a sudden elicited this interesting, interesting, interesting response: "Well, when I was down in New Zealand a few years ago, they ran CCH 3 on me, and I got tremendous gains, and I've never had any gain since."

You know, it's almost a case of my sighing deeply and saying, "Why the hell didn't you tell anybody this?" "Auditors have been beating their brains out over your case", I could have said to her. "And you had a process on which you were making gains and you've never made any gain since? You've just complained about it. And you never told a soul." This was obvious. You see that.

The trouble-shooting, then, consisted of finding out what was run a long time ago. What is the history of the auditing? And this is all part of it. Now, you get that as an executive or a technical expert in an organization, you see. You get that consistently. But working in the field, you almost never ask this question: "What's been run on you? What is the history of your auditing?" And then you take up an hour or two – take up more than that with this pc – and you're going to find some interesting things.

Well, we got a pc right here in class, right this minute (namely you). And what happened? The pc had a profile of some type or another, and then was audited, and then had another profile which was entirely different. But the second profile hadn't changed.

Got the idea? Here was a period of auditing on which a profile deteriorated. We just assumed – whether right or wrong; didn't even ask the pc. We just looked at the profiles and found out what had been run, knew something about the auditor, and already, and simply ran the auditor off the case. It's interesting that it took so many hours to run the auditor off the case. Fascinating that it took this many hours to run the auditor off the case. That should be a blink for you at once. We didn't even ask what was being run by this auditor. We simply knew here was a profile that sat one way, the pc got audited, here is this new profile. Wow! See? And the profile has deteriorated in the wrong places. All right. We'll audit the auditor off the case. All of a sudden, the pc's profile – I don't know whether this pc took a profile immediately after that or not. Did you?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. What did it look like?
Female voice: We haven't graded it yet.

You haven't graded it yet. Well, when we see that, I'm sure you will see that the profile snapped back to what it was before the auditor audited the case. You got the idea?

The person must have been audited with ARC breaks in full bloom, or audited with PTPs in full bloom, you see. Audited with the rudiments way out with very powerful processes, and something went wrong here. We don't ask what went wrong. We just see that this was the case, so therefore, we audit off one auditor.

The first time this was ever done was in an Academy. A student suddenly came down with measles; only the doctor couldn't find anything wrong with the student. And I got very clever about this time and asked the burning question, "What had this student been doing just before these measles broke out?" And I found out that the (quote) "auditor" in that particular case had blown the session.

Blown the session! The auditor had blown the session. Get somebody halfway through a measles engram and then blow the session. Pretty good, huh? So I just got somebody to run O/W on that auditor, or the equivalent at that time. And it didn't take a half an hour, and there were – the measles were gone. Got the idea? We took the auditing off the case. So you can always do that. You can always remove the auditing.

Oddly enough, if the case made any gains during that auditing, the gains are preserved. If the case had any loses during the auditing, the loses are vanished. That's a fantastic thing.

So in trouble-shooting, you can always do that. And that's one of the primary things to look for. And every one of you, I repeat, should be troubleshooting. You should be looking over the auditing this case has had.

Now, failure to look over this auditing will sometimes leave undisclosed, oh, five years in psychoanalysis – only, I can spot those from a way off. All I have to do is get the responses of the pc to the auditor.

Well, the pc says, "Well, I think um – I think, actually, my mother had a lot to do with this. It's very fixated on Mother. I've been very fixated for some time. Probably had a complex; caught a complex. And, uh, I felt inferior, you see. And I keep saving these fetishes. And uh…"

Along about that time, if I hear anything like this, I get very brilliant and assume the person has been psychoanalyzed. And I say to the person, "Have you ever been psychoanalyzed?"

"Oh, yes."

"Well, have you ever told anybody around here?"

"Oh, well, no. Why should I do that?"

Nothing except the person has been ground down to a nub, and actually now is in the frame of mind of believing that therapy can't do much for them, because they've had one whopping big failed help. Well, there sits the case.
Now, you could probably overcome this with the CCHs. You can run out psychiatric treatment with the CCHs. So obviously, you could run out psychoanalysis and things like this with the CCHs. You see, that's easy. But nevertheless, it's something you sure ought to know. You got the idea?

So find out first and foremost what has been going on. What is the auditing history of this case, or the treatment history of this case. And that's the big one. After that, they all dwindle off onto more interesting, lesser statted things. All of which, by the way, are very important. But they have no great stature compared to that one.

All right. Let's take up the next lower echelon of things, okay?

The next lower echelon is simply this: rudiments. Rudiments? Rudiments. When in doubt, check the rudiments. When trouble-shooting a case, check the rudiments. Look for the rudiments.

After you've found out what's been run, what's being run, what's the general history of the case; rudiments, rudiments, rudiments. All the rudiments. Not just the beginning rudiments, but the end rudiments. Even though they're both the same. Check rudiments.

Now, because you get a mutual withhold and a mutual ARC break with the world and so forth, in long duration auditing teams, the phenomenon occurs that when an outsider checks the rudiments on an auditing team, invariably finds them out. And this makes the auditor look very silly. But actually they weren't falling for him.

He could have made them fall for him, we know now, you know – by asking the question, "What are we withholding?" you see. Something on the order of "How do we feel about the auditing room?" You know, that kind of a rudiment. "Well, we feel about the auditing room sort of badly because you don't like to audit me in here." Got the idea?

So therefore, the room is really out. "The room's all right with me. Well, I know it's not all right with you."

The wrong thing to do is to turn around to the auditor – we know now, you know – and look at him sneeringly, you know, and say, "You knucklehead. Why didn't you find this?" You know? It wasn't there. That's why he didn't find it. Because something is wrong with the auditing room for him. He's complained a couple of times about it being drafty or something of the sort, you see. And that's enough to put the auditing room out with the pc, you know.

Pcs sometimes wind up protecting their auditors and all kinds of wild things occur. Actually auditor's doing very badly. But just make something that is even vaguely slurring about the auditor. You run into this both ways. You sometimes get obsessive agreement, you know, on the part of the pc. But as commonly, you get the pc right in there fighting with brass knuckles to protect the auditor, you know. "He's doing all right. He's doing his best." Or "She's just doing fine." Or "I really never had a better auditor. I never made any gains until this auditor came along."
And all you inferred was that the auditor would do better after they were trained a bit or something like this, you see, and blaaaaaaah. You've stuck your foot in it. So you have to handle this kind of diplomatically.

But anyway, check rudiments. Check them from the beginning to the end and back again and around and round and round, and keep them checked.

Because do you realize that the rudiments out in one session is one wasted session? If the rudiments are out for one session, that session is wasted. The optimum checking of the rudiments, then, is every session.

Now, next to the fact that "Does anything get run properly?" the next question of, "Are the rudiments in?" is your main grind. Is – are they in? And you'll very often find the rudiments out.

Now, no auditing can occur with the rudiments out. Furthermore, you don't have to keep the rudiments in so strongly that you've got the sensitivity over at 16 checking for the pc's withholds. That isn't enough to throw a session out.

You're now running a process known as the Joburg. Got the idea? You're running TR 10, because you turn the sensitivity knob over to 16 and say, "How do you feel about auditing in the room?" You get flinch! The thing goes bang! "Ohh", you say, "the TR 10 is out. Well, ooooh, well, all right. Well, we'll just have to run that." And we run it, you see.

And then we say, "Well, do you have an ARC break?" Plang! "Well, who do you have an ARC break with?"

"Well, I – I didn't know I had an ARC… Let's see, I think with my dog, yeah. My dog, yes. I had an ARC break with my dog. He woke me up about five o'clock this morning and wanted to go out. And – yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. I had an ARC break with my dog."

"Well, all right. Good. Now, do you have an ARC break?" Clank! "Well, who do you have an ARC break with?"

"Well, I have an ARC break – I don't know. Did it say something?" They try to look at the meter.

"Yeah. It said something all right. Now, who'd you have this other ARC break with?"

"Oh, let's see. Oh, I know who that'd be. Yeah, yeah. Over at lunch I almost got shortchanged in the restaurant. Yeah. Yeah! As a matter of fact, I did. Oh, well, what do you know, man? Yeah."

"All right", you say. "Good. Well, you got any other ARC breaks?" Clank!

"Who is that with?"

Wrong way to ask the question, see. "Who is that with?"

"Oh, I don't know. Did it fall?" You got the idea?

Wrong way to run rudiments. Because things that are falling with sensitivity 16 on the average pc – well, of course, you can always get a fall at sensitivity 16 on any one of these questions. You're running the whole case by rudiments.
How much does a rudiment have to be out in order to interrupt the case?

It is enough to show on the needle at a third-of-a-dial drop. And that's something you better put down because you'll have to tell everybody under the sun, moon and stars this when you start saying "Keep the rudiments in."

And immediately they'll get very conscientious, and they'll turn that sensitivity knob over to 16. And after that you get nothing audited but rudiments.

Look, if rudiments could have made somebody well, why, we would run nothing else but. Because they've existed since 1956, but there have been a lot of failed cases since 56. Test enough?

All right. How much does the rudiment have to be in? It's enough to show a change of characteristic. A reaction on the needle with the sensitivity knob set for a third-of-a-dial drop on the can squeeze. And that is the exact technical response. You can't see a rudiment at a third-of-a-dial drop, ignore it. You got it?

Of course, you can always, then, play a good trick as an executive. As a D of P or something, and then turn your sensitivity up to 16. After you – the auditor has been running at a third-of-a-dial drop, why, you turn your sensitivity up to 16, when you check his pc, you know. And you'll find all the rudiments out, of course.

Now, how thoroughly does it have to be in? Well, I've answered that question. It has to be in to that degree. Because if a rudiment will react at a third-of-a-dial drop, it is enough to interrupt the session.

All the rudiments are for is getting the pc into session. And any rudiment that is going to louse up the pc is going to be flagrantly out. Flagrantly out. You're going to see that reaction. And don't let me catch you with the sensitivity knob sitting for a third-of-a-dial drop – don't let me catch you finding a PT problem falling a couple of divisions or four or five divisions on that thing and passing it by because the pc says it's merely a mention of the idea of present time problems that's got him and that's falling on this or that. And he explains it all away.

Don't do it. Because you're going to have a pc exploding, going into apathy or going out of session within an hour to an hour and a half. You've just predicted it right there. Not only is he going to get no gain, but he's going to blow up, one way or the other on a PT problem. Don't pass them by. You understand?

But you turn the sensitivity up to 16 and you ask the pc, "Do you have a present time problem?" you will almost always get a needle reaction. Almost always. Since high sensitivity knob readings are used for the Joburg, and there you pick the bones clean. You got the idea? Or where you're looking for something or trying to trace something down or date something.

If you're trying to find something, you can always put the sensitivity knob up high. But the liability is that when you do it on the rudiments, you have immediately set up the rudiments to be the session. And that isn't what you're supposed to be doing. If they don't fall at all at a third-of-a-dial drop, they're in. And that's all you can say about it.
Now, the next thing that will happen in trouble-shooting a case, is that somebody will have been run on a level that isn't flat, or run on the CCHs, and that one wasn't flat before they went on to the next one. And you have to check this flatness. That is the next most important thing. Are these things flat? You go back and go over what's been run and find out if they're flat. Look over the auditor's reports. Say these things to the pc on the E-Meter and see if you get a needle reaction on them. Find out if these things were flat because the next most fruitful source of case stall is failure to flatten the process.

And immediately following that is then – in order – the next most fruitful case, and almost as frequent, is this horrible one: It's been flat for days, and it's still being run. It's just been flat for days, that's all. It's been flat for a session or two, or something like that. You'll find these real goofs, you know?

Now, the only disastrous thing that can happen under that circumstance is that the needle will stick so that you can't reassess. And the remedy for that particular thing is one of several, but amongst them is not running the incident that the overrun has stuck them in. That's not a remedy.

The most fruitful remedy is, is run the auditor off. And you'll all of a sudden find it'll come back to battery. And you can assess it again.

Where a pc consistently has the rudiments out… Now let's get down to trickiness. Now we're down to being tricky auditors and so forth, and we're not really fooling with the case. You know, and we're not looking for these gross errors. We're just trying to set up a case better. The pc is running all right, but they just always have an enormous number of present time problems and ARC breaks. And it just seems to be continuous. And we take two-thirds of the session to clean up the rudiments. And then we take one-sixth of the session to run the process, and then the remainder of the session is spent on running the end rudiments.

First check to find out if the rudiments are being established properly – third-of-a-dial-drop test – or are we trying to run all of the reaction of a needle out of all of the rudiments forever?

And if that is not the case, the next thing you do immediately after that – clang, bang, sock – is you assume this person is running continuous overts against the present time environment and everybody in it. The person is going pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, you know. Unkind thought overts. Unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought. They look at you: unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought. They look – if there's another person around: unkind thought, unkind thought, unkind thought. You got the idea? Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, automaticity. Unkind thought which leads to ARC breaks, present time problems. They have a hell of a time in life. And underlying these various things is pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, automaticity, unkind thought. You got the idea? And you're trying to run somebody that's stacking his case up with overts faster than you can unstack it with processing. And this is a very common, common, common source of difficulty.
And we've got an answer to that in Prehav 13⁴. You just take everybody the pc knows, do an assessment and so forth. And I've given you the details on how you do this Prehav 13 before. But you run Prehav 13 on the case. Just skip whatever you're doing on the case and just flatten Prehav 13. Just devote four or five sessions to getting Prehav 13 out of the road. And all of a sudden this person feels wonderful. And actually, if you do it right, they'll make all their goals for auditing right there, apparently. Of course, they aren't anywhere. But it's a very temporary situation, because that valence – which has already got to be licked, you see – in a few months at the absolute outside will be going again pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. So you actually just clean them up so they can be audited. That's the value of Prehav 13.

All right. Now, you're not running into this one as often now because in the routines it is provided for cross and center. But it used to be, that a major – much earlier in value than this list I've been giving you – source of auditor-pc difficulty and trouble-shooting and so forth was the withhold. The case had the withhold, and therefore was not in two-way communication with the auditor. But you're using Joburgs, and that's taking care of this in the auditing. So it is less in this. If you suspect this now, you order a Joburg. You say, "Well, that's all right, lay aside what you're doing and go on a Joburg." You get a reaction on a withhold, don't try to dig it up particularly. Just order a Joburg. Okay?

All right. And if you do those things with these various routines, you'll find more cases straighten out than all of the tricky solutions you ever could dream of. Because in opposition to all of these practical solutions of how to trouble-shoot a case, is the continual insistence by the pc, by the public, even by auditors under your supervision, that you think of something new, strange and wonderful that solves this case, because it is so different. And you're liable to succumb to it.

Once in a blue moon, you have to succumb to it. But that's when all else fails, man. That's really when all else fails. And then you'll find out it comes under the first category. There's something weird, wild and wonderful going on that nobody has communicated to you whatsoever. Such as the fact that the girl's living with three men simultaneously and none of the three men know about it, [laughter] or the fact the pc self-audits all night, or something else is going on here, you see, which you just didn't happen to find out about. But that comes under the first heading.

Now, the trouble-shooting of the case is very important because by doing that you actually also keep Scientology on the track. And if they think there's somebody going to be around in the establishment or in the town, or something like that, that can trouble-shoot a case, and will remorselessly do so, everybody starts to be better.

They all of a sudden think, "Well, you know, a month or so this person might wander over and Ken might look at her. And then all of my sins will out." As a matter of fact, it's a very good thing to foster that particular piece of propaganda.

"Well, go ahead and waste the next two hundred hours of auditing if you want to. Sooner or later, why, I'll have this case sitting here on an E-Meter. And I'll find out what the

---

⁴ Editor's note: How to run Prehav 13, see SHSBC-026, page 6ff.
devil you've been doing in those two hundred hours of auditing." You know I can hear now the certain names that I could mention out in Los Angeles all go ulp-urp.

You realize that by the Code of a Scientologist, if you weren't administering Scientology to the pc, he doesn't have to pay you. My God! What a horribly fiendish thing. Well, I won't put ideas in your mind. [laughter] There are ways of getting it done right.

The job of the D of P is trouble-shooting. The job of the D of T is quite different. D of Ts often turn their Academies into clinics. And they start making sure that all the cases of the students get progress. And that's not what they're supposed to be doing. And fellows come out of there, out of Academies in pretty good shape casewise, but you say "CCH" to them, and they say, "CCH – now, he did – we did hear something about CCH. Let's see, what was that? Oh, yes, yes, yes. That's one of the levels of the Prehav Scale." [laughter] But their cases are in good shape. You get the idea?

So in trouble-shooting in an Academy – you don't. You just don't. That's it. Some Instructor comes to you or somebody who's teaching Scientology or something like this, you know, and he's teaching courses of some kind or another, and he comes up to you, and he says, "Having the awfulest trouble with this case", you see?

"Oh? You are? Isn't that interesting? Do you have trouble with bulletins, too? I imagine you have lots of trouble with bulletins."

And the fellow says, "What do you mean?"

"Well, haven't you read anything about what you're supposed to be doing in the Academy? You're supposed to be training people in the Academy. If you think there's something wrong with this fellow's case, sign him up for some processing over in the HGC."

And this'll be a new, wild, strange one. I have seen an Academy with a full clinic, full clinical setup, from one end to the other, nobody learning a thing, and the Instructors just frantic about everybody's cases, these cases. Well, now look how shortsighted this is.

They may be frantic about those cases that are in the Academy, but let me point out to you that they are neglecting all of the cases these auditors will audit. And the only thing you can really do wrong with Scientology – you can use it backwards and upside down and run it wrong and everything else, and you actually won't commit much of a crime. But improper or incorrect or failure to disseminate Scientology adds up to one awful overt. Ask yourself for a moment, why?

Well, if Scientology is abroad in a workable state, even though this fellow kicks the bucket, he'll be picked out of it someday. But if it isn't properly disseminated, he'll never be fished out. You got the idea? He could be improperly audited and fished out in this lifetime or his next five. You see? But to be improperly instructed, or dissemination to be improperly done – that's an overt. It obviously is because you've barriered the track against his being fished out. You see?

You've said "The very best thing that you could possibly run is musical processing. And musical processing, that's the thing. And the way you do musical processing is you take this book on Suba-ooba-ooba, and you stand in the middle of the floor, and you go round and
round and round and round and round, you see. Then you stand very still, you see. And then the Gods communicate with you." [laughter] "When you fall down in a dead faint, why, then you're Clear." [laughter]

All right. So this character gets loused up by processing, and next life, next life, next life, he has run on him, "You take this book on Suba-ooba-ooba-ooba, and you stand in the middle of the room, and you go around in circles, and then when you fall down you're Clear." It's no road out. And that's happened to Buddhism, Lamaism, the original Daoism. Happened to any development they've had here on Earth. Started out free – by bad dissemination – booby trap. See?

I imagine Christianity was all right sometime or another. I imagine it didn't have some of the intentions which it eventually expressed, such as Inquisition and burning people in East Grinstead, and a few other things. Oh, you didn't know there were people burned in East Grinstead?

They're lying right up here in the courtyard. You want to drop into the church cemetery there someday. You'll see them. They're buried right up on the High Street. I mean, they were burned on the High Street and buried eventually in consecrated ground. It was interesting. But what's most interesting about it is that it didn't sour people on it; it only soured people on a branch of it.

Okay. Enough of this propaganda. [laughter] Okay. Well, I've kept you overtime again.

Thank you very much.

Audience: Thank you.
Wrong Target, Sec Check

A lecture given on
29 June 1961

Thank you.

Now, you'll have to give me the date today. I get on this automatic outflow of giving you the date.

Audience: The 29th.

The 29th? But, what year?

Audience: AD 11.

That's the right year; AD 11.

All right. 29 June, AD 11, and here we go with the Saint Hill Briefing Course, and boy, I tell you, how do you manage? I mean to say, how do you manage?

Anyway, I gave a talk earlier, which some of you heard, about wrong target – wrong target. And I've said since 1947, really – and you'll find it in The Original Thesis – the auditor plus the pc's analytical mind versus the reactive mind, tsk! you win. The pc versus his own reactive mind, nyaaah. The auditor versus the pc analytical mind, nyaaa-ah. It takes the auditor and the pc's analytical mind to whip the pc's reactive mind.

Did you ever see any – any steam locomotives or electric locomotives, or so forth, go over to a – a grade? They keep hooking locomotives on, you know? They can't pull the slope up to the high hills of Birmingham or something, so they put an extra locomotive on. Did you ever see anybody do that? Did you ever hear of that?

All right. That's the same thing as auditing is. You're hooking on an extra locomotive. But why? Why, hmm? Why would you hook on an extra locomotive? Well, it's because the locomotive that is on the train can't make it. It's one of these horribly obvious things, see? The locomotive that's on the train can't pull the grade, so you hook another locomotive on and they pull the grade.

All right. As long as your target is the pc's analytical mind, you're not going to win. If you're trying to clear his analytical mind, it will take you 75 hours to do a Security Check, 295 hours to do an SOP Goals Assessment. You get the idea? I mean, Scientology will work even in spite of that. If you want to know what the drag factor is, it's just that one. Wrong target.
I had a letter from Peter Williams today. He's halfway round the bend. That's pretty good for a Clear. That's where the auditors have got him. He can't figure out what they're doing. See? I mean, he can't figure out what they're doing, you know?

Well, I've had lots of experience. I can always figure out what you're doing – not only figure out the human mind, you have to figure out what the auditor's doing. Because, in all honesty and in all decency and trying like mad and through no willfulness on his own part, he gets the wrong curve on something, and all of a sudden this fantastic amount of time begins to occur. Tremendous amounts of auditing begin to elapse. Processes which would ordinarily work don't work. Well, what's wrong? What's wrong? There's a breakdown here in understanding of some kind or another whenever this occurs. You see that?

All right. Williams had a tremendously successful course. He made a Clear. He made a couple of them, as a matter of fact, down in Australia. And it was no small feat. He was doing fine, and all of a sudden I get a despatch from him today, and he's going, "Wha – well, I'd almost lost hope and then I got one of your tapes and I'm going in again, and so forth, but this exact...."

I got a telex today from London. And Herbie says that the auditors can't get any Sec Checking done in running Routine 1 because it's taking them two and three hours to clear the rudiments. [laughter] Well, all right. There's another one – just a curve, misapplication. But it's a very simple thing. He's asking me for an extraordinary solution, which is wipe out the rudiments on the Model Session used for Sec Checking, or at least wipe out part of them. That's an extraordinary solution. See? You get driven to the wall, think of an extraordinary solution and the next thing you know you're not doing Scientology. You got the idea? That's the ordinary course of human events.

Now, Ken was asking me yesterday about how do you spot – do troubleshooting. And I told him the first big, big pinnacle here of trouble-shooting was what the hell is going on? I mean, that's the big one, you know? Because there you're up against a tremendous amount of alter-is and counter-create. People are trying hard. They're not being vicious about it. They are understanding it to the best of their ability, and so forth.

All right. You're in the same situation when you're doing something like that that I was with – in with regard to life when I was trying to figure this thing out, see?

Here's life with this tremendous facade of the super-mystery and how you mustn't penetrate it and you can't and all of this sort of thing, you see? And just wasn't anything you could do about it, and all of these weird propositions. Well, that's because there's so doggone much alter-is and so darn much counter-create that the truth of what life was all about had been totally obscured. You got the idea?

So naturally, in relaying a communication about the simplicities of life, these things get restimulated, and people begin to look around corners, you know, when actually the cop is standing right in the middle of the sidewalk. So they go and peer around the corner, and they look up and down alleys, and they come back and forth to look up and down the road, and then turn around and bump into the cop. He's been there all the time. Just failure to observe some fundamental.
So don't feel bad if you do this sort of thing, because, look, I've been over this ground. I can tell you that I did it constantly and continually. That's what life was doing in trying to sort out any of its secrets. They weren't secrets. They were obfuscations. There is no secret about life. It is just the fact that life is surrounded by alter-is and obfuscations to such a degree that you can't see life.

You know, the fellow can't get his job done because there are so many other things to do. This is rather typical. You find this in organizations. You look around and you say, "Now, look, we want the halls clean." Something elementary. "Want the halls clean, you see? And want the place to look nice, you know – public come in and all that." And the fellow has been hired just to clean the halls, you see? And there he is cleaning the halls, and – you think – and you come in one morning and you wade through the dust over your shoe soles, you see? And the next morning it's over your toes, and the next morning it's around your petticoats, and the next morning it's getting around the waist. You can hardly get into the joint, you see, for scrap paper. And you finally say, "What the hell is going on here? We have a fellow who is supposed to be cleaning halls. Well, what's he doing?"

And you ask him, "What are you doing?"

"Well, I can't do that. I haven't got time to do that."

"But that is your job."

"Yeah, but I haven't got time to do that."

"Well, what's happening?"

"Well, actually, I have to run all these errands and I have to mail, and I have to this and I have to that."

And you say, "Mail? What are you talking about? We have a man over in the mail room that's supposed to take care of mail."

"Yeah, I know, but he's so busy addressing and stamping."

"Now, look, we've got somebody over in the – in the – in the Address Department that's supposed to be addressing and stamping and ..."

"Well, yes."

And you go over to the Address Department and you say, "Why aren't you addressing and stamping?"

And they say, "Well, we just have to clean these halls, and we ..." [laughter]

You see? Data starts breaking down, you see? And it goes into a concatenation. And the first thing you know, nobody can do his job because he's too busy. And then you don't have any organization, you see? And it's pretty wild when you look at it that way.

So that's what happens when you try to relay or communicate data about life. Life is sort of like that, you know?

The government today is doing basically the work of charity organizations. Well, they are. That's what socialism is. Socialism is that perversion of government to a point where all
social activities and charity activities are undertaken by the government, you see? And they don't do any governing. Try to get a suit tried. It'll cost you ten thousand pounds, and it'll take you about two or three years, and so forth. But now, wait a minute. That's the business of government: justice.

You try to walk down Soho about three o'clock in the morning and come out of it unscathed right in the middle of London. That's a rather adventurous undertaking – not as bad as it was perhaps, but it's fairly adventurous even yet.

Well, what happens? Why? Well, the government is so busy being a social worker, you see? It hasn't any time to arrest anybody or take care of the law. Get the idea? Can't – can't round up criminals.

Well, why can't it round up criminals? Well, because they have to send them to jail. What has sending them to jail got to do with handling crime? "Well, we're not quite sure, but that's the way it's done. But of course, we can't send them to jail, because as soon as we try to send them to jail..." (This is Washington, DC which has the highest crime rate, I think, in the world, including Port Said, right now.)

You see, that's an interesting comment on a government, you know? I mean, that its capital city has the world's highest crime rate. That's really getting there, you know? Here's the center of law and order which has the world's highest crime rate. Fantastic! You can't get the cops over there to arrest anybody. They won't arrest anybody. And the reason they won't arrest anybody is the people "bug out." And "bug out" is a new cop piece of slang meaning: they go up, they get sentenced to St. Elizabeth by reason of insanity, you see? They parked overtime by reason of insanity, you see, and the judge – psychiatrist rushes in, rushes him over to St. Elizabeth's. They spend a few days in St. Elizabeth's and they're released without any punishment at all. And the cops have gotten to a point where they just won't do their job, that's all. Why? That's because the government is so deeply enmeshed in social work that it hasn't any time to govern, you see?

Now, it isn't that the government is accomplishing government with social work. Actually, it isn't. Because in a good government, production rises, the people are more prosperous. Various other things are always attendant to good government. And yet none of these things are occurring. That's because the government is so busy doing something else.

The government is attacking everybody who produces, which is an interesting thing for a government to do. Just get in business and you'll find the government setting up the Lewis machine guns on your doorstep, see? I don't care whether you're putting yourself into a business of fixin' shoes or fixin' skulls. Same thing.

All right. This is the off-postness of it. It's all off post. Get the idea? Well, where you're living in a world where nearly everything is off post, everything is trying to force you to wear its hat. You see? And if you didn't watch it, you'd simply inherit all the hats there were. And for instance, if we didn't watch it, in the course of the next two decades, we would be wearing the hat called government, particularly if I continue to keep overts going against it. [laughter] And that isn't my job. And it isn't anybody else's job around here, you see? But here's – here's the thing. I mean, everybody wants you to wear his hat. And you're wearing everybody else's hats, and so on.
All right. Now, let's see how we can short-circuit this so we didn't keep getting off the groove. And that is to say, in an HGC or an auditing team or any activity in Scientology, the person who is on the ground observes. A person who is on the ground observes. Don't ask other people who are off the ground to do your observation for you.

I love Herbie dearly, but to send me a telex... Yes, he's in trouble, but he didn't observe. He didn't go down and look. He couldn't have. He leaves me in a position where I have to surmise, you see, what he's doing. And because he hasn't looked, then I sort of interiorize into his hat. You see, he sort of – he yanks my anchor points out thirty-nine miles. Get the idea? And then I have to figure out. Well, I can by experience, fortunately for him. But I have to figure out what his auditor is doing. See? What are they doing that's taking two or three hours?

Well, in the first place, innumerable mistakes are being made. The first is that a person on Routine 1 is not supposed to respond particularly, or is not expected to respond particularly to think processes. And you're going to run two or three hours of think processes on somebody instead of doing a Security Check and the CCHs, you see? That's kind of silly in the first place.

Well, the basic mistake which they are making is a simple one. They're just running the rudiments with the sensitivity knob too high. See, they're not clearing the rudiments for a third-of-a-dial drop. They're clearing the rudiments for 16. And because they're doing Security Checks, then they think they should clear the rudiments for a Security Check at 16, but then they never get around to a Security Check.

You know, do the Security Check, by all means, with an abnormally high sensitivity, and check it all out with the sensitivity at 16, by all means. But that hasn't anything to do with the rudiments, see, of running the Model Session in which a Security Check is going to be done. And you set it for a third-of-a-dial drop, and this is about the way you would run rudiments on somebody who is going through CCHs – which will run rudiments faster, by the way, than any rudiments process you've got.

You say, "All right. Is it all right with you to begin the session now? Good. Is it all right to audit in this room? Fine. Is it all right if I audit you? All right, that's good. Have you got any ARC breaks? That's fine. Are you withholding anything? Good. Fine. That's good. Do you have any present time problems? Oh, yes, you do. All right. Well, thank you very much. Now, we're going to begin this Security Check." [laughter]

It's just practicality, that's all. You've gone through all the motions.

'Cause look, you're going to be back on the CCHs, and oddly enough, if you really want to try it sometime, you can run a present time problem with TR 10. That's right. Just say, "Notice that wall. Notice that ceiling. Notice that floor." The guy is very upset because his wife is going to kiss somebody else, and he hasn't been kissing her for years, and he's wondering why. And you say, "Notice that ceiling. Notice that floor. Notice that wall," and so on.

And the guy says – "Well, now how do you feel about your wife?"

"Well, it's all right. That's pretty bad."
"All right", you say, "Notice that door. Notice your auditor. Notice the chair. Notice the ceiling. Notice the floor. Notice the wall. Notice that picture over there. All right. How do you feel about your wife now?"

"Well, not so bad."

"All right. Good. Notice that ceiling. Now, notice the floor. Notice the wall."

That sounds like a funny way to run a PT problem, doesn't it? And yet it'll work. All right. You can run an ARC break the same way, unless the ARC break is so violent with you, the auditor, that he won't do the auditing command. You could get into something kind of like that. So you possibly, in doing the CCHs sometime or another – it's rare, very rare – but you might have to run some TR 5N or something like this while bridging over into a Security Check. You got so many ARC breaks with the pc that it's better if you run ten minutes worth of 5N, see – TR 5N. But it's just wasting time, you see?

I mean, basically, the CCHs for sure will run all the rudiments. The CCHs are senior as processes to all or any rudiments process. That's for sure.

So on that, all by yourself, well, you could see that this is the – that the thing would all shake out in the wash anyway. And then look at your – your Security Check. Don't you suppose that's a bit superior to rudiments?

Well, rudiments are just rudiments for heaven sakes. And when you're running a think process, you'd better have them awful straight. Third-of-a-dial drop. Does the rudiment register on the needle? No registry on the needle at a third-of-a-dial-drop sensitivity setting? Leave it alone. Do you understand? And clear it only back to a third-of-a-dial drop – and then you've got speed.

Now, I wasn't giving you a lecture on this particular subject. I'm giving you an example here, that observation should have been done on the ground, see? Then we could have figured out what they were doing instead of getting some extraordinary solution.

Here's the next one that's of considerable importance here. This idea of the analytical mind. We say the analytical mind is kind of a misnomer, because most people think it's some kind of a computing machine. And it's not. It's just the pc. It was a mistake made in early Dianetics in research. There was something there doing a lot of thinking and computing, and so I called it the analytical mind to differentiate this, because at that time we didn't know anything much about thetans. You got the idea?

All right. We mean the thetan. Now, when he directly, personally – what is conscious of a thetan and the attention units available there – are attacked by the auditor, you're going to get no auditing done. Your target is the reactive mind. It is auditor plus pc versus the reactive mind. And boy, now have you really got it plowing. This basically accounts for that five hour-twenty-five hour ratio that's been a kind of a bug to us. Works like this.

As a matter of fact, Julia was the one who made this observation. She was doing a bunch of tests out in Phoenix, and I was taking on pcs, and I was auditing pcs five-hour intensives, see? And I had a whole bunch of pcs one after the other at five-hour intensives, see? And the days and weeks went by and Julia got ahold of a whole bunch of profiles. And they
were the – what was not then the guidance center, but the staff auditor profiles, you see, for
the same period of time, you know? And here was the five hours and here was the twenty-five
hours. And they were the same results, you know?

And she got ahold of this and she pointed this out to me. And there they all sat in the
files. And this was rather fascinating. I was getting results in five hours and they were getting
results in twenty-five hours, but we were really running more or less the same thing.

Well, when you see a wild variable of this character, don't assign it, as most people
would in their overweening conceit, pomp and prejudice to how good they are, see? Any time
you say, "Well, the reason there's a big difference is I'm just good, and they're lousy, you
see?" That would be a wonderful way to block off any further information on the subject.

Well, truthfully speaking... [laughter] where you have all of your auditors working like
mad, putting in time, doing the same thing as anybody else, you're working like mad putting
in time; there must be something different. I didn't discover it actually till a couple or three
weeks ago what the dickens this was all about. Their reactive mind was apparently choosing
out the pc as the randomness. Got the idea?

In other words, they were auditing the analytical mind. They were auditing the pc, see. They were thinking of the pc as being aberrated, and the pc was this and the pc was that, don't
you see? Well, of course, this is true, but it isn't something you attack. See, don't attack the
pc; attack his bank. Get this vast difference. Your target is the reactive mind.

Now, I gave you a talk about this not too long ago. And here it comes up again. We
haven't got this point yet.

It is a big point. It is not a little tiny niggardly point. It's a big point. It was enough to
make this five-twenty-five hour difference.

All right. So therefore, it's probably enough to account for doing a Security Check in
75 hours or doing an SOP Goals in 225 hour assessment, see? See, that all by itself. It's just
that one little mechanic that stretches out, this tremendous... well, you might call it waste of
auditing time. Now, if you could just correct this one little thing and save four out of every
five hours of auditing, hey, that'd be pretty good, wouldn't it? That'd be quite a discovery to
discover something that was that much. And yet, I discovered this a few weeks ago, and I
evidently haven't communicated it, because you're still doing it. You see? To some degree,
you're still doing this thing.

What do I mean by this? What do I mean by this? (I know Mary Sue has covered this
with you, but I'm going to really slam it home here.) You take an E-Meter, and you look at the
E-Meter, and you say, "Have you ever stolen anything?" Now wait. This is the first time
you've asked the guy the question, see? You know? "Have you ever stolen anything? Oh, you
have, huh. Oh, well, what do you know about that? Well, hmm. All right." [laughter]

Pc possibly is saying, "Yes, I once stole eight apples and I robbed a store and so
forth." And he's saying this; you don't pay any attention to that. That's completely aside and
has nothing to do with you. [laughter]
You say – and you say, "Well, all right. I'll repeat the question again." Clause 16, Auditor's Code: Stay in two-way comm with the pc. Gong! But why?

You're suspecting the pc of having stolen something. You're not trying to find ways and means of getting him to recall, ventilate, air and get the dry rot out of the reactive bank. You're assuming that he knew all about it and has been walking up and down the streets all these years knowing very well that he has stolen everything, and he knows it, and he did it. You got the idea?

He knows it. He did it. He is the bird, and that his only crime is that he didn't tell anybody. Now, you've short-circuited it one step. Yes, he did and he not-ised it. And he's got it down in the reactive bank and he doesn't even know about it. And he keeps getting these fantastic impulses to steal things.

Now, when you do a Security Check, at the moment you ask it, because it's a specific question that nobody has ever asked him before, he remembers it. And he will tell you about it ordinarily. Now, having gotten that far, you've just gotten that far on your own steam. You've looked at the pc; you looked down here at your paper and find out the next question is "Have you stolen anything?"

All right. You look at this and you say, "All right. Have you stolen anything?"

And the pc says, "Oh, yes. Yes, as a matter of fact, I did. I stole three apples and two bananas and a cartwheel. And I once belonged to the army – enough said – [laughter] and so forth. Yes, I have. Yeah, that's right. I sure have. All right."

"Good. Thank you." He's answered the question, hasn't he? All right. You're going to ask him again. You say, "Well, have you stolen anything?" in any wording you care to put it.

And he says, "Well, yes. Yes, as a matter of fact, when I was a young kid we stole an automobile and went for a joy ride."

All right. And you say, "Well, all right. Thank you. Good. Now, have you stolen anything?"

And the guy says, "I told you all about it. That's ... No, there's nothing more."

And you say, "All right. Now, let's just be sure. Now, all right. I'm going to ask you on this now. All right. Have you stolen anything? Oh, I'm afraid there's still a knock there. What else is it? Come on. You can remember it. Come on, what is it now?"

"Well, blessed if I know one. I'm damned if I know. I can't remember anything else that I stole."

"Now, there must have been something There must have been something"

"I did nothing. There isn't anything else I've stolen."

You say, "All right. Well, let's just check it out and make sure we're straight here now. All right. Have you stolen anything in this lifetime?"

No knock.
"Okay. Well you – so you've been a ruddy thief in other lifetimes, but you haven't stolen in this lifetime. So that's fine. That's okay. All right. Now, here's the next question: 'Have you ever buttered any bread?' it says. All right. Now, have you ever buttered [laughter] – have you ever buttered any bread?"

And the guy says, "Buttered any bread. No. No. Hm-mm. Nope."

And you say, "All right. Let's make sure. Good. Have you ever buttered any – Oh, wait a minute. There's a hell of a knock on this thing. Now look, you can remember that. Come on now."

"Uh, buttered any bread?"

"Yes, that's right. I'll repeat it. Have you buttered any bread? Well, look at that, for God's sakes. Look at it." [knocks on something] [laughter]

So he breaks out a microscope and a telephoto exposure meter and so forth, and he looks around. "Buttered any bre – Oh, no. Oh, no. Well, yes, as a matter of fact, I was a ... God, you know I'd forgotten this. I was an attendant in a psychiatric ward when I was about twenty-two. I'd forgotten that completely. Yes, and we used to butter bread in there all the time for the insane patients. Yeah, yeah. What do you know?"

And you say, "Well, all right. Okay now. All right. Now, let's just check this one so we can leave it. Have you buttered any bread? All right. Have you buttered any bread? Yeah, well, that's flat. Okay. All right. Now, here's the next question. Have you ever been a student?" [laughter] You understand?

Now look. Look here. This is a different demeanor. This is a different demeanor than the way you're delivering a Security Check. You're busy Security Checking somebody's analytical mind. I'm sure of that, because it's taking you too long, you see?

First thing I found out about this Security Check. You were taking latent reads. The only time you ever say "I'll repeat the auditing question" in a Security Check is when he said "somebody else."

You said, "Have you ever buttered any bread?"

And he said, "Well, my Aunt Gafooseba used ..."

You say, "I'll repeat the auditing question." Don't even let him finish the sentence. The devil with it. You say, "I'll repeat the auditing question. Have you ever buttered any bread? You."

"Oh, oh, you ... Well, no. I ..."

"Well, all right. We'll check it. Good. That's all right. Fine. Here we go." Got the idea? It's between you and the pc until what signal? There is a signal.

Audience: "He says 'No'."

"No." That's right. You learned your lesson well. That is the signal. And you'll have nothing to do with an E-Meter until you get that signal.

Male voices: Thank you. Yes.
Nothing to do with it. Put it under your chair. Sit on it. Butter it. Who cares? But don't have anything to do with an E-Meter, because you're cutting comm with the pc. Now, why you got that E-Meter under your nose? I never security checked anybody in my life in this particular fashion, staring at the E-Meter and looking at it suspiciously. "Yes, you criminal. I have you sitting in the chair." I can security check the most unlikely people.

Now, why are you using any Model Session in the Security Check at all?

Well, it's just better. It keeps you from yickety-yaketing, and takes you too far off the line. It actually isn't really a Model Session action. It isn't a Model Session type of action. There's a lot of yickety-yak goes on, on the thing. You can close it and you can bridge and you can use those Model Session factors.

But I get people to talk by persuading them to talk, in an E-Meter. I'm liable to say to somebody, "Now look. You want to know... You're afraid to tell me something about this, or I see you're now remembering something about it, and you're apparently afraid to tell me. Why are you afraid to tell me?"

"Well", he'd say, "You might tell somebody else."

I said, "Right. That's right." I said, "I'm going to ... Soon as you tell me, I'll get an HCO Sec and they'll put it on a telex and they'll send it to all Central Organizations as an Urgent."

And the guy says, "That's silly, you know?"

"Yes, that's right. It's silly. Now, what have you done?" [laughter]

"Oh," the guy says, "Oh, well, put in that light, well, actually, I used to kiss goats." [laughter]

And you say, "All right. You used to kiss goats. Very good. All right. All right. Okay. Now, let's just check out and see if you've remembered everything there is to remember about that, see? All right. What animalism have you practiced with illicit diamond buying?" [laughter]

Then a guy gets another knock and you say, "Aw! come off of it, you know? Did you – have you remembered this? Do you know this right now? Do you know this all?" The attitude is "You couldn't possibly know this and not tell me. And I'm helping you fish it up. And here you are wasting time here by holding... It's silly, you know? This is foolish. Now, come on. You did remember this? You – you now ..."

"Well, yes, I was embarrassed to tell you."

"Oh, well, all right. So you're so bad off that it embarrasses you to tell an auditor something. All right, now I'm not gonna jump on you for that or anything, just give me this dope here. Let's get the show on the road," you see – you know, that kind of thing. That is, if I suspect that he is remembering it now, you see, and then sitting there holding onto it or afraid to tell me. You can ordinarily tell; they start to look hunted, you know?

Well, that's about as far as you ever go in attacking a pc. But just a direct assault on a pc: To pick up that E-Meter, the first time you ask that question, look fixedly at the E-Meter,
ask the question in a rather suspicious tone of voice, and so forth. You're being absolutely certain that he's not going to tell you. What are you doing? You're cutting comm with the pc. You are actually encouraging him to withhold.

You might as well say to him, "Now, I know you're going to withhold and you know you're going to withhold, so therefore everybody is going to withhold around here, and therefore we're going to take five times as long to do a Security Check." You see, when you sort it out with this kind of an idea? Of course, he's going to withhold. Even if he knew these things, he wouldn't tell me. I go at an entirely different assumption, because I'm attacking the reactive bank.

I assume that if he remembers it or knows about it, he will tell me at once. And I do everything I can do to promote that frame of mind. It's not just promoting that frame of mind. It's true. And by the time he's asked about the third question, you know, answered about the third question, well, he says, "Ah! This is pretty interesting, you know? I mean pretty, pretty wild. Yeah, you know, I can talk to this guy", and he starts going into session. And here he is. He's in-session.

I ask him the next question, "Have you buttered any bread?" Never occurs to him for a moment to withhold the thing.

He says, "Buttering bread, well, as a matter of fact when we were very young, I – I'd sure hate to have this known."

I say, "Well, it's going to be known. Now go ahead."

And "Ah, well, when we were little children, we used to butter bread, you know, and we'd butter it and butter it, and so forth, and hide it from our mother."

And I say, "All right. Good-o. How do you feel about that now?"

"Aaahh. Pretty grim."

"All right. Good enough. Well, have you buttered any bread?"

"No, I've just told you."

That's it. That's all of it. See, that's "no". You know? Then let's say, "All right, now, let's make sure we've got all of it."

And we check it on the meter. And we're already reading with an advanced sensitivity knob. We ask him with the sensitivity knob advanced, and then we ask him with the sensitivity knob totally increased. No further fall. That's it. We have checked it out. We can leave the question. And it's just a one-two-three-four.

But, it is your role as an auditor to persuade him that he can remember and that he can tell you. And every time you make suspicious actions in the direction of the E-Meter, you invalidate that a little bit. So the less those suspicious actions are, the better off you are.

You sit down. You put the E-Meter down, so forth. It's not an attitude of "Well, we're gonna find out all about it now, because there you are walking around knowing all about these things, and so forth. And that makes you a pretty bad criminal, doesn't it? Hah-ha-ha-ha. Ha-ha-ha-ha.'
Well, two-way communication goes up the chimney right there. How could it do otherwise? How could it do otherwise? No. You as the auditor can create an atmosphere, not of confidence, but create an atmosphere of communication. Don't create an atmosphere of no-communication.

You don't have to operate like a con man; you don't have to operate like a priest. As a matter of fact, I'm not above throwing all sorts of dunnage into a Security Check on the basis the fellow is looking very, pooh. You know, you've just asked him, "Well, have you ever raped a girl?" you know.

"O-o-o-o-oh, yeah."

"Well, all right now, you just remembered something there. Now, what was it?"

"Wah-wah-wah-what. I don't know what I did there. Ughrr-oh-oo-oo-oooo... That's..."

I say, "What the hell is all this about?" I'm not above saying something like this. I go, you know, "What the hell is this about. Do you think I'm a Catholic priest or something? I'm going to make you wear sackcloth and ashes for the rest of your life?"

The guy says, "Oh no. I guess – I guess you're not."

And I say, "This isn't 1620. This is AD 11." [laughter] "All right, now, let's hit this thing hard now. Now, "Have you ever raped a girl?"

"Well ..."

"Tell me all about it."

"Well, all right." And he tells you all about it. And not because you found it on the E-Meter, but because you just said, "Well, look at them sighs and groans, moans and writhing. And, man, there is something there. And you and me had better get this into view, all the way, and let the turbojet blowers go through the reactive bank, you know?"

Next thing you know, promoted, question after question after question, he is more and more confident and feels more and more confidence in his auditor and feels better and better. And the knowingness is going up in all directions. And the E-Meter is further and further away and is actually only used just to check out the last two checks. And you get so that you'd never find anything on the last two checks. You just never find an additional fall, that's all. He's given the whole thing to you before you ever went near the meter, see.

You, after all, are the auditor. And when you forget that you are the auditor ... And no matter how marvelous a mechanical contrivance is, when you forget that you yourself are doing the auditing and that you yourself are handling the pc, you get a slowdown right there. It starts to grind, you see?

Now, our next level of wasted motion was, of course, in this thing of latent read and letting the pc wander and so forth, exerting no control over his communication in the session.

You say to him, "Well, have you ever bitten any snakes?"

And he says, "Oh, well, yeah. Once upon a ti- . Yeah, as a matter of fact, my Aunt Grace, she used to bite snakes – used to buy snakes down in the market and she'd bite them.
She used to bring them home and bite them. And it horrified me as a small boy. And that's why you're getting a fall on the meter, or would get a fall on the meter, if you were looking at the meter."

And you say, "Whoa now. Whoa, whoa, whoa. Whoa, whoa. Whoa. I asked you if you had bitten any snakes?"

"Oh, oh, me? Yeah, well ..."

"That's what the meter would be falling on if I were looking at it."

"Oh, well. All right. Well, the hell with it. Yes, all right. I do it all the time. As a matter of fact, I did it last night. Bit one. Bit his head right off. I've got to bite 'em." [laughter]

And you'd say, "Okay. All right. Now, we'll check this one out. Is there anything more there? Nothing more?" You know? I mean, "Have you ever bitten any snakes?"

"No. That's the only one. That's the only one."

"All right. We'll just check it out on the E-Meter. Have you ever bitten any snakes? Ah, that's all right. Okay. Fine. All right, now let's get on with this thing now. Stop putting on the brakes."

And the guy gets in a frame of mind where he feels perfectly safe, and actually his anxieties in life were borne out of the fact that he doesn't feel so safe. So you bring about a tremendous change in the pc just by this attitude. The attitude alone can bring about a change in a pc. Use your E-Meter when he says no. Until he says no, leave it alone. Check it out for the advanced read you are already using, check out the question again for the most increased read you can get on the E-Meter and then, if you got nothing then, go on.

But, of course, on the advanced read, not the most extreme read, you check it out "Have you ever bitten any snakes?" And it goes pang! again. Oh, I tell you the amount of disappointment which I can get into my voice is histrionic. I say, "There's a fall here."

Well, he says, "I told you everything I'm ..."

"Oh, you did. You don't remember this one? Oh, all right. All right. All right. Well now, let's see if we can find it. All right. I'll help you out. Now, have you ever bitten any snakes?" Bang! "What's that falling on? This lifetime? All right. It's this lifetime. Okay. Come on. Spot it. You can do it. Come on, you can do it."

"Whew! Yes, yes, as a matter of fact, I used to bring snakes in and hide them in the teacher's drawer, and then when she was gone, I'd take them out and bite them. Yeah. all right." [laughter] "Wshooow."

Say, "Yeah, all right," you say. "Okay. Now, let's check it out. Have you ever bitten any snakes?" Fall. "All right, all right, what's the matter? Are you afraid of this subject or something of this sort?"

"Yes, as a matter of fact. It drives me nuts."

"Well, come on. Remember it. Now, you can do it."
"Oooh. I don't know. I don't remember any more of it."

"All right. I will agree with you. You don't remember any more. Let's see if we can find it. I'll help you out here one way or the other. Now, have you ever bitten any snakes?"

"Oh, it's a movie I saw once. It's a movie. It's a movie I saw once."

"All right. Now, I'm going to repeat the auditing question again. Have you ever bitten any snakes?"

"Yeah. Oh, yeah. There's one. I didn't mention that one."

"All right. Good enough. All right. Now, we're going to check it out." (He's told you what it is.) And you say, "Have you ever bitten any snakes? Ah, there's no fall on that. Good. Have you ever bitten any snakes?"

"Nope."

"All right. Okay. Good. All right. Let's get on with the next one." Get the idea?

It's only when he says no, you use the E-Meter. And then if you're using the E-Meter and he's still saying no, you assume – not that he's really withholding from you – but you merely assume that he hasn't overwhumped the reactive mind. This disappoints you, you see? That he doesn't just bang like this. And he gets the idea that he should be able to do it. It's most remarkable.

The point is that you can get him in a hopeful frame of mind. I'm maybe not putting this point across too good because I'm not giving you an actual demonstration of this thing. But the point is that his confidence comes up, and his ability to overwhump the bank comes up, and his ability to communicate comes up; therefore, his knowingness keeps coming up. And the Security Check will start showing up on your profiles like mad. And they happen rather rapidly. And after a little while, you'll be saying to him something on the order, "Well, have you ever stolen anything?"

And the fellow says, "Yes. So-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so, name, rank and serial number, and sold it to the pawn shop. And that's it. Bang!"

And you say, "All right. Have you stolen anything else, now?"

"No."

You check it out. It'll be blank. His "noes" will be followed by a blank. His "noes" are not followed by a reaction.

Early in the game, yes, his "noes" will be followed by a reaction on the meter, and you'll have to turn around to him and say, "Remember it. Think about it." On the sort of an attitude of mind of "You can do this. It is possible for you to do this. I know that you can do this."

And he thinks, "I'm doing something. Well, yes, I am. I'm remembering something. What do you know! Yes, I am. And I can do it. What do you know!" I'm not putting any hypnotic charm on him, because what I'm putting on him is the fact that I've demonstrated conclusively to him that he could by just insisting that he did. It's like getting an auditing com-
mand followed. The auditing command you're kind of running is "Recall all your overts and
withholds. Thank you." And after a while, why, they just go off like a streak of light. And it'll
be very seldom that you ever find a knock on the meter after you've asked him to tell all. Then
you can resort to the meter. And you say, "Well, have you ever been a member in an armed
force?" you know.

And he says, "No. No."

And you get down to a point where you get much more rapid agreement amongst, the
auditor... And this is when you leave a question. When you have total agreement on "no". It's
an agreement. The auditor observes it; the E-Meter observes that it's no; the pc observes that
it's no, and the reactive bank doesn't churn anyone up, and so it agrees that it's no. See, and
everything is in agreement. There is a no. And you're promoting agreement like mad all over
the place, you see? Instead of the disagreement!

The disagreement which you're eliciting is when you sit down and look at the meter
and you say to the meter – you say exclusively, "Well, have you ever bitten any bread?"

And you know the pc knows this, but is only unwilling to tell you. And you're going to
sniff him out somehow. You're going to catch him off base. And the whole thing is being
conducted in a sort of a paranoid atmosphere of supersuspicion, you see? It does him good in
spite of all this, you see? It's just slow. That's all. It's just slow.

You can do Security Checks all backwards and do them all on the meter and stare at
nothing but the meter and never listen to what the pc says and go out of communication with
him. And you can still get away with it, probably, and you can still get the Security Check
system working. And you can still get an advance with the pc, but at what time ratio? Now,
we're just talking about time ratio. And that's all I'm trying to teach you these days.

All right. And you can build up something else that gives an entirely different time ra-
tio. And that is when you ask the pc, you ask him as a friend and with the encouragement that
he probably can remember it. If he has done it, he's certainly going to remember it, and then if
he has done that, he is certainly going to tell you. There is – no other thought ever enters your
mind than that this is going to happen. And you read him the question and only when he says
"no", in one time or another, do you check the thing out on the meter. And then when you
finally have checked it out on the meter, you got four things in agreement: the auditor, the pc,
the E-Meter and the reactive bank. They're all in agreement that it is "no". All right, then you
go on to the next question.

And you can do that with rather great rapidity because, as I say, he will keep remem-
bering them faster and faster. It isn't that you're – you see – it looks a different way. It looks
like his confidence in you is increasing, so therefore he can tell you. That is not what's hap-
pening. What's happening is he is able, better and better and better, to overwhump his reactive
bank and his withholds, and stare them right in the teeth and confront it and own right up to
them. And when he starts doing that more and more rapidly, he of course is taking more and
more responsibility, and you'll find these things are really blowing. He doesn't creep out of a
session and feel like a cur dog and so on. He feels good about it, you know?
And you get him back in the session again, and you get that confidence inspired once more. It's really rolling: It's just a question, he tells you all, you check it out; it's a question, he tells you all, you check it out; it's a question, he tells you all, you check it out. And actually, it's just more and more easy for him to do this. And therefore, it's easier and easier to conduct the Security Check.

And you'll find out that if it's conducted the way I'm trying to outline to you here, that you will get **forty or fifty times** the number of withholds off the case. Oh, you mean you get more off the case? You *said it*! You get *more*. Then he blows it *faster*, and it takes less time to get the more. Can you see that?

Well, what are you doing? Slowing it down, see? And the only way you can slow it down is be sure he won't tell you; be certain that it is the *pc* who is withholding it from you; be absolutely certain that it's only through the greatest of chicanery that you will eventually be able to trap him into a point where he has to run up a white flag and surrender with sword hilts reversed, you see? And say, "Well, all right, I've had a game with you and so forth and I give up now, and you've won the game." Now look. That isn't the attitude which you're trying to promote at all.

The other attitude is the one you're trying to promote, which is, "You *too* can remember your overts. You can do it. You can do it. And there they are and – uh-huh. All right. That was pretty good."

And you know, it is all in an understanding of exactly what's happening. Now, you got subjective reality on this, all of you. All of you right here at this particular instant undoubtedly have felt tortured at one time or another during a Security Check. You know? You were perfectly willing to tell, but the auditor didn't seem to be willing to listen. Or yourself couldn't quite put your finger on it, and you were trying hard, and the auditor seemed to blame you for not being able to put your finger on it, you know?

And the auditor was blaming you, but you were *trying* to remember, and you couldn't quite get it untangled, and the auditor gave you no help. Have you ever been in that situation in a Security Check? The auditor gave you no help to remember. That's because he's assuming. The auditor has assumed at that point that you remembered, but that you were just being mean.

So this is the assumption of a games condition in auditing, see? Don't ever assume a games condition in auditing. Never assume a games condition if you don't want one. You can materialize them left and right. You can materialize all kinds of games conditions. You can materialize more ARC breaks than you can shake a stick at.

Now, auditing is as workable as the rudiments are in. Well, what about this? Isn't this a better way to establish the rudiments during a Security Check than going over them with an advanced sensitivity reading and plucking them all to pieces; and particularly in Routine 1 when you're not supposed to be running verbal processes beyond a Security Check on somebody, trying to clear up his whole case by running rudiments and all this sort of thing. Don't you think that it's pretty apparent that these rudiments will just get ridden roughshod into the situation?
I have to confess to you that rudiments go out to the degree that auditing skill is out. And as auditing skill comes in, the rudiments come in. And you take a guy who has to have lots of havingness run on him, he generally is being audited by somebody who's audited him a bit roughly, you see? There's something going on here which isn't quite a good agreement, you see? So the rudiments are sort of perpetually out.

Well, if you can see that a profile can be held up and made absolutely static by a present time problem; if it can be reduced by an ARC break – if these two things are continuously present – naturally the case won't advance very well, will it? All right. So the best thing you can do is to create the operating atmosphere in which these things can't happen.

Now, if you are suspicious of the pc, continuously suspicious of the pc, they will happen because the pc isn't being bolstered by the auditor's confidence or the auditor's attack on the pc's reactive mind, you see? The pc isn't bolstered by it. The pc is just drifting.

Now, you see how you could really speed one of these things up? I'm sure you saw it earlier today, and I'm already going over ground which Mary Sue has already very, very well covered with you.

Perhaps it's a bit of an invalidation to go over it again, but I want you to see it in this operating atmosphere, not as a mechanical thing but as a created atmosphere that an auditor can create in a Security Check. And it's the basis of creation is simply: "Well, there you are and you've got a lot of these things occluded, and you can't remember them, and we're going to find them, and we're going to ventilate them, and you're going to feel a lot better. And after you've answered a few questions, then you too will be sure that you can remember the remainder very easily."

And the guy, you know – this kind of an operating atmosphere – he, "Oh, yeah. Yeah." Well, he's remembering faster and faster, and so forth. And he tells you once in a while, "I don't know if I want to go on with this. This is remembering too fast."

"You know. Well, come off of it. You can face up to these things. Have you ever faced up to 'em before?"

"Well, yes, yes. Yeah, I've faced up to 'em before. Must have faced up to them before. I did 'em."

"All right. Face up to them again! All right. Here's the next question."

"Did I face up to them? Hmm-mm. Heh! I can do that." You know, bang!

And he does.

Can you get some concept of the velocity involved? That is to say the speed of advance – of the increased speed of advance – that you can do with just this single factor. Hm? Do you see that that single factor injected into Security Checking could enormously increase your speed of advance, huh?

You set yourself up as somebody that people cannot help talking to; you set yourself up as somebody in whom people have confidence; you set yourself up as somebody who can be confided in, and you do a fantabulous Security Check.
You set up yourself as a cop who is going to sniff out the crime in spite of everybody preventing you from doing it – heh-heh-heh-heh! rrreh-heh-heh – and you'll have to sniff out the crime.

I'll tell you. It's a direct test of how good an auditor can do this, how many times he has to resort to the E-Meter to get it all. That's a direct test. The more often an auditor has to resort to an E-Meter to pull the teeth of withholds, the less he is using this. So you yourself have a good test that you can use while Security Checking. If you're finding you have to resort to the E-Meter, resort to the E-Meter, resort to the E-Meter, you know? And, "Did you do it?" And you get another fall. And you have to clear that. And you get another fall. And you have to clear that, and so on. You have to assume that you don't have the guy's confidence, that's all. You don't have this pc's confidence. That's what you have to assume. That's the first thing you should assume. That's the time for a heart-to-heart talk – time for one of these nice fireside chats.

You say, "Well, what'd be the liabilities of telling me about these things?"

"Woooh..."

You'll be told. You'll be told why you didn't – weren't easily able to bring about this atmosphere of confidence. Now having brought it about, get subjective reality on this, you know? Having brought about a better atmosphere of confidence, trust and communication with the pc, look at the speed with which the Security Check goes and how seldom you have to check against the E-Meter.

Well, what is this? It isn't the pc has become more willing to tell you those things which he himself was knowingly hiding. I'll tell you he doesn't know these things. You've given him enough horsepower now, see, that he just goes into the bank one way or the other, and the fur flies. He remembers this, and he remembers that, and he remembers something else, and there it is, and bang! bang! Oh, yes, he can attack that. Yeah, he can overcome that. After a while, he's saying sort of "Aah, bring on your reactive banks. Who cares? I can lick them!" Got the idea?

It's the way the first clearing was done, was in that operating atmosphere. Well worth remembering that there was an operating atmosphere that had to do with that. It was simply increasing somebody's confidence over his bank, and increasing his confidence over his bank and increasing his confidence over his bank, and they go Clear – not by running this or that or getting mechanical. They will go Clear, if you just increase their confidence enough over their ability to knock out the bank. Have I made my point?

All right. Well, I hope it's of some help to you.

Thank you.
TRAINING ON TRs,
TALK ON AUDITING

A lecture given on 30 June 1961

Okay. I think this is the 30th of June and 61, Briefing Course Saint Hill.

The first item that we should discuss today is the fact that I'm going to give you lectures after this on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday because you look so exhausted, you know. You look so exhausted come Friday that it's actually very – hard talking to you, you know. The CCHs are what are getting to you, I think, and – not so much receiving them, but doing them on people. The Security Checks, they're probably the most exhausting. They exhaust all sorts of charge on cases. Anyhow, all joking aside, I'll be lecturing on Tuesday, Wednesdays and Thursday afternoons.

Oh, yes, I have a news item. I have ceased to own two boats in the last twenty-four hours. Not having gotten my hands on them very solidly, and apparently have gotten hold of the – a Fairmile B., an old antisubmarine warfare vessel, 116 feet. They're good, solid weather boats – they were in their day. But the luck of the Irish, it's very interesting. I mean, it's the middle of the year, you see, it's way off season, and the most fantastic buys are just going begging, you see. So I couldn't resist one. We need one anyhow for this expedition. That's what I've been trying to find. So I finally connected with this boat, and you'll be hearing more about it.

Matter of fact, it has enough staterooms on it to set up an HGC. [laughter] Yeah. But don't worry. Of course, if you got audited under those circumstances, about the middle of the session you'd hear a howl coming through the loudspeaker system, you know, "Now hear this!" – I wouldn't be able to keep out of that valence, you see.

Well, anyway, I think you're making pretty good progress; by and large, making pretty good progress. I notice one or two of you are changing your minds about things anyway. Life should be looking a little easier, and if you're doing your Security Checks in this mood that I've been telling you about – of course, it's the technical precision, but there's a mood goes along with it. And that's practically the first time I've ever introduced, to amount to anything, for many years the subject of mood in auditing.

And you can classify it now precisely as a technical asset. The medicos never did that. They just said a doctor had a bedside manner or he didn't have a bedside manner, and he would be a good doctor or he wouldn't be a good doctor, and that was the end of the description, see. But you can say that an auditor who does not encourage the pc to overwhump his reactive bank and remember things and so forth has a poor auditing manner.

But what is it? It's just encourage the pc to overcome his aberrations and surmount them and get the show on the road, you see. I'm not talking about, now you tell him to invalidatively or something of that sort, but you audit him encouragingly. You know, "Come on,
you can do it" instead of "You schnook", you know. And that would be the difference between a good auditing manner and a bad auditing manner: was whether or not the element of hope, confidence and encouragement were entered into the session. Now you enter those three elements into the session, and it becomes comprehensible what we're talking about. And as soon as you enter those in, you'll find the pc runs faster, considerably—completely aside from anything else.

All right. Well, you now probably have a much deeper insight into the TRs. Do you have any insight into the TRs? [Audience: Oh, yes!] You think you can do these? I'll give you a note here in passing.

Time after time you're going to find somebody in organizations or something trying to teach the TRs this way: Go on to TR 0 and stick. And now it's—eight months from now, we'll still be doing TR 0. You got that?

You're going to find that consistently because the element of endure enters into it, see? Now, that is improper.

Here is the way you do the TRs, and that's probably—you'll find very valuable.

You do TR 0, flunking only TR 0.

You do TR 1. The guy didn't pass TR 0, see. He just got accustomed to it a little bit. TR 1: You do TR 1 flunking only TR 1. Don't flunk anything else.

TR 2: Flunk only TR 2.

TR 3: Flunk only TR 3.

TR 4: Flunk only TR 4. You got the idea?

Now come back to TR 0. Get the guy better at TR 0, and go on through it again, flunking only the TR they are on. You got it?

It's kind of like running the CCHs. You get a better idea of it, you know. They get a little bit of a win at it, and you go on to the next one. You got the idea?

Now you go back, and maybe the third, maybe the fifth run through, according to your judgment, you start TR 0 and you insist that it's pretty good. And there's another element I've just missed. About the third run through you should really start cuffing them around. Flunk only the one they're on, but start cuffing them around hard, see. Give them the business. Give them things they can't possibly confront, you know. Try to shake them up. Let them coast in on it easy. I better review that so that you don't get a double confusion.

TR 0, TR 1, 2, 3, 4, flunking only the TRs 0, 1, 2, 3, 4; flunking only the TRs, not giving the student much trouble. All right.

Now! Start in. TR 0 and give them the works.

TR 1 and give them the works; 2, 3, 4. Flunk only the TR that they're on, but give them the works. You understand? Don't give them a chance.
All right. Now, run through them that way a couple of times flunking only the TR that
they are on, giving them the works, pushing their buttons, you know. Give them something to
confront for sure.

And then start this business of TR 0 – mess them up.

TR 1 – mess them up and flunk TR 0s. Flunk TR 1 and TR 0.

TR 2 – mess them up. Flunk TR 2, TR 1, TR 0.

Get them on TR 3 – you're messing them up. And flunk TR 3, TR 2, TR 1, TR 0.

Get them on TR 4 – messing them up. And flunk TR 4, TR 3, TR 2, TR 1, TR 0.

And thereafter, running the TRs, always give them the works. Flunk everything in that
battery of TRs. You got it?

If you do that, you shorten the time it takes to learn the TRs considerably. You see
how this is?

In other words, you approach this with a gradient scale. We did learn about gradient
scales many years ago. Now we should continue to apply that knowledge. Let the guy get
used to it, and you'll find out they progress much faster if you do it that way.

Now, learning Model Session. Model Session actually can be learned concurrently
with learning the TRs, but for a while just let them learn Model Session. When you've got
somebody that's got all of his TRs pretty good, make them do Model Session, which they've
already learned and they can rattle it off and all that sort of thing They've got it letter perfect,
you understand.

Now there's another Model Session. And that's Model Session with all the TRs in.
They can do Model Session, you see. Is it all right if I don't bat this pc's ears off or something
of that sort? They can run this off, see, rapidly.

And then when they've got their TRs flat, your next gradient step on TRs is Model
Session. You run the TRs with Model Session. And you let them go through it with Model
Session, sitting back, not giving them a bad time but just letting them go through it but flunk-
ing all the TRs, 0 to 4. Just flunk those TRs. Let them go through the Model Session. You see,
they already learned the Model Session, probably while they were doing their TRs. And now
you put them over the jumps, flunking each TR from 0 to 4 inclusive that they flop on. Give
them the business, you see. Just flunk them on these things as you're doing the Model Session.

Now step it up. And give them a lot of trouble as they're doing the Model Sessions,
and flunk all TRs. You got the idea? Long since, you should have finished flunking Model
Session flubs. They should be – before you begin any of this, you see, they should be in a
position where they can go over the Model Session without laying eggs or flubbing, you see.

So now when you're giving them the business up along the line – you see, you just
flunked TRs while they were doing the Model Session. All right. Increase the tempo. That is
to say, give them a bad time while they're trying to do the Model Session and flunk all the
TRs that they flub, see. Because – but now they're going to start flunking on the Model Ses-
tion too, because it'll rattle them. Got the idea?
So you flunk the rattles and you flunk the TRs, and you flunk the lot, and eventually you get a guy up to a point, no matter what button you push, no matter what you do to him, his TRs don't go out and he can continue to do the Model Session. And boy, he's got it made. It gives an auditing presence that is utterly awesome.

But the steps I've just given you here are probably the steps which you should use in teaching staff auditors and people around, field auditors and so forth, to do it. And if you follow those steps and insist they work at it, why, you'll get there, but if you insist that they sit and grind on nothing but "Model Session" (quote), you see, or you sit -- they sit and grind on nothing but TR 0, or you know, you just stop the whole thing. Actually, you in effect stop their learning. They sit on to an endure. It's just like you wouldn't run a CCH after it was flat, see. It's what you're doing. See, you run TR 0 and the guy has gotten a couple of jolts out of it, and he's uuunh, and he's this way, and he's that way. And then all of a sudden, why, he can do it kind of, you know. Well, that's it. That's it, you know. Knock it off then, and go on to TR 1. Got the idea?

So you're running on a gradient scale of wins and you don't keep giving him loses all the time, and he'll eventually get up to where he has a professional presence which is awesome to regard, you know. The room blows up, and he says, "I'll repeat the auditing question", you know. And anything happens, why, he's competent to take care of it. He doesn't get thrown out of session himself, then, just because some extraordinary emergency occurs, you see. He's not so nervous about the way he's running a session that he can't handle a session, you see? Hm? There are no TRs for the -- as such, tailor-made so that the person will just sit there and give the auditing command in the CCHs. But remember that the balance of the TRs which are taught in Upper Indoc are there to back up the CCHs. And you can do those much the same way by gradient scale. Got it?

Of course, it really gets something. You get probably far too complicated when you start doing Upper Indoc TRs, you see, and flunking the lower TRs. That sounds a little bit complicated. You know what I mean, you know? A guy is wrestling around madly with you and so forth, and you all of a sudden flunk him on TR 0. As a matter of fact, it'd be a good gag to pull on somebody, you know. But it shouldn't have any part of the training program.

All right. That should -- that should get you over the hump in teaching large numbers of people to do the TRs. If you follow that type of gradient, why, you'll find that you'll be very successful with it. Okay?

Male voice: Routine 1, CCHs -- what is the guiding factor when you come off Routine 1?

When do you come off Routine 1?

Male voice: Yes.

This is the established criteria. You'd come off of Routine 1 when they were nominally flat. Nominally flat. You don't have to grind them to pieces to the ne plus ultra, but you don't
want a pc who is getting big changes on Routine 1 to be shifted off of them suddenly. That's your main criteria.

The time to take them off, and the only time you can take them off, is when you have gone over CCH 1, 2, 3, 4, and they are, all of them, temporarily flat. You could take the pc off at that time. You could. But the best time to take them off is when they're going through them, not at the beginning of the run when they're not getting any reaction and before you get into the reaction stage of the case.

You know, twenty minutes, no change. Twenty minutes, no change. Twenty minutes, no change. "Well, we've done the CCHs." Like hell we have. You've got to go over them a few times and run through that gamut a few times and all of a sudden gog! you know, and whew! and zoog! and so forth.

Now, when you've got that out of the road, you'll find out that the CCHs have bitten. That's the criteria, you know. Have the CCHs bitten on this pc at all?

All right. If they've bitten, then you'd run it up to a point where you are actually back to – this is the theoretical perfect end of the CCHs – where they were all running routinely twenty minutes apiece, without any change. And of course, it would be a break of the Auditor's Code to run them any longer. After you've gone through them maybe three times with no marked changes, man, the CCHs are flat – with the proviso that they have actually bitten, while being run. Okay? Does that answer the question?

Male voice: Yes, it does.

Good. Security Check, by the way, has nothing to do with it. It is not an influencing factor because it's carried on over into Routine 2 and Routine 3. Just the CCHs influence it. Okay. Any other questions? Yes, Ken?

Male voice: A run-through of Routine 2. I'd like a run-through of 2 – Routine 2.

You'd like a run through of it?

Male voice: Yeah.

In what respect, beyond what's in the bulletin?

Male voice: The scale itself, primary.

The what?

Male voice: The Primary Scale.

Yeah.

Male voice: How is that exactly run? I've heard two ways: run generally through it, just naming off the various different items, levels. And using the terminal.

What terminal?

Male voice: Hm?

What terminal have you got in Routine 2?

Male voice: we don't have any terminal.
That's right. How could you name a terminal? I see where his confusion is.

*Male voice: Ah, okay.*

He's got Routine 2 and Routine 3, and where he has come across the crossroads here is that he's heard that in Routine 2, you can run Prehav 13* which, of course, gives you a list of terminals over in the chronic PTP of the pc.

*Male voice: Ah.*

So, you see, that could slop over into Routine 2.

*Male voice: Okay.*

All right. So therefore, you would have a terminal in Routine 2. There's where that is, but you wouldn't name a terminal unless you were doing Prehav 13 or the fellow has always had trouble with his leg and he just has an awful time with his leg – You can, by the way, take anything like this. You do an assessment. Actually, Routine 2 general runs encroach on goals, but you shouldn't get them confused. They're distinctly different because you're only giving Routine 2 terminals a lick and a promise. You're not doing anything with them to amount to anything. Nothing serious.

So what do you get here? You say to this – you never run a terminal without doing a Terminal Assessment. Always a Terminal Assessment. This individual just keeps telling you, "Well, the reason I want to be audited is because I have this ringing sound all the time in my ears", see. He keeps telling you this, and this is his hidden standard and a bunch of other things, you know. And so you say, well, let's do something about this ringing sound in his ears. It's even coming up as a present time problem. It's getting in our road, something fierce. The corollary is, every time you come into session, they have a big problem, present time problem with the husband. And it takes forty-five minutes of the session to clean this up, session after session. Well, you say, "to hell with this", because "What part of that husband have you been responsible for?" is not about to clean up everything there is to clean up about husbands. You got the idea?

Similarly, by the way, the confusion area here is that sometimes a pc on a Goals Assessment assesses out to his present time problem, but you're still running SOP Goals, you see. I'm talking about this other thing.

This pc just keeps having this present time problem, present time problem, and it keeps getting in your hair. Or the pc has a hidden standard. Just these two conditions. The pc has a hidden standard, hidden standard, hidden standard. What auditing result do you expect? You know, he keeps crabbing, "No results, no results." What's he mean? Let's clarify it.

And he says, "Well, well, doesn't mean anything. I'm just not getting any results."

"Well, what would have to happen for you to know that Scientology worked?" That is the golden question.

And he says, "Well, the ringing would have to stop in my ears, of course. And I know whether auditing has worked, you see, as to whether the ringing in my ears gets louder or

---

* Editor's note: Prehav 13, see definition and description further down in the text.
softer. And sometimes it hits high C and I know I've had a good session", and so on. You can find all kinds of weird things like this going on, see.

All right. Now let's do an assessment on the ringing in his ears. What is it? Is it ears? Is it ringing? Is it heads? You know, what is this difficulty? And we just make him keep saying terminals, terminals, terminals, terminals, terminals. You get the idea?

We keep writing them down, writing them down, writing them down. We get a whole bunch of terminals for this ringing in the ears, you know. A whole gang of them. And if it hasn't disappeared in getting the terminals, which it very often does, then you turn around and you run an assessment on these terminals. Find one which falls the most. You don't have to do it by elimination, by the way. That's just getting just a little bit too purposeful. Just take the one that seems to be the most reactive in that list, gives the most change, you see.

We take that and we assess it on the Prehav Scale. It's a kind of a mockery, you know, of SOP Goals, and we assess it on the Prehav Scale, same way. We give it great seriousness. We run it. We run it, see, on the Prehav Scale, but you'll find out that very often you have to run it by the needle. The level doesn't last long enough. And sometimes it grinds out longer than you would think, and you'll be quite surprised, but keep it going. And get it a bit flat. Sometimes it might take you two or three sessions, or something like this to get this thing really flat. When it seems to flatten, by any criteria, assess it again on the Primary Scale. Don't bother with Secondary Scales. Not for something like this. And assess it again and run it again. And maybe you might have to assess it again and run it again. But that time's [it's] gone. Now you've gotten the chronic present time problem that you were handling session after session wasting time on, with a poor process, see, with a rudiments process, and it was a very weak process. Well, let's get in there and pitch. See.

All right. The Prehav Scale opens up. You can run this particular terminal. You can run it ragged. If it goes more than three or four sessions though, you'd better ask yourself if you're doing right, you know. Something wrong here. I'd do it all over again. Do a Terminals Assessment on it all over again or something. It's going too long. All right.

Now the other operation, that's the PT problem sort of thing. That's PT problem of long duration to be absolutely technical. A person's had this for a number of years but not more than one lifetime, see. You do the same thing with Prehav 13, which is pretty gorgeous, by the way. That's a pretty gorgeous one. You -- you just better get that in your working kit because it'll run on practically anybody under the sun. And it just is marvelous. So far, all the reports I've had on Prehav 13 were utterly rave reports. So it's got lots of velocity. And it's called 13 not because of the position on the Primary Scale, which is what you're liable to confuse it with, because it's a successor to Formula 13.

And what you do, the way it's been is very easy. All you do is make a long list of everybody the preclear knows, even faintly, but personally, in his whole lifetime, this whole lifetime. Just keep putting down names.

Now, as the pc runs along, he's also going to think of other names, and every time you do an assessment on this list, he's going to think of more names. Well, you add those to the end of the list. You don't assess them when they came up. You got the idea? Don't Q-and-A with it. Just keep putting these new names he thinks of on the end of the list.
In other words, there's just a stable datum there that every time he thinks of a new name after he's ended his list – you know, the list is over. "That's everybody I know." Now he thinks of twelve new names, see. You add those to the end of the list. You don't assess them at the time he gives them to you. You just assess them in turn. You got it?

All right. You take this list and it'll be a rather imposing, overwhelming affair, and you're liable to think the first time you ever do this, "Good heavens, we're going to spend the next 875 hours of auditing doing nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing, nothing, but go over this list, list, list, nothing. Kawow!"

Well, that isn't true. As you do the assessment and try to find out which person it is, and as you pick one of these names because of its greater reaction... By the way, you – you assess down the list – you could assess something on the order of taking twenty of the names as a block, and just assess that twenty, and find the person in that block of twenty that has the deepest fall, you see. You don't have to assess the whole list like you would in SOP Goals. It actually doesn't much matter how you do it, you got it? You're straining at gnats; you're the ensign out there on the bridge, looking through the sextant with chewing gum in the eyepiece and pointing it and taking a very fine meridian altitude on the truck light. And then he goes below and spends the next seven or eight hours, you see, figuring it all out to the ninety-fifth decimal point, you see?

So he figures out – the point he finally arrives at was – is actually far smaller than a pin punched in the ocean, you know. The accuracy of his action is, however, anything that would put him anywhere on this planet with a sextant. You got the idea? I mean, this is a standard one. It's one I joke about because frankly it's one I've seen many times. This tremendous – I've seen engineers do this, you know. I've had engineers – well, you've seen them, too. It's just horrifying.

And sometimes these guys will be horrified at what you're doing, you know. And you say, "Well, we're going to throw this bridge across this stream here. We've got to fix up this – this steel column here so it's going to support the roof", you know, and golly, you throw in all of these factors. You think it over, you know, and you say, "Well, let's see, there's going to be a lot of tonnage up there, and then there'd be tonnage moving in and out. And there'd be this and there'd be that. And the mass of the roof is so forth, and our factor of safety, let's call it 5, and so forth." And you say, "Well, let's make the thing so it'll hold up 192 tons."

And this fellow you're working with says, "Aren't you going to measure it?" you know.

And you say, "Measure it, why?"

"Well, well, I know, but good heavens, such inaccuracy you know?"

And you look at him and you say, "But there isn't any way to get a totally accurate down-to-the-last-ounce weight on any building. The wind blows, people move a machine upstairs. After you've built the building, why, they drag in another machine, and they overstress the area and they understress it, and during certain times of the day it has lots of foot traffic, and other times it has none. How are you going to stabilize the load on this beam? There is no such thing as a constant load on ..."
"Oh, well, yes, there is, you know." And they just believe this so implicitly, it's pathetic, you know. And half the time those guys will put up a beam, and you'll put one small electric motor or something up above this beam, and it crumples, you know, like a piece of taffy. But, boy, have they figured it. Man, they've got the last piece of gravel that is going to be on the roof, you know. They have figured out even the weight of the seeds of dandelions that are going to blow, you know, and touch the top of the building. [laughter] They got them all. And then they'll frankly go on by the hour, and they will take this figure — which is at best a very rough, rough guesstimate, see — and then they'll take this figure and with what agony will they reduce it to what accuracy. See? And golly, you watch this. But they watch you equally in horror, you see, as you're doing an inexact operation.

For instance, I happen to know that the stresses on a helicopter airfoil had never been measured. Nobody has ever measured one because we don't have men that endure enough to get out there on an actual helicopter blade, you see, and put spring balances on them this way and that. And a slow motion picture demonstrates that a helicopter wing, while spinning — they're wings really — they've got a twist in them as much as thirty-five to fifty degrees. And you'll see this — this blade going this way and this way under actual use. It's the most horrifying thing to watch. You say, "How can any piece of material ever do this", see? And as the helicopter wing swings forward, it's got one set of stresses, and then as it goes around past the nacelle and goes back, it's got another set of stresses entirely different. And somebody's going to calculate this? Man, that is just unimaginable. After they've calculated it, you see, what have they got to do? They've got to carve out a helicopter blade and swing it around to find out what it's going to do in actual service, and then make it a bit stronger, and they've got it. And that's the way it's normally done anyhow.

So I don't want in any respect to give you any idea that an exact formula, you see, exists in an area where the most wild, rough, slapdash is going to do some good, don't you see.

Now, it's quite one thing with what precision — because boy, it is precise if you do it right. And a lot of you have got reality on it, when you've run out all the guy's goals and you've got all of his terminals flat, man, the final one is just sitting there, and it's inevitable, and explains everything that's been going on and so on, and there it is.

In other words, you're up with a single answer because you're trying to achieve this single answer, you see. And there isn't any other answer. It isn't a dozen answers. It's just one.

Well now, that's quite a precise activity, and you then assess this particular one answer on the Prehav Scale and you're running for blood because you're running the fellow's whole track. Well, you have to do it pretty precisely. You have to make sure that it's the right level, after making very sure that it's the right terminal. Oh, yeah, a very precise activity. But looka-here: Prehav 13? Look, for heaven's sakes, there is no way to determine how fast these things are going to disappear. They may disappear on his mentioning having remembered them. They may disappear on charge on having them included in the list and read a couple of times as you're going over assessments.

They may disappear on the basis of you're — you've just got them, and you say, "All right. Now we're going to take Joe Jones, and we're going to run him on the Prehav Scale. Now, would Joe Jones be Cause?" You know, and here we go, you know, anything on the
Prehav Scale, and all of a sudden we're looking at the Prehav Scale, we're trying to assess Joe Jones, you know. Oh, we got a fall, you see, at Cause, and a tick at Faith. And we go back to those, and we can't get any reaction. No, you blew Joe Jones in the process of trying to get him on the Prehav Scale.

All right. Let's say we've got Minnie Gulch. And Minnie Gulch is over here, and we get her, see, on the Prehav Scale. And we actually find a level and it assesses out beautifully. And Minnie is sitting right there at Withheld Effect or something, and here she is. Man, we're all set, and we're forming the auditing command, and we're all set. There's no reaction on this thing, let's see now. She's gone.

And then you're suddenly startled out of your wits by having Mr. Zilch suddenly turn up on the case and not only hold good for a whole assessment, but hold good for the whole of the formation of an auditing command and hold good for about five hours of auditing Kawow! See? This throws you out of balance totally.

So every time you have to go through the same action. But don't expect that there's going to be anything very definite about how long that name is going to stay hot, because it isn't going to stay hot in some cases and it is in others, and it's very inexact. Well, in view of the fact that you've got this many vagaries of behavior of the list – yes, it is done precisely the same way every time, but it doesn't much matter whether you assess the whole list or assess part of the list or do what. It's all in what would be the most effective or efficient on how you handle this list – actually, how you assembled the list and so on. This is rough because you're doing a very inexact thing And I'll tell you why it's very inexact. Do you think there's a single person on that list that he's going over that had actually power enough to aberrate him the way he is?

So if you make the mistake of believing you were doing anything else but making the case happier or easier to run and getting all the present time problems out of the road, taking these people off as locks. You're just making things easier for yourself, you see. That's the only reason you're doing Prehav 13. In spite of the fact that it makes the preclear happy, it isn't going to do a great deal for his case at large. It's just going to make him easier to audit.

You haven't gotten any of his major aberrations out of the road. If you got one out of the road, don't get silly and believe that you've done something fabulous for this case because, let me tell you, you haven't. There isn't anybody on the list he'll give you for this lifetime that had power enough to aberrate him. Not a single soul. And this guy says all of a sudden, "Oh, I just had this wonderful result and thank heavens you finally found out the fact that my father used to beat me every evening, and I never forgave him for this. And isn't that fine, and isn't that nice?" Aw, pishtash! [laughter]

It'll last at best only about twenty-four hours, forty-eight hours, something like this. Now, if you could get all of his recall back on this lifetime, ah, that would be a big step forward. If you got all the not-knows off on this lifetime, that would be big. Because you'd be opening the track to his other lives. There's another Security Check that's coming up which is the whole track Security Check. You got it?

Audience: Yeah.
Of course, you wouldn't use that until the person had some kind of an idea that he'd had a past. I imagine it's quite something to struggle with, isn't it? Well, don't take it unless it falls. Unless you get an instant fall, don't pay any attention to it. A lot of these things are intriguing, you know. And you could wind the pc up just bragging. [laughter]

Here's this other Prehav 13 though. Well, you're just smoothing out the auditing and you're smoothing out his life, and you're keeping him from getting rudiments out while you're auditing him. Now, don't mistake it. This is very valuable. But that's all you're doing. So to lay you down any precise estimate of "For 3 minutes and 57 seconds point 9 if the tone arm is registering at 7.1, but preferably if it is registering at 7.199264", [laughter] "this you do and that you do and so forth. And then it's this way and it's that-a-way and so forth." No, it's just one of these crude, rough, kick it over, let's find out what's biting him. Let's get these PT problems all out of the road effectively on the Prehav Scale, you see (which is pretty powerful), instead of kicking them in to sessions and having to get rid of them in rudiments all the time.

That's actually the basic use of Prehav 13, is keep yourself from being messed up all the time by having the rudiments out, you see. That's its basic use. And its auditing value? The pc'll think it's marvelous – actually very slight.

Compared to a Security Check, it's nothing. Therefore, this type of action gives you all of the latitude in the world. How do you find all these people? Well, if you just took everybody you knew and took them one after the other, crudely, and assessed them on the Prehav Scale, most of them would blow out. Oh, you leave five hot. So what! They didn't do anything to him, anyhow. Got the idea?

See, its a very highly imprecise action. It's just something that you get out of the road. You can go over this list. You'd end it when you could go over the list without getting any kicks on the needle. That's all. Not even with a very high sensitivity, you know. You know, third-of-a-dial drop.

Oh, I got a joke on somebody on sensitivity. I told you Herbie was having trouble, and I put him back on the line, and I had it put up on the board here. But he says, "Sure enough." Only, it was – surprised me, the observer on the ground found something that I didn't necessarily predict, see. I thought that he'd find that they were setting the sensitivity knob too high while they were doing rudiments. This isn't what he found. Being right on the ground, he had an opportunity to observe it. No. None of them knew what a third-of-a-dial drop was. [laughter] You see?

Remember what I was telling you. It's just fantastic. It's just the unguessable. [laughter] Don't bother to guess it. Just look. We used to have a slogan: Look. Don't think. And it sure applies to this kind of thing, you know. Some guy is having an awful lot of trouble. Well, go look, man. Go look.

All right. The running of Prehav 13, the running a PT problems on a goals-type assessment, are done in Routine 2. And Routine 3 isn't clobbered up with this stuff at all. And there's where you got your crisscross.
Now, when you're just doing a general run as called for in Routine 2, you do your assessments just as you would assess for a terminal, but you certainly aren't mentioning any terminals. And you just go down the line. Same way. What I do is I take the list from the bottom and I run on up toward the top until the needle starts rising consistently. I do use a needle rise. And when it starts rising, I say, well, why go any higher, you know. And as I've gone up, I simply make a mark after the Prehav level that reacted. Every one that reacted. I didn't linger around on it.

You never repeat Prehav levels. You just say them, and it reacts, and you go on to the next one. And then pretty soon you'll find the needle starts climbing and climbing, and you say, "Well, we've hit the end of this fellow's reality."

All right. So we start back down again, and now we only take those points that we have a mark after. And we read those over once and find which one of those is still live. Any one of those that's still live, we make the same mark after it. Now you've got about two, three levels, or something like this you've got, with two marks after them.

Now, you read that second-mark level again to the pc, you see. You know, the one that got the reaction again, and you read those three over. And one of them falls out, and then you play the two against each other that remain. And one of those will fall out, and that is the level. And that is the fastest, most accurate way I know of, of doing a Prehav Assessment with a terminal, with a general level or anything else.

If you were to find that – while you were running SOP Goals – I'll make this comment because it – there were several checks here as to whether or not you're on the right track and you're doing all right as an auditor. I'd better mention them.

One of them is you do – this is about the third time – second or third time you've assessed this pc – preferably about the third time – on an SOP Goals run, and you're assessing this terminal which you have long since established on the Prehav Scale the third time, you see. You've already gotten rid of a couple of levels. You've run them. And all of a sudden you find twelve, fifteen levels of the Prehav Scale are alive. Uh-uh-uh, oh-oh, mm-mm, da-dadadat-dat. Wrong terminal. Wrong terminal. You goofed. And the thing to do is to end the assessment there. Right now.

Don't go on with it. You've got twelve, fifteen levels live. Something is awfully wrong. First find out what's been going on. Has the pc been selfauditing this thing? Has he been auditing some other terminal to himself? Has somebody else been running him, you know? Ask the obvious questions. No. None of these things.

So you sort of assume, well, I've goofed. So let's go back to the terminals list, and let's take the whole terminals list that we had, and let's read it all over again to the pc and find out what's wrong with it. And we may find that we have bought a cognition surge or something like this, and we selected that terminal too rapidly or something of the sort. Let's go back, because now we will find, possibly, that it wasn't quite the right terminal. Now we get the right terminal. Now just go on and run. Don't bother to go back to check your goal. That's certainly not going to be out. Your goal is kind of uncheckable anyhow, because the moment the pc's attention is put on terminals for the goal, the goal desensitises.
All right. So that's the – that's one test as to whether or not in Routine 3 you're on the right track. There is another test of similar validity. And when you're doing a level and, without being even questionably flat, the tone arm just goes up, particularly between sessions – the tone arm just goes up. This doesn't happen every time, but between sessions, you know. He left reading at 3.5 and he comes back in reading at 6.0. Or you're running him, and fantastically you've got a tone arm which goes – it's been running between 3.0 and 4.0, and all of a sudden it starts to run between 4.0 and 5.0, and then starts to run between 5.0 and 6.0. Well, that's another check. Your rudiments are out. That's all that means. Your rudiments have gone out somewhere along the line, see. The pc's got a withhold from you. The pc's got a present time problem. The pc's got something or other.

Now, this is a little bit confusing to read because toward the end of a line, just before the level gets flat on a terminal, this also happens – to a slighter degree, but it also happens. Your level is just about going to get flat, and the tone arm will go up half a point, and it kind of gets sticky and goes up and so forth. Well, so naturally, the best way to get around this is to check the rudiments before you reassess. If you think something is flat, your end rudiments should be very thorough. You think something is flat, you should end the session and hit those end rudiments very thoroughly, before you do your next assessment. And of course, you've got another crack at it in your beginning rudiments.

Now do your assessment, and if the level that you have been running is still alive and it was only an ARC break, it'll become obvious to you because the rudiments were badly out. You understand? And if the thing appeared flat, but then you went into the end rudiments, and the rudiments were very badly out, you would then assume that it really wasn't flat. And the – really the safe thing to do even before you reassess or test anything or anything else is, run another twenty minutes of it. See, after you've got the rudiments straightened up, run another twenty minutes before you finally get down to assessments. You see that?

That's the careful auditor. You won't make any goofs this way. A pc can go out of session, and the level you're running on SOP Goals appears to be flat. This is normally signalized by – when it's apparently flat, but reason is an ARC break or something, the tone arm is going to go pretty well up before it flattens. It's going to go pretty well up. So as I say, in – before you assess again, you should run those end rudiments, run some beginning rudiments, and if you found the rudiments were wildly out, just assume that thing wasn't flat and run another twenty minutes of it. Another test, in other words.

Now, this is – works exactly the same way in running Routine 2 on general runs. That general run is a highly precise action. And all of a sudden you're running Failed Leave on the pc, and you're running it and run it and running it and running it and running it and run it and run it and run it. And all of a sudden the tone arm goes up about two dial-divisions. And all of a sudden there's no motion. Well, one of two things could be the case.

Case 1: It's flat. And Case 2: He's gotten a violent ARC break or a violent PT problem or something else has happened, very harsh, very rough on the case. And in either case, whether running Routine 2 or Routine 3, you should make a very careful rudiments check. So therefore, you end the session. You don't say "Well, that process is flat. We're going to reassess for a new process." No, sir. That'd be a bum one to do. What you do is go over those end
rudiments. Now see if they were wildly out. You know, he had a PT problem. He had an ARC break. He had a withhold. I mean, you know, wow! See?

And you notice while you're doing this that the tone arm comes down. You'll see that happen, if this is the case, you see. And don't ever make the mistake of thinking the level you were running was flat because it isn't. And the safe thing to do is to, of course, give it another twenty minutes.

Now, if it *is* flat, of course, it'll remain flat. There isn't anything mysterious going to happen here. Nothing is going to unflatten it. There isn't any walking on the thin edge of anything. Go ahead. Test it again. So you might say, to absolutely guarantee the results you're going to get, the proper thing to do is, when a level is flat — whether Routine 2 or Routine 3 — the proper thing to do is to run end rudiments, beginning rudiments, and if these things markedly shifted the tone arm down, run it for another twenty minutes to find out if it was flat. Okay?

Of course, this even means an ARC break for the pc sometimes. But so what? I'll tell you this. I've never had it fail that when a preclear was ARC breaking on the basis of "You are running this level, and this level has long since been flat!" and so forth, and I have never seen it otherwise in the case that the level was just about as flat as the Tasmanian Sea, which everybody knows measures waves seventy feet between trough and crest. Not flat.

Just the fact that the pc is saying, "Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow, yow. And I know it's flat, and I'm tired of it, and I want to get off of this, and you just keep running it. And actually it's killing me because you're bringing in these other masses on me, you see. And it's all very ruinous and *yippety-yap, yippety-yap, yippety-yap.* I don't even look at an E-Meter. I just go on running it. Not to punish the pc, but I know the pc is just on the verge of a startling and horrendous gain, and sure enough you'll see it every time.

The pc will all of a sudden say, "Oh, well, what do you know. Gee. Wow, *uh-huh-huh! Hearh!"* They never tell you though, "Boy, it's lucky you kept on running that, man." They never say that. They never hear them say it anyhow. They only say, "Yow, yow, yow, and it's flat, and you know it's flat, and you're just running it to punish me. You're just running it because I said I didn't want to run it. That's why you're running it."

It's like the CCHs. When anybody says, "No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No! No! No CCHs. That's only for nuts, psychotics. That's for bums. My case isn't in that bad shape. Actually, I had the CCHs totally flattened in 1952." [laughter] And, oh boy, is that a good enough reason to run them. I mean, it's a perfect assessment. Something is overwhumping the pc here. Because a fellow, let me tell you, that has the CCHs flat will simply sit down and run the CCHs, bang! There's nothing to it, see. You just sit down, he'll run the CCHs. You got a reality on that now, I'm sure. They sit down, they run the CCHs. So what's that? That's nothing very drastic. The auditor will find out in exactly eighty minutes that they are flat.

All right. Good. Of course, if the pc asks you to put it in writing so that it won't happen again, [laughter] once more we have another test. The only place that the CCHs can really fool you is on the beginning of the run, and that's the only place a level can really fool an auditor. There is no telling at the beginning on many cases, whether the CCHs are flat or the level is flat. Because in one case the pc has no reaction; in the other case, the E-Meter has no
reaction. You don't get any reaction out of the pc in the CCHs. You don't get any reaction out of the meter on the level. And you go on. You run it and you run it and you run it, and you go through them once, and you go through them twice, and you go through them again. Aaaahhhhh. Nothing happening here, and all of a sudden the pc says, "Thuuuup!" Thud!

And then they get liver, and they get liver, and they get liver and liver, and then they're getting real hot, and the pc's going along just dandy, and everything is fine, and only after they've hit a peak of some kind, do they then cool off.

Similarly, with a level: you take some case, particularly that has to have a high sensitivity knob setting. And you start to run this level, and it's Failed Cause or something, you know. And here you go. "What have you done to the Confederacy? What has the Confederacy done to you?" Failed Cause, something of that sort. [laughter] And you get to run it along, and here you go. And you're getting an eighth-of-a-dial tone arm motion. Eighth-of-a-dial tone arm motion. Eighth-of-a-dial tone arm motion. Every twenty minutes it shifts a sixteenth of a division, you know, that kind of thing, you know.

And it'll shift an eighth of a division, and then it'll shift a quarter of a division. Then it'll shift half a division, and then it'll shift a division, then it'll shift two divisions, and it looks like it's doing a rock slam over on the tone arm read, see. And then it's hot, hot, hot, hot. And it runs hot. And it runs for a long time, and then it starts running cool, cooler, cooler, cooler, cooler, flat.

And you can expect this cycle of action to occur on the unflatness of any process in the three routines. That can happen anywhere in the three routines. The person is getting no reaction to something at all. And then the reaction suddenly increases. Okay?

All right. Is there – are there any other questions? I answered that one rather obliquely, but it's some data I thought you ought to have. Is there any other question? ...

Okay. Well then, you've had a successful week, have you?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, on this weekend, you're not going to have anything to do this weekend. Nothing for you to do this weekend except, well, do SOP Goals and run the Security Checks and routine things like this. [laughter]

I want you to check over with yourself – have a heart-to-heart talk with your thetan – [laughter] and check over yourself, "Now, are my TRs pretty good? Do my TRs stay in while I'm in a Model Session – doing Model Session? Do I really know everything there is to know about this here E-Meter? Or is there some things that I don't know about this E-Meter?"

Find out definitely if you really think you've got a good grasp on Security Checking, and find out if your idea of running the CCHs – if you're running those okay; if there's anything you need to know about those. And then look over very carefully, and find out if you got a good grip on general assessments and the Prehav Scale, and so forth, on doing an SOP Goals Assessment.

Sort of do a review on yourself on those seven points, and let's see whether or not you have anything else to learn on these points that you feel terribly stupid about. And if, while
you're checking these over, a horrible feeling of stupidity comes over you, while you're just checking these over, then ask your thetan what it is. [laughter] But don't let it stop there. Don't let it stop there. Let's tell your Instructors about it and see if you can get some point in it straightened out. Okay?

Don't hide from yourself a lack of knowledge along these lines. Don't kid yourself, because there's no point in it. You're not getting any grades. Nobody is giving you any grades at all. It's the world that's going to grade you. Why should I? Okay?

Thank you.
ROUTINE 1A-PROBLEMS

A lecture given on 3 July 1961

This is the 3rd of July, and I told you today that I was only going to talk to you three days a week, but I was sitting upstairs and I got lonesome. [laughter] Besides, you have – something **new** has been added.

Now, you go ahead and add things, you know. You're always adding things to processing – I see somebody was doing a Goals Assessment on some pc, somewhere along the line, is – was something on, "What success have you had? Thank you. What success have you had? Thank you. Oh, that was too bad. What success have you had? Thank you." you know? Weird.

So anyhow, if you want to add things, well, I might as well be able to add things, too, [laughter] and there is a place for another routine. Actually, there are places for many other routines, and it'll probably go up like the CCHs did, you know? Get all complicated, and then be cut back to simplicity.

This is Routine 1A is what I'm talking about. And I'll call to your attention that we did not change, differentiate or invalidate Routines 1, 2 and 3. They're pretty good as far as I'm concerned. They've stood the tests – all the crisscross tests of time.

But there is a case that should be run on CCHs that can't be run on CCHs. There is such a case.

Now, let's look this over. There are three things which can hold up cases: present time problem, a big withhold or an ARC break. ARC breaks normally stem from withholds.

There is a process on ARC breaks, which is "Recall an ARC break." It is not an unpoweful process. It is quite a process. If not flat, it becomes quite a process. That's just that one process. It's just one repetitive command. "Recall an ARC break." That exists.

And if ARC breaks are taken separately or under the heading of overts and withholds – to which they're intimately connected – it gives you either two or three things that could be wrong with a case that isn't progressing, you see?

It could be present time problem, withholds and ARC breaks. Or it could be present time problem and O/W. You see? They both amount, more or less, to the same thing.

So you'd say there are fundamentally two things, then, which are productive of three things. All of which mean case deterioration or no progress.

The two things, of course, are problems and withholds. And these are productive of problems, withholds and ARC breaks, you see? But by running just the two of them, you can cure three, ordinarily.
The person who ARC breaks badly, and so forth, is normally staggering along under lots of withholds and a lot of unkind thoughts and that sort of thing. ARC breaks should come under the heading of O/W, in any event, because that's the way you cure an ARC break with the pc. The pc is ARC breaky, you run O/W and that's it.

But there is nothing, via'd, that will cure a withhold except getting rid of the withhold. And there is nothing that cures a problem but getting rid of problem.

Do you see that? You're looking a little bit blankly at it. I wonder why? Because this is terribly, terribly, basically simple.

If a case isn't progressing in an HGC, you immediately assume that the case is either being audited on a PTP or the case is being audited with a tremendous withhold. See, these two things is what you immediately assume and that's what you should assume.

So how about the CCHs walking uphill against tremendous present time problems? There's no way to get rid of the present time problems, if you're running the CCHs, because there are no rudiments; and your rudiments processes probably wouldn't work on this pc anyway, quite interestingly. They don't work very well. So this leaves us room for Routine 1A.

Now, Routine 1A would take care of just these two factors: the problem and the withhold. Just these two factors would be cared for. That would be all. You wouldn't do anything else, then, but run a Problems Process and a Security Check. Problems Processes and Security Checks, and Problems Processes and Security Check. You got the idea?

Well, the only reason 1A could come to fruition so suddenly is that I had a nice blue flash. It was about from here to that oak tree down in the middle of there, and it turned the air a little bit ozonish for just a few minutes; and suddenly realized that all this work that has been done on problems – which began in earnest about 55 and saw the light of day in 56, and it's been heavily stressed ever since – had not been simplified to its lowest level of simplification. And that lowest level of simplification is the process "Recall a problem."

It runs all legs of the bracket. It'll run thirty-two legs of the bracket if you let it, see? It doesn't say whose problem you're supposed to recall.

Of course, the person usually recalls their own problems for a while, and then they realize that they're a problem to somebody else, and so forth. And this gets this thing of problems. Something – you do something about problems. Not necessarily a fast process.

But there are several things that I should tell you about problems in order to understand the handling of this particular thing. And I finally have found out what it is that makes a problem so deadly in processing.

Well, a problem is postulate-counter-postulate. A problem is ordinarily two ideas counter-opposed. It's an indecisional proposition. One cannot decide, because there are two things one could decide and when these things become even faintly in balance, one of course gets his attention on two data. This, of course, is almost impossible as a situation. So one doesn't see the amount of confusion on it. And the confusion tends to ball up and pile up, you see? And the confusion starts mounting around each one of these data. And you get two separate zones of confusion and the stable data.
I'll give you an idea:

Mary says, "Let us go to the movies."

And John says, "Let us play checkers."

Now, if these two things are of equal magnitude as to what we should do, we cannot look at the idea of movies and we cannot look at the idea of checkers. Because, you see, there's no deciding between these two things. Then, of course, movies start to ball up as a confusion. You see, because we're going to go to the movies, but we're not going to do it, you know? We're going to do it, but we're not going to do it. That's just an insane situation, you see? Now, we're going to play checkers, but we're not going to play checkers.

So we get two of these confusion and the stable datum. There are two of them there, not one. See, there isn't just the confusion and the stable datum, which is the ordinary spin that a person gets into and gets out of. There's two of them.

And you mustn't look at either postulate and you don't look at either confusion. So nothing gets as-ised. So a problem tends to persist and the common denominator of a problem is persistence. Of all things that endure, a problem is the endurigest. Problems endure longer.

So people become impatient with problems and they solve them. Now, a problem that is solved is a problem that is not-ised, not a problem which is as-ised, in the ordinary solution.

Now, people go along solving problems all the time.

Now, the solution of a problem, at the finest reductio ad absurdum, is of course, an overt against a problem. See? Problems can't just be problems; they have to be solved. And so much is so, that everything there is in this universe is a cure for something else, which is to say a solution to some other problem. And this is a basic factor in the persistence of the universe.

This isn't the only reason the universe persists. Mechanically, there is another reason. But as far as thinkingness is concerned, we get the oddity that everything is a cure for everything else and that all cures deteriorate and in their turn, become the new problem. All cures become the new problems.

Now, Jan and Dick, one time when I was discussing this in a lecture, they went home and figured out what time and space and matter and energy and so forth, were in time – in terms of cures. And they got it pretty good.

I had a big rack of cures of various things, in the lower order. So they pushed it over into the sixth dynamic to see what they were cures for and sure enough, they figured out that time was a cure for space and ... You get the idea. And energy was a cure for time. Everything was a cure for that.

I've never investigated this very thoroughly but it was quite interesting. Just the concept that these very elements with which we deal were cures for other things. But the basic thing is that nearly everything is a cure for something else.

All right. Let's look this over then. If that's the case, let's take a good notion here as to what this is all about and we find that alcohol, just about a century and a half ago, was curing
things. It was curing things. There is no doubt about it. I'll tell you that a naval vessel, like the USS Constitution, wouldn't carry three-quarters of its stores in potable beverages, unless it was good for something.

And somebody would get tired, you see? And they'd take a drink and they'd feel better – and life at sea was pretty miserable in those days – and they'd get cold and wet, or have a cold coming on or something, and they would take a drink and that would cure it. It really would cure it, you see? It was smooth. It really did work.

And nowadays, you take a drink and you get tired; and we have a disease called alcoholism. See, it itself is a disease.

Now, bacteria itself that causes disease at one time or another cured something and you can figure out most diseases on the basis of what they cured, which is quite amazing to figure out.

Well, you take an organization that is hammer and tongs on the subject of creativeness. The Roman Catholic Church is – no propaganda in this at all – it's just the fact that they do really have the hatchet out on the second dynamic, you know? I mean, they're real frothy on this subject. They don't think any creation ought to be done that can possibly be prevented. You realize that from their literature.

And they actively oppose any material being segregated which in any way, shape or form informs about cures or as-ises or has anything to do with the eradication of venereal disease. Because they think it's a good thing.

And VD programs in New York City in the recent decade or so ran into the heavy, heavy, heavy weather of anti... well, Catholic propaganda. They were just hot on this. They wouldn't let anything be shown to educate people into VD. Educate them as to what it was or how to take care of it or anything else. They spent enormous sums of money.

I see you're looking very blank about it. But this – I guess I'm telling you something that's news to you.

This is not news to anybody in the medical profession. They, as a matter of fact, are quite hot on the subject. That somebody would prevent the public from knowing actively how to take care of themselves on the subject of VD, of course, condemns the rest of the population to contagion – unwitting contagion and so forth.

It's just somebody is idiotically explaining how cancer is all right, you know? It's okay, you know? It's a good cure. Well of course, VD is a cure for sex. That's all it is.

Actually, there's terrifically heavy incidence of VD amongst military personnel. Why?

Well, I don't know. For some reason or other people get into armies and navies and so forth and they don't run into any women. I think it's very unenterprising of them; never had the trouble myself. But they do. They get into camps and things like this, and there are no women, you see? And they get on board ships and they're gone for some time at sea, and there's no women. I don't know who perpetuates this weird idea.

I know I wrote the Navy Department in 1942 and said we could use seven or eight girls on board. They didn't ... [laughter]
Actually, it would have been a good thing – having nothing to do with the second dynamic – because we couldn't get any sailors to man the guns, because we had to do all the cooking and yeoman work and so forth with fighting men, you see?

But I got interested in this one day, because we had innumerable – numerous cases of VD – a very unlovely subject. And of course, these cases would sort of wind up on my docket as something I had to do something about.

And when you're working in expeditions or corvettes, or something like this, you seldom have a doctor. Or the doctor is dead drunk or something. You sail out of a port and you've got seven out of a crew of a hundred men totally incapacitated. That can be very serious when you're already shorthanded, you see? VD. So of course, you break out the knockout drops and the sulfathiazole and the penicillin and so on and you let them have it.

Well, what was very interesting to me, a little Jewish boy – he was a terrific, terrific, terrific yeoman. He was marvelous. And he must have been all at about eighteen, something like this. He was quite a little guy. And, ah... name was Hymie. And Hymie came down with a roaring case of VD out on the Pacific coast. That's very interesting because all Hymie had to do was think of a girl, you see, and he'd practically go up through the funnel.

And we went out to rescue a careless pilot, who had mistaken the middle of the Pacific for his landing field and Hymie was hauled off the ship by the local medic. And Hymie, in tears, came by as they were dragging him away – literally dragging him away, you see – because here was his ship going to sea. My God, you know, and here he was being hauled over on the dock.

And he says to me, he says, "But Captain", he says, "I have never had anything to do with a woman, never in my whole life. How could I have venereal disease?" And they dragged him over on the dock. There was – doctors are a suspicious lot.

And we came back, having not found the aircraft. The army – I think they forgot to despatch it or something and everybody is educated by the movies, you know, into believing, you know that an aircraft goes up, and if it's unreported for fifteen and a half seconds that there are rescue squadrons all over the place, you know; and people talking efficiently on phones, and the Coast Guard talking to this and merchant ships at sea being alerted in all directions, you know. And you have very nice music backgrounding all this up, you know, [laughter] and so forth. And that isn't the way it's done at all.

All of a sudden, you'll hear a plaintive cry, someplace or another, and it sounds like a very faint Mayday and somebody's going down somewhere. And you take a radio fix on him and you instantly radio a base someplace, the nearest aircraft base. And you say, "Is one of your planes missing?"

And they say, "Well, we don't know."

"Oh, you don't know?"

"Well, no. We don't count planes taking off from here. You think we're crazy or something?"

And, "Well, is one of your aircraft missing?"
"Well, uh ... oh, I don't know. We'll find out in the next few days. Do you have to know?"

And you say, "Well, there's somebody out here yelling Mayday."

"Oh? Probably isn't from our base." [laughter]

That's an actual experience. I never did find any aircraft base that knew where any of its aircraft were, so that was pretty good. It's all propaganda, I'm afraid.

I don't suppose they abandon all of them. I suppose occasionally, when the press boys are around, they suddenly send out somebody to crash and get rescued or something.

Here we had ... That's a cynical attitude, but they're cynical people. I'm just Q-and-Aing with it.

So I pulled in alongside of the dock, and we're all disgusted, and there's nothing has happened. And we're all beat up and thoroughly dusted by the cruel, cruel sea. And we pull up alongside the same dock, and there's Hymie, see? And he's standing there with his kit bag, you know and he's looking very happy and very cheerful.

And he comes aboard and he says to me, he says, "Skipper", he says, "Heck, I didn't have it. I didn't have it. They told me it was something called a nonspecific." [laughter]

I talked to the medicos about this and they said, "Oh, yes, we get lots of those, lots of those." He said, "There's no bacteria present. There's nothing present and so forth. It's just a tremendous discharge." He says, "A lot of boys get very, very worried about this sort of thing."

I got to thinking about it later. I was going over this subject, here, a few years ago and it occurred to me that, obviously, venereal disease stops sex. So if sex is stopped, you get venereal disease. Got the idea? See, no sex equals venereal disease. Because venereal disease equals no sex.

And it goes both ways and you only get this high incidence of VD amongst very sex-starved people; and you get these nonspecific venereal diseases, you see, amongst groups of people who haven't anything to do with sex at all. Quite interesting, huh?

Of course, prostitution, and so forth, is about as close as you can get to no sex. You just ask men around London how close you can get to no sex at all, and they tell you prostitution. I actually conducted a campaign on this some time ago. That's also sort of a no-sex proposition, you see.

So this combines up in various ways, and we've got no sex, and we get over here a no-sex condition. So that's probably what VD is anyhow, because it very often doesn't even exist as bacteria. You got the idea? It's got all the symptoms, and somebody could be worried to death, but it isn't.

Well, there's a case of cures, suddenly emerging and arising, you see? Now, sex is a cure for no bodies. See? That's what sex is a cure for. And then, if you get no bodies, of course, why, you get a cure for sex. Get how weirdly and tortuously and involvedly all of this works out? Get the idea?
I mean, the cure becomes the cause becomes the cure becomes the cause. You know, the illness becomes the cure becomes the illness becomes the cure. You see how all this is?

Now, you haven't got a pc, whose ideas about horses sleeping in beds, who hasn't cured something with that idea. Quite factual. Every aberration he's got was a cure for something.

Let's take his motionlessness. This is why withholds work so well. His motionlessness is a cure for having killed so many people. See, that's a cure. If he doesn't move, he won't kill anybody. All right, so you pick up the withholds on killing, and all of a sudden he can move again. See, because he isn't under this tremendous compulsion.

But what was killing? Killing was a cure for something. Get the idea? Killing was a cure for hating people. If there weren't any people around, of course you didn't have to hate.

Well, what was hate? Well, that was a cure for associating with people to some way or another. Or that was to keep one from associating with people because one was liable to damage people. So we've come back to the same cure.

See? Hating people was a cure for liable to damage people. And then, of course, damaging people was a cure for people being people. And then, motionlessness was a cure for damaging people. You see how this works out on the withhold line? It's all this nonsense of one thing goes to another goes to another goes to another.

And guys will get some mighty weird, wild and wonderful ideas on what they're liable to do and how they should restrain it, or what's liable to happen and how they should solve it.

And as long as you see perfectly logical (to us) solutions, why, you think this is all right. It's only when you see these oddball solutions, you see, that you say, "Well, what is that a cure for?" And you don't understand it's a cure for anything and of course it isn't. So therefore, you say it's an aberration.

You might say an aberration is a cure that you don't understand or an aberration is a cure that doesn't cure anything or aberration is a cure that cures some craziness.

Now, you get all of this weird concatenation of illness is the cure, and the cure becomes the illness, and all these things get entwined and so on, and all these things go this way so irrationally because basically they are problems. It all goes back to the confusion and the stable datum, one kind or another.

Now, you get two confusions and two stable data and these are counter-opposed and you don't dare do one, and you don't dare do the other one; and therefore, you don't confront one, you don't confront the other one. You get an endurance because it is never as-ised.

And the endurance goes along the line on and on and on and on and on. Why? Because you never as-is the thing; it is always solved. You see? You do something else.

So these pcs, for instance, that have a via plus a via plus a via plus a via plus a via to run an auditing command inherit it simply on this basis of, they run into a problem, you see, and then they'll go up through the solutions, through a very serie – series of vias, and the basic thing wrong with them is the problem. That's basic. They've got a problem of some kind or
another. And this problem they have never frontally attacked. They have never looked at it as a problem; and not looking at it as a problem of course, gets them into some interesting states.

Now, when you say a problem of comparable magnitude, you've put the via of cure the problem – you've taken it off of automatic, you see? So you're getting the person to covertly look at the problem, look at the problem, look at the problem and you've seen it be quite effective. And all of a sudden the problem disappears. Well, why? Because you've made him look at the problem, look at the problem, look at the problem.

But basically, problems have terrific endurance. And they just run on the track forever. So therefore, certain conditions, which are designed to cure other conditions ...

A snake's venom is the thing which causes the snake to be antipathetic and it is a cure for the antipathetic character of people toward a snake. You see, you don't like snakes because they have venom. Well, they have venom, you see, because they – people don't like them. [laughter] You get how idiotic? This is always this idiotic – it all comes down to some idiocy, and we get the basic thing of Q-and-A is simply that the question's answer is always the question. The answer to a question is the question. You see?

You say to me, "Well, why don't you stand a pc on his head in the corner in order to process him?" and of course, the answer to it is, "Why don't you stand a pc on his head in the corner to process him?"

See, it's of course the perfect duplication. See? That is the answer to that question. You got the idea? That's the idiot's delight. That's the duplication.

But of course, that question is not prompted by that question. It is prompted by some other confusion.

So by simply replying to it, "Why don't you stand the pc on his head in the corner to process him?" and you say back, "Why don't you stand a pc on his head in the corner to process him?" This is very unsatisfactory. People don't like to have this happen to them.

Well, that's because they're trying to solve a basic confusion they have. But the confusion will be something very fundamental, about something very fundamental. There's a fundamental datum about Scientology or something awry they have a confusion on someplace else. And you haven't reached that.

And one of the ways of teaching – a very skilled method of teaching – is to try to arrive at where this guy is wound up. Don't give him an answer to why you – on a silly question like, "Why don't you stand pcs on their head in a corner to process them?" Don't give them – try to solve the thing for them. Just try to find out how – where he – where he got that lineup that would wind up with this, you see, as the satisfactory solution.

And you'll find out he's got some basic and fundamental confusion on Axioms 1 to 55. See? There's something going wrong here whenever you hear of one of these things and he's trying to cure a confusion and then when you answer him or give him a sensible solution, you very often are trying to cure his confusion. But as long as you try to cure confusions, the confusions continue.
That's why man drops back to threat of duress and punishment all the time. He is despaired of correcting this criminal's juvenile lifetime as the son of a millionaire or something, you see? His terrible period of childhood is something that's totally beyond anybody's reach and of course he got very fundamental confusions about human relationships in that childhood.

Oh, everybody recognizes that these days, but hardly anybody tries to do anything about that. Instead of that, they arrest the guy and put him in jail. Boy, that's sure a stable datum, isn't it? That is motionless, enclosed, it's a location that isn't going to change and that is a cure for what? A bunch of confusions about people.

Well, there are now no people there hardly at all. You can't be confused about people because there aren't any people there. Well, that seems to me to be terribly, terribly drastic. In other words, that's a heavy action, which is borne out of despair and it is only faintly a cure for criminality, because you find most criminals that are confirmed criminals or real bad criminals have been to jail several times.

In jail they get educated into hating people, you see. It's like the snake's venom. They get the idea people don't like them. So therefore it's perfectly all right for them to hate people, you see? And you've just moved them further and further out by "curing" this broad thing called criminality and I mean, advisedly, this offbeat idea of "curing" criminality. No, you'd have to get rid of somebody's basic confusions about life before he would cease to be criminal.

All right. Clarifications of one's own background knock out all of these confusions and there is a way of making a fundamental attack upon this. This is a frontal attack. These confusions very often stem from withholds. So you give something like a Joburg Security Check and you get the withholds off the case. All right. You get the withholds off.

In the process of getting the withholds off, have you ever noticed the pc appears confused at times? You know? Kind of spinny and confused and so forth? Well, actually, what you're doing is arising some of these fundamental confusions. He wonders, "Why the devil did I do that?" He's trying to find the problem that he solved with it.

Well, let's take a further look at this and we'll see, then, that the most fundamental confusion there could be would be two counter-opposed data, each surrounded by a confusion, and nobody could put his mind on either one of these two data and nobody could put his mind on either of these two confusions. Of course, those confusions would tend to persist all the more, wouldn't they? Because that's what you call a multiple confusion.

So a problem is a multiple confusion. It's more than one confusion. If you don't believe that, examine the anatomy of a problem someday.

Your pc has a problem, just find the two confusions. And you'll find out there are two confusions – not one confusion; there are two – and there are two solutions or two ideas involved in this, each one with its own confusion.

It's an encysted – *encysted* – confusion. Because there's a solution to it here, and there's a solution to it here. But of course you can't do solution A and do solution B. And you can't do solution B and do solution A, you see? And each one has its own confusion, so you...
just try to back off from this. And of course you can't back off from anything, actually. So as a result, it follows you. And you get this oddity of a problem moving in on somebody every time you get him to solve it and moving out on him every time you get him to look at it. You see, he's trying to escape an idea, and the idea is with him and the faster you try to back off of one of your ideas ... [laughs] You know?

Well, experimentally, get an idea that all lions are dangerous. Now, consider that as a very dangerous idea; consider you're a lion tamer or something. They like to be called lion trainers, I just remembered. And, "Consider that all lions are dangerous" would be a very dangerous idea for a lion trainer to have, see?

So, you shouldn't get that idea, should you? That would put an end, rather, to the aplomb with which you go in to the arena.

So get the idea of getting the idea "All lions are dangerous." Now do this, right now. Get the idea "All lions are dangerous." Now, decide that is a dangerous idea and decide you're going to back off from it. Don't forget it or anything. Just try to back off from that idea of "All lions are dangerous." ... Does an odd thing, doesn't it? Has a tendency to collapse.

Trying to escape your own ideas, you know, is very, very interesting. It's like trying to play checkers on your own coattail. And that is the mechanism on which problems move in on one, is one gets an idea he shouldn't have the idea, so he moves off from the idea. But of course the idea is his idea and where is there to go? Well, one thing one can't hide from is his own ideas, of course.

You get a sort of an idea of withholding though, as you try to back off from one of your own ideas because you're trying to get away from it, you see? So as you move back from these things, of course, they follow you in.

And therefore, you ask a pc – he tells you he has a problem. You say, "Where is it?"

He'll very mysteriously say, quite ordinarily, that it's out there about ten feet, see, or five feet, or it's right here in his head. And ask him to get a problem of comparable magnitude to it or just think of a problem of comparable magnitude to it, and then say, "Where is it now?" And he'll say, "Well, it's out there twenty feet", see? And, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude." Moves out there forty feet, fifty feet, sixty feet – as long as you run that one.

Now you say, "Solve it, son. Thank you. Solve it. Thank you. Solve it. Think of a solution to it. Thank you. Where is the problem now?"

"It's right here."

You say, "All right. Think of another solution to it. Where is it now?"

He says, "It's right in the middle of my head."

And you say, "Okay. All right. Now, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to it. Good. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to it. Good. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to it. Good, good. Think of a problem of comp – . Where is it now?"

"It's out there about thirty feet."
Well, you keep that up and of course you say, "Well, where is it now?"

"Well, it's gone over the horizon and disappeared."

And you can actually get him to confront this sort of a problem long enough that this happens. Then you say, "All right. Get an idea that solves that problem. Get an idea that solves that problem. Get an idea that solves that problem. Where is the problem now?"

He says, "No place."

In other words, you haven't brought it back in. Well, why haven't you brought it back in? Because in the "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude", you have actually got him to as-is it. The confusions of it disappeared. Got the idea?

You got him on a via and so on. So he did confront it, on a via, and then he confronted it directly. And of course as soon as he did that, it disappeared.

So you can't say endlessly to somebody – . He tells you he has an awful problem with his wife, you see, or something like that and you say, "Where is the problem?"

This would sound at first statement like it's an idiotic question. Where is it? Well, she is home and he's here, so obviously, it is either home or here, but he never answers that. you don't get that answer. He says, "It's right there."

And you say, "Well, where's right there?"

He says, "Well, it's fifteen feet out in front of me", or something like this. That is his response, in actuality, if he's going to locate it for you and providing he's high enough up the line that he can see ridges. A lot of people are below being able to see ridges. They only see lines. Some people have lines going all over the room. Darnedest concatenation you ever saw. The old Reality Scale, way back – 17th ACC. Anyhow.

So you can't endlessly say, "All right. This problem with your wife. All right. Think of a solution to the problem. Think of a solution to the problem. Think of a solution to the problem. Think of a solution to the problem", have it arrive right here in his head, and then say, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you", and have it move out; and then say, "Think of a solution to that problem. Think of a solution to that problem. Think of a solution to that problem. Think of a solution to that problem", have it move in; and then say, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Think – ." What problem? This actually disposes of the confusion. It doesn't just endlessly yo-yo and last forever. You see that?

But problems have endurance. So you could say, on a thought level, that thought mass is basically problems. If thought mass is enduring, then it is basically composed of problems. If ridges are enduring, then they must be problems. Why would a problem endure? Unless the thing – the problem is the two confusions and the two stable data, counter-opposed. And one doesn't look at either of them or as-is either of them, so you get an endurance of energy masses in the mind.

Some pc complains to you that ridges are about to knock her 'ead off, or some pc says to you that they have a terrible pressure in their chest; or some pc coughs all the time. What's this? This must be a persistent mental mass, right? And mental mass is mass. There is no
doubt about that. It has weight. Very tiny, but it has weight. It actually has size and shape and so forth.

All right. This person tells you they have a persistent difficulty with their leg. Now, that isn't quite a mental mass because it's materialized in the physical universe and all of these conditions that I have just enumerated all add up to the fact that the person has problems.

Now, if you get this going enough, the person will be a problem, and of course, inevitably, will dramatize being a problem. And quite ordinarily, they say problems are unsolvable or these problems are much too much for them. So of course, the problem that they're sitting in is going to be much too much for you, too. Everybody sees to that. Got the idea?

So you start – you keep worrying about this pc, because this pc is a problem and then you keep trying to solve this problem. Then one day you got facsimiles of the pc. Do you see how that would work?

But the pc will actually get to a point where they dramatize being a problem. Now, if you ask around and ask people if the case has made any progress, the people that say no – even when their profile is changed – of course are doing what? They're simply dramatizing being a problem.

Well, what's wrong with them? Problems are persistent. They have terrific endurance and this person is sitting right in the middle of a problem, which is from Lord knows where, when or how or what, you see? But there it is and they've been so overwhelmed by this problem that when they're asked about problems, they are the problem. So they present themselves to you as a problem. And when somebody says he has no gain, he has said the same thing to you as, is "I'm a problem to you. Solve me." [laughter]

Now of course, your chances of solving it, on any oblique line, are quite poor. Why are they poor? Well, because problems are the one thing that have the heaviest endurance. They're the most enduring things there are. Because they're postulate-counter-postulate, each one with a separate confusion.

So one can make neither head nor tail out of a problem because he can't put his mind on confusion A without getting hit by confusion B. And he can't try to as-is or consider answer or stable datum B without having answer A strike him as the best thing, you see?

So he tries to put his attention on one, he gets the other one. He tries to put his attention on the other one, he gets the one and he finally says, "I will back off from this."

So he adds a curtain across this whole proposition called no-confront. Pcs which have consistently rising needles – you know, anything you ask them, why, the needle starts rising. At the drop of the hat, the needle starts rising, you got the idea? And it rises and rises and rises and rises and rises. It's no good for reading because you can't tell what they're not confronting.

But I can tell you what they're not confronting now. I didn't know a few weeks that I could, you know, say it, just bang! that would communicate well. But they're not confronting a problem.
So that's what a rising needle is all about. They're not confronting something, that's for sure. Well, we could never say what they weren't confronting. But we can say it in a generality, now: They're not confronting a problem.

And after you audit this person for a while, this person will find out that this person has problems. Only they didn't know they had these problems, see? But anytime you ticked anything that had anything to do with his problems you, of course, put them on a no-confront and you'd get some oddity like this: You'd be talking to the pc and you'd say, "Well, now, how's tricks and how's it going? And has anything happened between this last session I gave you and this one now?"

And the pc will say, "No." And all of a sudden the needle starts rising like a startled gazelle. And the tone arm starts going up.

And you say, "Well, what is this?" and "Something did happen?"

And they say, "Oh, no, no. Nothing happened."

And you check it down and you're finally forced to do something you really shouldn't do, but you can't take somebody who has got a very, wildly different tone arm read – between sessions this was acquired – and go on and process him if you expect to get anyplace, because something has happened!

But they will quite normally – it's like fishing for fish in a sea where there are none! It's like these resorts that get you down there that promise to sell you bait and boats, and you're going to catch all the fish in the world and the only thing you get is a sunburn, you know? You just – apparently just can't find what this is, you know, for a long time. It's like drilling for oil in barren rock.

Then all of a sudden, "Well, there's nothing happened, except I had an automobile accident last night. That's all. I mean, couldn't possibly be anything. Oh yes, it was. Yes, as a matter of fact, I was guilty. As a matter of fact, I – I just remembered, I have the ticket from the police in my pocket now. I'm supposed to appear as a summons and lose my license at two o'clock." You know? I mean, it could get this nutty.

But factually, you see, it was a problem, and they backed off and they didn't confront it. And then, now, they can't tell you about it. why can't they tell you about it? Because they can't confront it, that's why.

But I can tell you the common denominator of all no-confronts is problem. No-confront? Problem. Persistence? Problem. All these things add up.

Now, the CCHs can cut and saw through this remarkably well, considering. But this is where you get your slow gain. This is your slow-gain case. This is the case that doesn't take off like a startled gazelle and run to Clear in a hurry. This case is mired in problems and this is probably the answer to slow clearing. This is why slow clearing occurs. Okay?

Now, you need the answer to that. Why is slow goals? Why does it take forever to get somebody's goals? Well, he's sitting in a problem.
Now, you'll notice that a case that is slow in gain is heavy on comm lag. Or if they are talking, aren't talking quite on the line of what we should be talking about. Got the idea? Either the confusion is withheld or inverted.

In other words, the communication is withheld or inverted. The comm lag stems from the no confront. And then this can get so bad that they don't even confront what you're asking them but disassociate slightly and talk about something else every time you ask them a question. You got that?

In other words, you can back off from a problem to such a degree that there's no place to go. And then you have to go on a complete disassociated via because everything is associated with this problem.

Well, now, what caused the pc to react, dumbly? The pc sat down. They were apparently okay. The tone arm wasn't too high and you said to them, "Has anything happened since the last session?" And of course this clicked it. But they went on a no-confront, so they can't tell you. It clicked and put them on a no-confront.

They were all right, right up to the point when you asked them if they had a problem and this is the phenomenon that you've run into consistently, of somebody being very upset with you because you asked them if they have a problem. You've asked them to confront something they can't confront.

And they're liable to get a fall, so they know they can't run it, because they know they can't do anything about a problem, don't you see? And they'd rather get on with the auditing. Haven't you ever noticed this one?

Well, this is their confession, when they have this type of reaction to a problem, that they're sitting in the middle of some God-awful problems, none of which they're confronting. See?

Well, you might say the clue to slow gain or odd behavior in a pc is a problem; and not one, but a multiple series of problems which compose themselves into a ridged bank. So you get your invisible field, your black field, your field with small rockets. And then, of course, on an inverted basis, a field with little trains that run by and give you the dope, see? This is a way to communicate without looking at anything. You put them all on little toy trains, see?

And this explains these various field mechanisms. And I've never given you a good explanation for them before. I couldn't put it well. But there it is.

It's basically a problem. They start to confront; they get no confront. That's because it's an indecisional situation, wholly indecisional.

Now, all this is a prelude to a very, very simple process. It is so idiotically simple that you will begin to wonder when it half-kills your pc. Because it will. It'll turn on somatics that are fabulous. It'll turn on aches and pains and sore throats and bad ears that you never heard of before, you know? But every one of these things is what's keeping the pc from going up the line.
So you could make a direct, frontal attack on the no-change case, not with change but with problems. I've known for years that that stuck profile was the fact that the pc had a problem while he was being audited, see?

Well now, let's reduce this to a point where the pc is a pc where all problems are life and life is a problem. That they're being audited is a problem. That they're alive is a problem. That they're going to die is a problem. That they have a car is a problem. That they don't have a car is a problem. Do you see? It's all a problem now and no apparent solution to anything. And reactively, it becomes very dangerous to them to solve anything; and they don't solve anything. They have an awful time, terrible time.

Problems. Sniper on the right, sniper on the left. If you duck to the left side of the tree, you get hit by one sniper, if you duck to the right side of the tree, you get hit by the other sniper. Well, what you going to do? If you do either one, you're wrong.

So you take up religion. [laughter] See? It's just, thud! Just like that, you know? You'll find that it is in the fields of stress and duress of life where religious cults make their finest harvest.

Here's skid-row George, you know, stumbling down and he knows if he doesn't drink wood alcohol that he's going to get the DTs; and that's terrible, see, because he'll start coming out of it. And if he does, it'll kill him and it's that much further to come out of it, see? What's his answer? Salvation Army standing there on the corner; he all of a sudden helps them beat the drum. [laughter]

He's arrived at exactly nowhere. See? He's gone into a think. He's gone out of a confront into a figure, see? And you'll find -- you'll find afterwards, the thing to do is to beat the drum, you know?

And you say, "Didn't you used to be an alcoholic?"

Has nothing to do with what the case is. He won't say anything about his life as an alcoholic.

It'll cut in on some kind of a level, "... and then I took up religion, and I was no longer a liability to myself or others." Got the idea?

He'll hang in the middle. Just ask him sometime. You can hang him right in the middle. If he doesn't say, "Yes" -- except as it sort of comes out as propaganda -- "Yes, I was an alcoholic. I remember well, lying around in a barroom, and there was this bartender there. And he gave me a job sweeping out. And I was lying there on the barroom floor and he picked up the bar broom and he swept me out instead. And I was lying there in the gutter in the rain, and this cop came by and took me over to the hospital and I had a devil of a time in the hospital. I had DTs and everything else."

No, none of -- the story never goes that far, because there's not that much confront in the man. It will go something like this:

"And the bartender picked up the broom." He'll get that far. "And I realized, then, I was on the wrong course and I've been beating the drum ever since." See, he does a depart. He never finishes the engram.
Only, next time that you ask him about when he took up religion, or you say to him something on the order of having been an alcoholic, he tells you an entirely different tale about the moment he decided. He was up this mast, in a ninety-mile-an-hour gale, and he realized there wasn't much to life and that it was all very perilous and all there was, was really God, see? And it was at that moment that he suddenly did.

And the next time you ask him about anything about his being an alcoholic, he'll give you another story which is entirely different; and of course, all of these things are fictitious nonconfronts of one character or another. Because he cannot confront the problem of having been an alcoholic. Because he's now solved it. Which is a matter of he's sitting right in the middle of being an alcoholic, being the solution to being an alcoholic, see? That's why Alcoholics Anonymous do what they do.

I always thought this was a pretty good organization. One of their members convinced me otherwise, down in South Africa. He told me what their texts were all about. Their first tenet is "There is no cure for drunkenness. There's absolutely no cure for alcoholism. One must make up his mind to it."

I didn't believe the guy, but since that time I've read some of their literature. They sell a person absolutely, hypnotically, hundred percent, with a sledgehammer on the idea that he can never be anything but an alcoholic. That is his first line.

What he must learn to do is to overcome it in some fashion or another. Realizing all the time that he is an alcoholic. I mean, you talk about finding a guy in the mud and then using his head for a stepping stone, that's it. It's not so good.

See, I thought they were doing something about alcoholism. No, they're not. They're saying nothing can be done about alcoholism. That's why they never cooperate with us. I never understood why before, but they never do. It's always a little token cooperation, and then they find out that we say that you can do something about alcoholism and they're off us like a shot. That's because they've got an opposed datum, is there's nothing you can do about alcoholism.

All right. Alcoholism is a problem. And to them it is a problem of tremendous endurance and enormous magnitude; and they're saying you can't confront any part of it. See? So therefore you've got to walk around being a solution to it. So join Alcoholics Anonymous. A nice mechanism, isn't it?

"Man is evil. He is a terrible problem. There's nothing you can do about it. Become a monk." see this? These are the concatenative thoughts that all wind up in the same order.

Now, you're in there; somebody's come into Scientology saying, "Well, there's nothing you can do about life. I'll sit here and not confront anything", and their case doesn't make any gain. They aren't many. Don't think you're one of them. Because they're only people who get no case gains to amount to anything. Got the idea?

Then their withholds and their problems... Their problems actually come about through their withholds, and then their withholds come about through their problems, you see? And then the more they withhold, the more problems they've got. And then the more problems they've got, the more they withhold. You see? And the less confront there is in
them. So they get foggier and foggier and mistier and mistier about the whole thing. And what are they doing? They're flinching from themselves. They're there. Where else is there to go? There isn't anyplace else to go.

The atomic bomb, you say there's no place to hide. That's a lie. I know of a lot of satellites, asteroids, the moon, various planets, even Jupiter — if you like to swim in seas of liquefied air. These are places to go and I don't mean getting out on the broomstick that they send off at Cape Canaveral.

I — I'm talking about the fact, so, they knock you off, you go someplace. Or before the atomic bombing comes, why, you die of something and go to Jupiter or something, you know? What's the difference? There is someplace to go.

But there is one thing that you never can get away from, and that of course is yourself. Because you're there and as long as you're there, you're there.

And as soon as you start getting away from yourself, of course you try to pretend you are not where you are and you get some kind of a dispersed locational situation. You get a "buttered all over the universe." See? The guy is everywhere at the same time, you see? He permeates everything without being anywhere.

Well, he's just somebody who's trying to escape himself Why? Because he himself has problems and these problems all carry, as a common denominator, no-confront.

So just as you get the idea that lion taming is dangerous — thinking of yourself as a lion tamer — try to back up from the idea. Of course, where are you going to go? You've put motion and action into a thought process. And as soon as you do that, of course, the two become inextricably entangled. Only inextricably short of Scientology.

All right. These ridges and all that sort of thing that people run into and that they're having difficulties with and so forth, actually surrender on this one command. They do.

But I am not telling you a lie when I say it's actually hell to run. It is. It is rough, because it turns on some nice, horrendous somatics and from session to session, in the early stages of it, it does not move rapidly. Do you see why it does not move rapidly?

It appears to be very gluey, and the pc's liable to tell you they're getting all gummed up in the glue of it all, you know? And that it's all stacking up and it's getting worse and worse, and so on. Well, the CCHs are moving this same thing through.

But you ask somebody to recall a problem, you've said what? You've said, "Confront something you're not confronting" so you have to be very careful to get the auditing command answered. So a secondary question very often should be interjected.

You said, "Recall a problem."

And he says, "Mm-hm."

And you say, "What problem was that?"

And you'll very often catch him out. He just has a generality of life. He's just thought of a generality called life. Yes, he's recalled a problem. It's a generality, you see? And this great generality has sort of spread all over the place and he hasn't told you a problem.
And when he says, "Well, um, yes. Well, um – ha – I didn't – I just uh, didn't – didn't really think of one. I thought of a ..."

And you say, "Well, I'll repeat the auditing question. Recall a problem."

You have to make sure that he does recall a specific problem. Because on this particular process, more questions go unanswered than in any other known process. More questions can be dogged than any other one. So you have to be quite sharp on that. What was that one? You know?

"Recall a problem."
"Mm-hm!"

That's great. Yeah. *Mm-hm.* What does this *Mm-hm* mean? It's probably agreeing with your auditing command. It isn't that he did it, till you say, "What problem was that?"

And you very often get the immediate confession that it was just a generality. It didn't have anything to do with any particular problem anyplace, anywhere, at any time.

Now, a man goes through, or a girl goes through, nonconfront like this like mad. And these various ridges that are hounding them and making them cough and pushing their noses into the back of their heads and all that sort of thing, are simply problem ridges, and that's all there are. They're confusions which have centered around counter-opposed data, between which nobody could make up his mind, except to confront them. And they haven't confronted them; they have backed up from being – "lions are dangerous." They backed up, and of course, they – there is no place to back to. So there they are.

So they begin to have the sensation, then, of being pushed or being pressed upon or being infiltrated or being entered or having terror stomachs or facial somatics or sinusitis or bad eyes or pains in the head or migraine headaches or something like this.

And of course they – it feels, to them, like some exterior pressure is at operation on them. See, there's some kind of an exterior, pressing, demanding thing that is evidently being levered against them from some other quarter.

Well, the other quarter, of course, is not another quarter. They're trying to back up from where they are, you see, but every time they back up, they carry what they have with them, naturally.

It's like a fellow with an armload of kindling and he keeps backing up to get away from the kindling, but he never looks at the kindling or lets go of it. And of course, he'll get the sensation after a while that something is busting his ribs. What is it? It is very mysterious. Well, it is not very mysterious. It is a problem.

But don't think of it in terms that if you could just find the one problem of the man's life, you'd have his whole case solved. You could find the basic-basic problem that started all of his confusions on the track. You could find various vintages of problems, which would then start a concatenation and a rip-up of problems. You could find a lot of considerations that move problems into a tough category, and so forth. But it is just this one consideration, really, that there's an unconfrontability between two counter-postulates.
It's like – it's like you belong to the Greek army and you were having a lot of fun knocking off Persians and you got exteriorized in a battle, and so on – getting your mock-up knocked off. So you picked yourself up a Persian, see?

I say you picked up a Persian; you kind of marched off with the Persian hordes, you know, and you picked up somebody in Persia. And then they all of a sudden say, "Well, those damn Greeks are coming over the line. And we – and you're conscripted. And you're part of His Majesty's Darius's cavalry or something." And there you are, you see, and you're looking at all these Greeks.

This gets to be an interesting problem. You should be on the Greek forces, but you're not. The confusion to the Greek forces is the Persian forces, you see? But you're in the Persian forces, and confusion to the Persian forces is the Greek forces.

There's only one answer to that. Go take up a lecture circuit on the subject of peace. Because you will land halfway in the middle of the battleground. See? You can't be a Greek and fight the Persians, and you can't be a Persian and fight the Greeks. Unconfrontable. Both of them are wrong.

Well, you run a pc who's in this situation, and you find out he was a Persian before he became a Greek. It wasn't the other way to, see? He was a Persian before he became a Greek and then he again became a Persian; and you've got that all solved. And you say, "Well, that was the answer and that was the problem." And then you find out, actually he was an Egyptian, you see, fighting the Persians and then exteriorised into the Persians. That's how he got there.

And you say, "Well, we've got that one, now. We've finally sorted that out." And the pc will tell you he's got that all sorted now and then you find out he was a Persian before he was an Egyptian.

You see? And they keep running this way on the track. And a pc, as he runs this, actually will tend to come up with some interesting solutions. You find him sitting there, and all of a sudden he'll have a very interesting solution. It's a solution to what? Well, he won't be quite sure, but it's an awfully interesting solution.

And he's no more than thought of it, and it becomes a terrible problem to him. "Well, it'd be awful to put that into effect", you know?

"Well, I've just decided to go to the movies", he says. "I've just decided to go to the movies. And the finest thing I could do is go to the movies. And we're all set, and so forth. Get your hat and coat, here we go to the movies – oh, to hell with it. I've seen the picture before. Where are you going? What are you doing with your hat and coat?" See?

You say, "This guy is nuts." No, this guy isn't nuts. This guy had a solution.

He was feeling bored that evening, and so he solved being bored that evening by [snaps his fingers] going to the movies. And then, on a little, three-minute, four-minute, five-minute comm lag, why, he of course does the other flip; and solving it was dangerous, so going to the movies is a boring proposition.
See, he was bored. So he solved boredom by doing something interesting. But then the interesting thing he decided to do, all of a sudden, Qed-and-Aed and flashed back on him and he's bored with it.

You get a lot of people that go out and buy a Mercedes or something, you see, and they no more than stick the keys in the ignition than they instantly are bored with the Mercedes, you see? Just do that, bang! just like that.

And they say, "I don't know what's wrong with me. I don't know what's the matter with me. What is the matter? Something fantastic is wrong. I – it's not ..."

No. They got the Mercedes because they were bored. See? The Mercedes is a solution to boredom. Well, the Mercedes is not a solution to the boredom. The Mercedes is a Mercedes. Look one over if you don't believe me. [laughter] And that's it, you see?

But if they haven't examined this, and they don't even look at the Mercedes, and have-n't even looked at the Mercedes at all, and they were bored so they bought a Mercedes; they step into the Mercedes, put the keys in the lock, and they're bored.

See, the problem is the solution, you see. And the cure becomes the – and then they don't know which they are. And naturally, you can do fantastic things by getting them out and having them touch the Mercedes, you know? Touch the fenders and the wheel, and so forth. And they say, "What do you know, it's a Mercedes. It isn't a solution to boredom." And then they become interested in the fact that they have a Mercedes. And you would do this by touch. Otherwise, they will never confront the Mercedes, because they can't confront the boredom. Now you see why Touch Assists and familiarity and that sort of thing work out so easily.

So you have 1A. As I say, it's got a lot of rationale behind it and it looks very innocent, and it looks very simple, and so forth. The things you must do in it, don't overrun the thing, beyond the Security Check point.

When I say hour for hour, I don't mean one hour on this process and one hour on the Security Check. I mean if you happen to run 12 ½ hours of "Recall a Problem" or CCHs, then it looks to me like you've got to put in about 12 ½ hours on Security Checks. You got the idea?

We don't care when it's done. You flatten the CCHs. You bring them up to a flat point. And you say, "Well, we can let that rest for a little while."

Now you do a Security Check for a while. And when the person seems to be kind of wound up on the Security Check, whether it was one page or ten, you say, "Well, we can leave that alone for a while, and we'll do some CCHs." You see, you kind of run them flat.

Well, similarly, you'd run the motion out of the tone arm on "Recall a Problem". And the motion is momentarily flat, and so we at once move over into doing a Security Check. And the person seems to be cooled off. And the needle seems to be doing better now and life seems to be a little bit easier on the thing; go back to this problem. Because the problems will kick withholds into views, and the withholds will kick problems into view, see? The things operate one against the other very well.
And that's Routine 1A; and I advocate Routine on – 1A on people that aren't making any very rapid progress on a CCH. The progress is rather slow on CCHs, and we say, "Well, what we're doing is trying to solve the problem with control, communication and havingness. And we probably could get there, all right, but let's make this person directly as-is some problems before we go on", you see?

You'd run Routine 1A until things looked a bit better and the pc was making changes and gains and you were getting more and better tone arm action and a looser needle. I don't care whether that's an intensive or two intensives or what, or five hours. It doesn't matter. It's just as long as you attain some kind of a goal, looks like the pc can change better, why, you could go back to Routine 1 or you could go to Routine 2. Okay?

But Routine 1A is a culmination of many years of investigation of this particular goofy factor called a problem.

And it's well worth noting that the solution to a problem is a problem. That is the solution to the problem; and when a pc is being a problem, then you'd better get him to look at and as-is some problems. Some problems, because it isn't ever one problem. A case never has one problem. A case does have one goal, a case does have one terminal, but a case never has one problem.

So you try to run a PT problem flat, and you're going to find yourself with another problem. Haven't you ever noticed that? And then you run that problem flat, and you'll find yourself with another problem. They can just go on this way, ad nauseam, endlessly.

Now, also Routine 1A would be something you would resort to if the pc keeps coming into session with present time problems. By the time you've run three or four – no matter what else you're doing with this pc, by the time you've run three or four sessions on the pc, and every one has got tremendous, fantastic and overwhelming present time problems and they take up an awful lot of a session – it just seems like we just have an unlimited supply of present time problems to view – you've got Routine 1A as the best, fastest method of getting this case on the road. Okay?

All right. I wish you good luck with that one.

Thank you.
Thank you.

Well, I'm very glad to see that you're all still alive. I personally didn't think this was going to happen. And I'm sorry for it. It's an accident. We have a great many processes, though, that we still could use. [laughter] And furthermore, we could let them be used by somebody that read the bulletin and thought it was written in Chinese. That's about the only way.

We've just heard, from your part of the world, that Routine 1, on two cases, is showing absolutely no change or gain of any kind whatsoever. And this means what?

This means some gross error. I mean, a Security Check is being run backwards or – it'll be a gross error, believe me, you know. I mean, it'll be big. And it is so unimaginably big that the Instructor, in this case, doesn't imagine that it could be that big, so doesn't look for anything like it, you see.

Like Herbie, the other day – he's telling us, well, he's having a terrible time. And can't he omit all the rudiments from a Security Check because his auditors just are spending nothing – getting nothing done but the rudiments in a Security Check.

And I tell him a third-of-a-dial drop – thinking it's something else. And then he, of course, on the ground and able to observe it, finds out what? His auditors don't know what a third-of-a-dial drop is.

So they've been setting it for anything, you see? But he never imagined this. See, he thought there was something basically wrong with the process or something of the sort.

Now, you're going to find out – you're going to find out that the mistake which causes Routine 1 not to operate is something like a Security Check is not being done. Be no Security Check that you would call a Security Check, see?

The auditor, you know, doing something weird, you know? And it isn't happening as a Security Check. And then you'll find that Routine 1 is probably operating with the CCHs all out.

You know, they got the idea that the CCHs actually must bite – this was a mistake they were making – making a week or two ago – the CCHs must – each one must be made to bite before you leave it. And that doesn't matter if it takes an intensive to get CCH 1 to bite,
you go on running CCH 1 until it bites. And you're only entitled to leave the thing if it has bitten. You see?

Totally missing out the idea that if a thing is flat, it's flat. And twenty minutes worth of it, it's flat, and that's it. So they never – nobody ever got any CCHs run.

So you'll find out, somehow or another, the CCHs aren't being run. And somehow or another, a Security Check isn't being done, and then Routine 1 doesn't work.

Female voice: Hmm. Maybe they don't know what a CCH is.

Hm?

Female voice: Maybe they don't know what a CCH is.

Well, I understand that just a couple of weeks ago there was a terrific yickle-yackle on the subject of all the HGC had to go over to the Academy, if they found out the Academy was teaching and running them entirely different. And then somebody else had an entirely different idea of how they were run. And they were all trying to straighten out and get some agreement. Well, I understand they did come to an agreement. But are these the CCHs?

Female voice: Sure. [laughter]

You see, that would be – you see, that's the gross error that you come up against with something like this.

Somebody tells you suddenly that some process doesn't work on a pc. "All right", you say. "That's fine. That's fine." But the first thing we do is to find out if it was that process? Was it in any way being used? That's the first thing we ask for.

Rather than, "Ah, what process is going to run on this pc?" That could be an interesting thing. Okay. Enough of that.

We've got Routine 1A operative here, haven't we?

Female voice: Yes.

Hm?

Female voice: Yes.

Is it working on anybody?

Female voice: Yes.

Female voice: Jolly good.

Male voice: Sure is.

You like that?

Male voice: oh, yes.

You like that. Well, of course, who would think in the midst of – only I would be able to get a simplicity on the subject of problems. [laughs] Because, of course, I just realized that any time anybody has looked at the idea of auditing problems, of course it has been a problem – how you did it.
I actually worked for a very long time with problems to get some kind of an anatomy of them. And we have a fantastic array of technology, as I gave you yesterday. That's why I wanted to give you that lecture yesterday, so that you had the gen on – on problems.

And it's an interesting thing that anything could be as much of a problem to man as the problems of man, you see, had an anatomy. That's what's interesting. Or it was undoable or had any understandingness about it.

It's the way we first entered the game on psychosis. We had to assume that the main thing about a psychotic was that it was all incomprehensible. Everything was incomprehensible. And then if you had everything incomprehensible, of course, why, that was it. And everybody was trying desperately to understand psychosis. And that's the only mistake the psychiatrist has made.

He hasn't actually done anything about psychiatry – "psychiatrosis." [laughter] He has labeled it, he's identified various types and forms, and then he has applied an extraordinary emergency remedy. Extraordinary! Just fantastic!

I mean, it's something on the order of, well, this fellow's – this fellow – his leg keeps itching. His leg keeps itching. And, well, he has to scratch it.

And this is the order of remedy of psychiatry, you know: "We'll cut it off!"

So they cut his leg off, see? Keeps itching. Now they have no remedy. They're done, you see, right there. That's the way they're treating insanity.

When you use these heroic measures which are all out of proportion to the condition, of course that's what you always wind up with. There's never a second trench. There's never a second ditch. There's nothing to go into. After you've electric shocked somebody, what can you do? And after you've given somebody a prefrontal lobotomy, well, he can go pick up another body. That's about it. you know, that kind of action.

But oddly enough, in Scientology now, we have actually been able to do something about this. We've been doing things about these, if anybody wanted to sail in and do something about them.

The common denominator of the psychotic, of course, is problems.

The understandingness of problems winds up, eventually, to an understandingness of insanity. When all the solutions become the problems, and all the problems become the solutions, of course you have your ne plus ultra A=A=A=A.

All right. Now, there's an additional condition. There's a further reach of this. When the problems can't be the solutions – you know, the problems are the solutions, that's one level; now let's go down a stage and let's invert it – and the solutions and the problems no longer can be matched or associated, then we get a tremendous number of solutions which themselves are the problems but which are not matched up to any problem.

And this I think, if you look it over, describes psychosis. The person is being a whole bunch of solutions to nonextant problems. Think it over.
You see a psychotic in an institution; he always carries a roll of toilet paper with him. And that's to wrap it around door knobs so that he won't have to touch any of the door knobs. You'll see them doing this quite – it's quite an ordinary mechanism.

Freud observed a lot of things like this. He added quite an enormous amount of observation to the field. He's now busily – he was taken over, you know, by psychiatry. And now he's being repudiated by psychiatry. And now, the next thing we're going to find out – according to Marilyn who just wrote me something on it – we're going to find out that the only psychiatry there is, really, is Pavlovian.

That could happen to us one day, you know. I mean, somebody takes over Scientology, you see – tries to take over Scientology; somebody tries to take it over and then, when they've got full control of it, invalidate it, see? And then knock it out, and then say there's nothing left but brainwashing.

Well, the hope is there that they could do that, because they continually are trying to come around and say that we do brainwashing. See the – so the hope must be extant. It's a psychotic forecast of what their future – they would like to have their future be.

There's always something you must know about these things, though, before you consider or give them tremendous dangerousness. Don't assign dangerousness to these things. The psychosis is a solution to a nonexistent problem. The problem doesn't exist for the person who is solving it. The person is living the solution to a nonexistent problem. I see I'm not reaching you too well here, you know. And when you see a psychosis, after it's all described – after this (quote) "psychosis" (unquote) is all described – there's a missing datum in the description, so of course it's incomprehensible. See, it's been objectively described. They haven't described what problem it is that this behavior is a solution to. So of course the main part of the data is gone. See, you haven't got the problem, so it's gone. You got it?

Male voice: Mm-mmh.

See? So therefore, you couldn't understand psychosis by observing behavior. It's incomprehensible because it's 50 percent missing. It's like trying to understand an electric motor, you see, that has no guts – has no leads, terminals or guts.

Now you walk along, and you say, "What is this thing?" Well, maybe somebody did a futuristic shell, you see? You see. See, it's just the observed thing, but there's – the rest of it is not there. So of course you couldn't – .

Frankly, the cure of a psychosis, by addressing the psychosis, is – listen carefully now – not possible. You cannot cure a psychosis by addressing the psychosis. Now, you cannot cure an aberration by addressing the aberration. Why?

Because you're running the still in the middle of the motion. You're running the solution in the middle of the confusion. The stable datum and the confusion. You're trying to cure the stable datum. And it is held in place by an existing confusion.

And you're not looking at the confusion. You're looking at the cure. You're looking at the stable datum. You're looking at the motionless fact. But of course, it won't move out unless you get the motion off of it.
Now, you get an idea of a whirlpool with the center of the whirlpool motionless. But without that center, the pool wouldn't whirl, you see? But for some reason or other the center of the whirlpool is motionless but all else is moving. And that motionlessness continues to be motionless only because it has motion around it.

So you get the idea that, yes, if we could pluck out this motionless piece, the whirlpool would cease to exist. We get this idea.

But I'll tell you something. Practice, empirical practice, in my efforts to do various things and combinations over a very, very long period of time, have demonstrated that it is not possible to take the motionless piece out of the whirlpool. You can take the whirlpool off the motionless piece, but you cannot take the motionless piece off the whirlpool. Because the thing is being motionless only because the whirlpool isn't being confronted, to put it into mental terms.

So here you have confusion and the stable datum. Here you have motion and no motion. Here you have sound and silence. Here you have absolute location and change – change surrounding a location which is motionless. Here you have all these things.

Now, the solution is analogous to the motionless point in the middle of the whirlpool. That's the solution. And you can't pull the solution out and have the whirlpool disappear – that's mentally. It just – just take my word for it; it can't be done. Because if you leave the whirlpool there, all that's going to happen is, is a new motionless point will arise, and you can pick off an endless – an infinity of motionless points off this motionlessness. You could just go on forever picking up no-motion. Just forever.

But to pick the motion off of it, ah-ha!

It's a very funny thing that everything that is wrong with a thetan is what is right with a thetan. Anything that is on the way upper Tone Scale that is right with a thetan, in a fixed, aberrated state at the bottom of the Tone Scale becomes what is wrong with the thetan.

At the highest upper level, a thetan can be motionless. And at the lowest level, he has to be.

It's a matter of determinism. On the higher levels of the Tone Scale, he can determine motionlessness. But at the low level of the Tone Scale, motionlessness is being determined for him. And when this gets into the field of mechanics, of course motionless is not being determined by another postulate; it is being determined by the mechanics of motion.

If you want to see somebody stiffen and go still – and actually, this test, by the way, this is – will amuse you, but it doesn't work as a test. It's the perfect lecture room test. Theoretically, you see, this thing is perfect. I'll tell you why it won't work in a moment. As a demonstration, people don't get it. Because I'm – so I'm not going to do it. I'm just going to tell you about it.

You stand a fellow up and you shake your hands in front of his face. You're going to demonstrate confusion and the stable datum, you see? You're making him the stable datum and you shake your hands violently in front of his face. Not threatening him, particularly, but just a lot of motion, you know – fingers shaking, and so forth, in front of his face.
And you say, "Now" – you say, "Now, there you are, and there was the motion." And point out to the rest of the class and the observers that he stood still.

And you'll see it every time. He actually freezes. You know, the person will sort of tend to freeze. You know? He goes still on you. You show him the motion. He goes still.

And now – you say, "Now, isn't this a wonderful demonstration?" And nobody gets it. They've all gone still. [laughter]

And this stillness is a stupidity. So the person you have demonstrated it on doesn't get it at all. It's the most marvelous thing you ever tried to demonstrate.

I tried it up here at London HASI several years ago. And I just couldn't get it across to the staff auditors, you know. I kept showing them, you know, one after the other. I kept – and they just kept getting stupider and stupider and stupider. [laughs]

Because then, of course, you're dealing with the absolute basic woof and warp of what happens to people: that they withdraw from this motion, and they get into a fixed stillness, you see? Well, they won't confront the motion, and yet they can't not confront the motion, so they put up a barrier against the motion, which is stillness. And they think that if they become still enough, the motion will duplicate them or something and become still. That's the last resort.

And then after that they just butter themselves all over the universe because they're trying to move out of a stillness and be a stillness without, of course, actually confronting the motion. And eventually, they go into violent motion. They eventually have no place to even butter themselves anymore. So they themselves become motion.

You'll find out in Goals Assessment that it is the commonest thing in the world to have a preclear come up with a whole string of goals of "get in motion." They come up with this whole long string of goals. It doesn't matter whether it's in space opera or any other field they come up with – race driving or something like that. They come up with this long string of goals: get in motion, get in motion, get in motion, see?

What they're actually trying to do is avoid the motion. And they go back into the motion. Kabibliu-boom! See?

Now, after they're audited for a while and so forth, they'll go on a reverse course. They're liable to go into an obsessive stillness for a while. You know, not want to go out or something like that, when they're out. And then all of a sudden they will go into motion. Only this time they're in control of the motion. See, they become cause over the motion.

But at the time they give you this, usually, as a whole string of goals, they're sure being the effect of motion to such a degree that they're the effect of stillness. You see? They're driven out of a stillness. They can't be still, and they themselves become the motion. They're the particle on the line, the leaf in the breeze, the pilot in the cockpit of the fighter plane. He's got to go, man, go. That's his motto: "Go, man, go."

Yet you look at this fellow's life in general and he hasn't been going. You say, "If you like speed that much, well, why aren't you – why aren't you doing any race driving?"
You see, in actual fact, they've moved out of the motionless spot into the motion and are being the motion. But factually, the step upgrade is motionless from that spot. So they do an awful lot of motionlessness, which is very hard to understand, hard for everybody to understand.

The person who can't leave the house – well, there are certain motions around that are just too motion, see? And they mustn't go out and confront this motion. And they're doing a no-confront of the motion which, of course, fixes them with stillness, and so they don't leave the house.

That is all this odd aberration is called, you see, of motionlessness. This odd aberration of not leaving the house all it could be called is, you see, is a no-confront of motion.

And we have a case up in London who's been a guinea pig. I've done my best for this case, and so forth. I've given auditors direction on the case, and so on. But this case's motionlessness has now been audited for very close to eight years with the very best processes and the very best auditors. And the case still stays in the house. Now, you get what I mean?

Now, the practice on the line demonstrates that every time. I haven't any other reverse cases. Whenever motionlessness is audited and motionlessness is audited and motionlessness is audited, and you audit nothing but the motionless – "All right. What silence would you be willing to be?" See? Any process of that character. All you do is stack up a bunch of motionless points, and the bank looks like it's jamming.

Now, you can slightly differentiate the difference between motions, but you cannot easily differentiate the difference amongst stillnesses. So stillnesses identify more rapidly than motions.

Now, let's look again at psychosis. The person is being one of these stills, even while they're being driven out into the agitation. See, they're being a still, of some kind or another. Well, what kind of a still is it?

Well, the worst kind of insanity there is, is catatonia, not an agitated insanity. It's the insanity of total motionlessness. Catatonic state. Now, that's deemed to be incurable. Why, it isn't incurable at all. I'm sure there are many things that you could do.

But you recognize that the fellow who's sitting there writing checks without a checkbook, without a pen, in his cell in the institution – he's sitting there writing checks. And he gives these invisible checks to the jailer, and he gives invisible checks to this one and invisible checks to that one. And he's always mailing them off in invisible envelopes. It's quite an interesting activity. Well, when people try to cure him, they try to find out all about these checks, you see. Well, factually, he probably was simply a business executive that's been driven mad by Internal Revenue, you see. [laughter] And the thing that's wrong with him hasn't anything to do, really, with sitting still writing checks. What's wrong with him, is this was a level of stillness to him, at some time or another, which became a fixed solution to some other very motionful problem.

Now look – just try to throw your imagination across this, and you could see easily that there could be a thousand problems to which sitting still and writing invisible checks would be a solution to.
Some writers, when they finally, finally go around the bend – it's right – immediately after they – they usually wind up, as their last ditch, is writing for *The Saturday Evening Post* and *Reader's Digest*. And they take off from there, and they want to watch out from that point there on, because that's just one step, you see, close to no writing at all. They almost wiggle in the chair and they move over into no writing at all.

Well, that fellow had better watch it because he's liable to be out in the park one day and all of a sudden pick up an invisible pen, you see, or invisible typewriter and start typing an invisible story. And there he is, you see?

And matter of fact, there are many cases of this. That's very common. Very common. A fellow sitting still writing an invisible story on invisible paper. Very common.

Well, that's what the fellow gets for writing for the *Saturday Evening Post* and *Reader's Digest*. That's all I say. It's good enough for him.

Now, those are the great organs of mediocrity. The great organs of mediocrity. I absolutely despise a publication that intends to achieve nothing but mediocrity.

It's like, I respect a skid row bum if he has set out to be the bumbiest skid row bum that anybody has ever heard of, you see, he's really willing to work at it. I'll respect him. I'll respect him.

But if he's just trying to be a mediocre skid row bum, why, I'm afraid I don't have much respect for him. But if he starts to *work* at being a mediocre skid row bum, I'm afraid my contempt knows no bounds. I wouldn't even confront him in Steinbeck.

Now, the substance of this is, the fellow has added up all skid row bums, see? So he's got an average skid row bum. So he's not trying to be *one* skid row bum, you see? He's trying to be *all* skid row bums.

Now, that's a very interesting state to be in. And it's like this magazine, *The Saturday Evening Post*, which doesn't even come out on Saturday evening and wasn't founded by Benjamin Franklin. [laughter]

And it's sort of trying to be all magazines at the same time, you see? And there it is, working *hard* to be all magazines. And never publishing anything brilliant, really, you see? Never publishing anything bad. And never publishing anything good.

It has a stated editorial policy, if you please, that it has stated – and released statements on – that it wishes never to publish a brilliant writer or a bad writer, but just a mediocre, medium writer, because that's what really appeals to everybody. And that's their editorial policy.

Well, when somebody is going out to be average, he isn't really being himself at all. He's being everybody. So of course you've got one of these buttered-all-over-the-universe cases. See, he's promptly being everybody. He wants to be an average. What the hell is this?

There are individuals. There can't be an average individual. There could be an individual who has the same IQs or characteristics as other individuals, but there can't be an average individual. I'm not quibbling with the thing.
There can be, however, a fellow who is trying to be an awful lot of other individuals and therefore is buttered all over in terms of beingness. Now, that fellow will be obsessively in a still. That's for sure. The stills which you will run off of that case are fabulous. And he's right next door to going around the bend. Don't kid yourself.

The operations which this universe uses to make a person assume the average and try to convince him to be the average are so numerous that they appear not odd to you, you see — or nothing reprehensible about this. They've been completely dulled down on this particular subject, because the operations are so innumerable.

You know, "You mustn't really stick your head above the crowd." You know? "And you mustn't get down underneath the crowd's feet, either. You must just be the crowd."

Now, how the hell can you just be the crowd? I'd like — wish somebody would tell me something. And this thetan is going to occupy all of these bodies, called a crowd, simultaneously, huh? Well, that means, of course, he isn't occupying his own body. And that's the first thing you'd find out about in processing. The one thing he isn't occupying is his own body.

So what can he do? If he thinks of himself as being everybody else, then every time he breathes wrong, he will have qualms. Because of course he's made everybody else breathe wrong. You got the idea?

So if he thinks an abstruse or an abtuse — obtuse thought, in any way at all, this is liable to have terrible consequences because some child going to school in China might be thinking — might have to think this thought, you see? And that would be terrible, because — not because of anything else but that he'd be thinking the thought, but he'd be thinking the thought in China. You get the idea?

It's not that he — you find out, in the final analysis, that he has specialized in murdering children in China, see? But he, actually, is not worried about the child in China. He's worried about the fact that he is in China, you see? See, he's actually the most self-centered person in the world, while being buttered all over the universe.

All right. Insanity is right next door to that.

So a person is never himself, and therefore, by addressing the solution which he is being — and let's put a definition in right here: Insanity is a solution. It's the adaption of a solution. The obsessive adaption of a solution, to the exclusion of all other solutions, in the absence of a problem. Got that? There's no problem there, but the fellow sure got a solution. And he can't be any other solution.

Now, the one thing you can't do to this insane person is say, "Well, now, why don't you put these three rocks that you must put on your window sill every evening before you go to bed — why don't you put these three rocks on the chair?" You say, "Now, I'll help you out, because they keep falling off the window sill and waking you up, you see?" The person keeps brushing them off, "We'll put them on the chair."

And the person will go along with this, merely because he can't do anything to you. And you put them over on the chair. And then you leave the room and you come back and the rocks are on the window sill, see? You'll explain to him that "This is what is waking you up
and why you can't sleep, you see", and so forth. And you'll always find the rocks on the window sill.

Now, this looks pretty daffy. But what problem is he solving? And that's the question you must always ask of insanity. What problem is this fellow solving?

Because he's obsessively being a solution to a problem which he doesn't know about and cannot confront. To the exclusion of ever changing, to the exclusion of ever really looking at any problem. Because if you'll notice, the number of problems which they create are just innumerable.

If they would just go on through life being this solution to the problem, we shouldn't argue about it or worry about it very much. But they're not content with this. Because they're the one solution to a nonexistent problem, all problems with this person are on automatic. And the number of problems which occur in their vicinity, practically can't be counted.

Well, they – all they have to do is get into an automobile, and the motor doesn't start, and all of a sudden the battery goes down and two tires go flat.

And you say, "What on earth is this all about?" It looks absolutely telepathically, teleportationally mysterious beyond all mystery. You'll find there's probably, a very logical connection between this, or something. But that's the truth with them. They're just surrounded all the time by problems.

You sign them – one of the things Registrars should know, in Central Organizations, is when they hand the person a writing pen to sign a contract, and the pen doesn't write, take the pen back and take the contract back. [laughter]

This is not your average condition. These are pretty extreme. And they're very recognizable.

You'll find out that when you put one of these in an HGC, for instance, that all of a sudden, clear up on the third floor of the building next door, you've got problems. You've got problems, man! You've got problems out on the front walk and you've got problems in the basement and you've got problems every place. Problems you never dreamed existed around there.

And not only that, they've got most of the people in their family on full automatic on problems. And you'll have all those on your neck giving them – giving their versions of all these problems, you see?

You'll find out you cannot even mail them a letter. Try and do it. They've given you the address and everything. And you stamp it carefully and so forth, but my golly, by the time you get through, this letter will have gone to Tanganyika. And just nothing can – nothing can permit – this letter just won't ever arrive, that's all.

But in the process of not arriving, man, does it sure carom off a lot of places! Don't be surprised if you have the whole postal department down there on your neck, you know, trying to find out why this letter, see? Why, you see?

And yet you look at it, and apparently it's just an operation of you wrote a simple letter. And you put it in an envelope, with the proper address, and put a stamp on it and put it in
the postbox. And it looks to you like it ought to be, then, picked up by the Post Office Department and eventually delivered to this person. But that is not what is going to happen, I can assure you. That is not.

And you can look through the files of Central Organizations, where they have come into collision with a person who should have been institutionalized long since, and you will see some of the weirdest, oddball communication curves you ever have cared, read. It is very funny.

You see, the person confronts no problems of any kind. So in the final analysis, of course, all problems are on automatic and they just happen. The person takes no responsibility for any action of any character except being a solution. And the person goes on being this solution. It's just one solution. That's all. And it'll be at the bottom of everything.

Now, there can be a million problems. There can be a million problems, but there's only one solution. See that?

Now, when you're doing a Goals Assessment, you're actually covertly getting a person to look at problems. That's why they go null. So it's a pretty good reach.

Furthermore, you're getting them to look at what they haven't been doing. Which is to say, while being A they were trying to be B and so never as-ised anything about A. So you keep dropping them back and around, and moving them on the track, to all those areas where they weren't being what they were being but were being something they weren't being; so we got no as-is. And that's what happens in a Goals Assessment.

Now, the lower harmonic or even, perhaps, the more direct approach is in Routine 1A.

Now, if you wanted to see somebody go through the roof or out the window or down the spout, run Routine 1A on a spinner. I haven't advocated that you do that. We don't have very many people that are edgy. And we certainly don't have any psychos.

You lack experience with psychos, I can tell you that. They – when I say "psycho" – the word "you're crazy" is used so carelessly in English language that – so careless that people lose sight of the fact that there are these conditions, that they do exist, and that in the United States something like one out of every fifteen people – including Menninger – have been in an institution at one time or another. And before they take them to an institution, they have to be pretty bad off, or mixed up in politics, one or the other.

And factually, a tour through an institution sometime – . Put your collar on backward sometime, or hang a cross on your chest and take over your ministerial rating or something, and go down to console the poor dead screamers that are inhabiting the local or some private sanitarium.

They usually won't let you into a private sanitarium. They're holding down Grandma, and so on, so they can collect the family fortune in there. Usually the people are in there for usual economic reasons.

For instance, we have a professional pc who caroms around in Scientology like this. And her brother – every time he needs some money, he gets her pronounced temporarily insane. And then, according to somebody's will, he has the family fortune at his beck and call.
And this girl simply gets put in institutions and electric shocked. And then the family is no longer interested, since they've got what they wanted for the moment, or something of the sort. And then she gets out of the institution. She's allowed to drift around for a little while. And then there's some economic bind comes along, and they put her back into the institution.

This has been going on for years. She's been breaking auditors' hearts. She even showed up one time in England, here. And promptly, of course, from various quarters and so on, pressure was put on authorities, and she was promptly put into an institution here in England. And she walked out the front gate of it and turned around twice, and so help me Pete, was back into it. I don't even know where she is now. I've gotten – I've lost track of this particular character.

We've rescued her out of too many gray walls, you see. But the gate there – there seems to be a strong wind blowing from outside and through that gate. But it's economics.

And – but you go to a public institution – and the best thing to do – to go near is a public institution. And – like Menninger's fills up all the time. And – well, Menninger has his own clinic on one side of the river, and after they all run out of money, then he ferries them across the river to the state institution on the other side. I'm not kidding you. That is his modus operandi.

And practically nobody ever walked out of Menninger's front gate. They go down and go across the river, and they get put into the state institution where they don't cost anybody anything. [laughter]

But state institutions are great – are the great neglected – state institutions. And you'll find lots of people in there that – they're real psychotics. And it is actually something to look at a real psychotic. It is something to look at. Wow! Wow! Very impressive.

Years ago I used to worry about them. Long time ago, I thought this was something remarkable. The only thing remarkable about it is the psychiatrist with his solution. And of course, your psychiatrist is not Q-and-Aing with any problems. So therefore, he never tries to solve insanity. He Qs-and-As with what this psychotic is being – a solution. And when the psychiatrist Qs-and-As with the psychotic, the psychiatrist comes up with an obsessive solution.

You wouldn't even stand a chance getting electric shock relieved in the United States. You couldn't even legislate against it. Everybody would be pouring in there, telling you, "This is the solution."

And you say at the same time, "Has this ever cured anybody?"

And they say, "No, it has never cured anybody."

And you say, "Well, why are you doing it?"

"Well, it's what you're supposed to do."

"Who said you're supposed to do it?"

"Well, it's what you do!"
"Yeah. All right. Has it ever cured anybody?"

"No. As a matter of fact, if we didn't electric shock anybody, they'd get out of here weeks before."

"Well, now look. Then therefore, that's costing the taxpayer money, isn't it?"

And they say, "Well, yes, but it's the solution!" you see?

And if you wanted any greater proof than this – I wouldn't think you would want any greater proof than this, that what is the psychiatrist going to Q-and-A with? He's going to Q-and-A with a psychotic, that's for sure. Because he has no answers to amount to anything. So you just – now examine the psychiatrist's fixation on the idea of a solution. You give him an unworkable solution and he's very happy. And he'll never change his mind. That is the solution, and that is it.

And you talk to a psychiatrist and you try to tell him all about Scientology, see? And you say it'll do this and do that. Oh, yes, he agrees with you. He probably thinks it does. He doesn't think that it doesn't work.

What you're going up against is the fact that he is himself being an obsessive solution. See? He is a solution. What kind of a solution is he being? Well, he's a psychiatrist.

You say, "Yeah, well, all right."

This is what gets on your nerves all the time. The guy can't cure insanity. He can't do anything about psychosomatic illnesses. And yet, continually, everybody is referring to him, "But he is a psychiatrist!"

And you say, "Very good. Now, what has this got to do with it?" The person who handles the mind should be able to handle the mind. And everybody in the state and psychiatrists and the medical profession – they all look at you and they give you this complete non sequitur.

They'll say, "Yes, but he's a psychiatrist."

You say, "All right. Let's go over this again, slowly." Do you no good at all.

No, the man – that is the society's solution. And of course it's just held in place – rirrrr, crunch! See? And the psychiatrist cures are just held in place – rirrrr, crunch! See?

And when you come along and you say, "Why don't you do something practical?" you're asking a fixated solution to change, which isn't aware of any problem. And that's the mystery of psychiatry. They don't recognize that psychosis is a problem in the society. Psychosis is not a problem.

And therefore you would have some very odd conversations with the psychiatrists of this institution you visited. These conversations would sound very odd to you. You'd say, "This guy is nuts." Well, that's right. But you're talking to a fellow who is being an obsessive solution. And that is all he is being. He isn't being anything else. He doesn't have a chance to be anything else. Why? Because he's handling only people who are obsessive solutions.
Now, they're being obsessive solutions because they have no view of any problems of any kind whatsoever, and not a slightest idea of a problem ever existing! They have no idea that they are problems to anybody.

You can say to a psychotic, "Do you realize…" – after they've splattered a pitcher of milk all over the room – you can say to him, "Do you realize somebody's going to have to clean up this pitcher of milk splattered all over the room?"

No. You have not reached them. That does not communicate. That somebody else has a problem or that any problem exists does not communicate. There's no communication on the subject of problems. You can talk in vain. You see what I'm talking about?

So if psychiatry, in its various studies, has pursued a course of research, it has been a research of solutions. But what would you think of a group who continued to solve a problem they didn't know existed?

You say, "Why are you institutionalizing these people?"

And they'll give you the most oddball answers. But they will never give you the obvious answer. "They're a menace to their family and society, and therefore should be locked up" – that is not the straight answer. But you know that's the answer you'd get if you asked them. You know that because that's a sensible answer. But that's not the answer you'd get. You get all sorts of odd answers.

And they speak about cure. They're continuously speaking about cure. Either they hate anybody who says they can cure anything…

So while being the solution, they hate solutions. So you can get a whole series of solutions set up, and you can examine these solutions forever. And you say, "Well, where are we? What are we at? What are we looking at here?" Well, we're looking at solutions.

Well, please, in research, and please, in working with the mind, never make the mistake that man has now made all the time he's been on the track. Look, if there's a solution, there must have been a problem.

Look at the Ten Commandments, which are 162. You know, I'm beginning to believe the ministry can't count. I looked that up the other day, how many commandments there really were. You know, there's pages of them. And everybody keeps talking about the Ten Commandments.

And some versions of the Bible have Qed-and-Aed with the fact that there are supposed to be Ten Commandments, and they dragged in Ten Commandments. And they got Ten Commandments in them.

But a full Bible has just got commandments, commandments, commandments, commandments, commandments. Man, you don't know whether you're coming or going, when you finally get to the end of all these commandments – because you take any group of five, and at least two contradict. Confusing, man.

These are all solutions. The only thing they've listed is solutions. And that's why you don't like moral codes. Because moral codes are solutions to problems which aren't announced. And you can therefore define a moral code, technically. A moral code is a series of
solutions to problems which have not been confronted or analyzed. And you get upset about moral codes. "Thou shalt not drink pitchers of milk after three P.M. before thy parents"; or something like this. [laughter]

Do you realize that almost all of those commandments which are in the Bible at this particular time, that we call the Ten Commandments, are prompted by some obsessive crimes that existed at that state of the game, and that several of these commandments are solutions to venereal disease? Isn't that interesting? I think it's fascinating.

I see those archbishops now, standing up there with the little choirboys all singing and the harps drumming or whatever they do, and swinging incense burners around their head like slingshots, and going through it all, and everybody dropping nickels on the drums and so forth because they're solving venereal disease. I think that's terribly interesting. [laughter]

Why didn't they invent penicillin? Look what we would have been spared, man.

I've actually managed to shock even you a little bit. Look them over. Look them over. You think I'm kidding you. The next time you run into a copy of this thing, read them over and find out how many of them are solutions to venereal disease.

You see, that was a problem that descended on them that they could know nothing about. That was a problem that descended on them from various quarters of the world, and finally descended upon them from the New World. And they didn't know what the devil cooked here. But they got a lot of solutions. But they never looked at the problem.

And the problem, of course, was inherent in the basis that there were some (quote) "no sexual practices." They had enormous numbers of practices whereby, there was supposed to be no sex. They were already preventing sex, don't you see? So they turn around on the other side of the picture, and they say, "We'll leave all those in place, and now we will solve this other thing. While leaving all of the things that are causing the problem, you see, in place, we will now get some new solutions." That's the one thing they didn't need, man. Yeah.

They already had about forty too many solutions. They had actually prevented morality, at an ethical level, see, and then invented an immorality with a whole bunch of new morals.

I'm telling you this, not because I'm yip-yapping about the Christian church.

But solutions. Solutions. The more you have to do with solutions in straightening out human conduct the less gain you're going to make. And that's all there is to that. That's all I'm trying to tell you. The more you have to do with solutions for the third dynamic, the less third dynamic you're going to have. Because solution, by definition, is a nonconfront of the problem. And you get a fixed confront of the solution.

Well, if everybody is facing inboard while the enemy is attacking the gates, all hell is going to break loose, I promise you. Everybody faces the courtyard, you know, the inner keep. All the soldiers on the walls do nothing but look at the inner keep. And there it stands, stony, silent, massive, impressive. And they say, "Well, that will take care of us. That will take care of us." With their backs, you see, to the wall; and the walls are being stormed.
Now, what do you suppose is going to happen to all these soldiers? They're going to get a solution. That's for sure. They're going to get somebody else's solution in a hurry, aren't they?

So later on, this is proven so unworkable – this becomes so unworkable, at length – they try various means of this. They face inward, and eventually they take the keep, you see, and they make it have face, and they have arms, and you have stone idols. And if you just look at this enough, you see, you're all set. And don't go look that way, look at the stillness, you see, and that's good.

Now, the next one that happens after this sort of thing, of course, is that even though there isn't a war on, everybody's looking at the muezzin in the minaret. And he's saying, "Aly-al-Allah", or something of the sort. What does that mean? Father of evil?

Anyhow, they pray to this minaret, see? And everybody has to face in certain directions at certain times. And of course, this is a good solution. It's a good solution. Particularly for thieves in the market.

And you see, we get more and more of these "Face the motionlessness", "Contemplate the motionlessness, contemplate the motionlessness, contemplate..." "Look at the stillness. Look at the stillness." "Face inward; don't look outward."

Does that sound like any religions you ever heard of? "Meditate." "Now, if you just contemplate stillness enough, you've got it made, son."

It's an operation. It's the basic operation of the track. I don't – I'm not anti-Christian. I'm just anti-operation.

I believe it's perfectly all right to do anything you want to to people. I believe this is perfectly all right. I run on a very odd code. It's very peculiar for this universe. It's all right to do anything you want to, as long as you don't say it's something else, or try to convince people you're doing something else. That's where the crime comes in. The entrance of the not-know.

Or say you're doing something for some very wonderful purpose, you see, when as a matter of fact, you're doing it for quite another purpose, which is not wonderful at all. This, you might say, is evil. And this is practically the only evil there is that drifts on down the line.

And I don't – there's a qualification to that: is as long as – you can do anything you want to, as long as other people aren't being completely plowed under by it. Greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics. But that allows you an awful lot of latitude, believe me. There's an awful lot of latitude in there.

But fighting in the dark, up in a black alley with a poniard – nah, nah, nah. That's no way to live, man. That's no way to live. They pick you out of the burning ghat. And – you don't go to hell, you have to live with yourself – which is about the only hell there is.

Now, where you have solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, and nothing but solution, and nothing but solution, and nothing but solution; and you never have problem, problem, problem, problem, problem – you never see any of these problems; these
problems are never disclosed; you never see any part of them; nobody's ever asked to confront any of them, and so forth – of course, the person winds up eventually just bthaaa solution, you know? He's a walking solution. But he doesn't even know what he's a solution to. That's what's grim. It's the not-know.

Now, when that stage is reached, that's the definition of an obsessive solution. It is reaching the stage when one does not know what one is a solution to. And those are obsessive solutions, or being an obsessive solution.

Or when one is being terribly still, he doesn't know what he is being still to counteract the motion of – what. See? He doesn't know what motion he's trying to counteract by being still. Then – only then does obsessive stillness enter.

So you've got not-know, you see, running through all of these things. That is the bug factor.

Now, where you have an individual solving problems, you don't have an evil. There is nothing wrong with solving problems. Quite the contrary.

But an individual who has put all problems on automatic, now can't solve problems. If he does solve them, it'll be with some fantastic liability. Fabulous liability to the solution of a problem. He's liable to cave in, terror stomach turn on. Oh, my God, all the things that'll happen to him if he solves a problem.

So he's galumphing down the street, you see. And he doesn't know where to go for the night. And he doesn't know what to do, and so forth.

And you say, "Well, why don't you go down to the YMCA?"

The first thing you get back is, "Oh, no."

Well, it never occurs to you to ask him, "Do you have another solution?" But it should, because he hasn't. He doesn't know what he's trying to solve a problem. He just doesn't dare. They're not crazy, you know. That's not insane. It's just they don't dare solve a problem.

When you have somebody around who's a workman or something who is in this particular state, everything sort of goes into a fabulous decline of some character or another. And you can't quite figure out what is happening here. You'll find every job in the place gets half done. Everything is half done. And eventually, the whole place is just torn to pieces, and it's in complete ribbons.

He isn't being evil. He knows he's supposed to be working. So he's trying to work without solving any problems. Because the terrible consequences of solving a problem weigh down upon him mightily.

Now, you go up another stage, and you get a fellow who can solve problems of a minor nature but can't solve problems of a major nature. And we very often hire them as executives. Not in Scientology, but we very often see these people around in organizations trying to be executives, you know? And all they can do is swell themselves up and practice pomposity or be mean to their juniors or something like this. Because they for sure don't dare really solve a big problem.
The little problems about the ink wells, yeah, all right. But the contract with Blitz & Company, do we accept it or do we reject it? Brrrr, no, no, no, no. "Let's have a board meeting" is the usual answer, isn't it? Let's hang everybody else with the responsibility for this thing.

Now, they know this is so dangerous that they will very often try to protect you by preventing you from solving a problem. And they'll keep feeding you all sorts of extraneous data to the problem that has nothing to do with the problem at all. But they're merely trying to protect you; they're not trying to confuse you. Because they know what's going to happen to you if you solve a problem. Because they know what would happen to them, if they solved a major problem. The consequences of it are fantastic.

Now, we move up the line; we find a fellow who can relax on this particular subject.

Now, the level of aberration of a problem, the level of aberration – what it takes to be an aberrated solution, you see – we mustn't get the idea that all of it is very mild, you see, and this all runs at a very low level. We only see that when they're accumulating as locks.

Actually, the problems they have tried to solve and the problems they have failed on and the problems they have proposed and the things which they couldn't confront that they did solve are pretty magnitudinous. Such as "Shall we wipe out this planet?" You see, the problem was "The planet is getting overpopulated and people are having a rough time. Now, the solution is, "Shall we wipe out this planet or shall we practice immigration or what shall we do?" – see, to this problem of it's all overpopulated and things aren't going very well, and nobody's very happy. And this person took their finger off their number with magnitude, see? Big magnitude.

And they said, "Well, the thing to do, I guess, is to wipe out the planet. I know it's a bad thing, but it's the only thing we can do." And they did. And there they are now, down in the spinbin, see?

This kind of thing, you see? They make this – they didn't confront the problem. Either through laziness or stupidity or irresponsibility or something, they didn't confront this problem, and it influenced more dynamics than just themselves, and influenced them very heavily. And they did some great wrong by not confronting the problem. And they did some great wrong.

And after that the idea of "Problem? Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha. No, there are no problems around here. Everything is going along just fine." you know, the machinery is all busted down and the papers are all over the floor, and they're using the account books out there for a doormat. But "Everything is going fine. Yes, everything is fine."

And that's why you sit – see these guys – see these guys sitting in the middle of absolute – well, you wouldn't call it an office, you'd call it a catastrophe, see? And you'll see a guy sitting there, and there's just stuff running out of the walls, practically, you know? Man, they wouldn't dare touch any part of it. See? That itself would be a – they'd have to face this confusion. They'd have to see the condition they're in.

And when you see somebody living like that or somebody working like that, one of two things are true. Either the stuff is avalanching in faster than they can cope with it – but in
that particular case they're coping with it; they're getting something done, so they can then
straighten it out – or you've got somebody that doesn't even know it is there, doesn't even
know it's cascading in on him. And you'll go into this person's quarters or office or some-
ting, and you look at him and you say, "Why don't you straighten this place up?"

And the person says, "What?"

Well, that's the essence of what I've been trying to show you. They don't even see the
papers cascading all over the floor and the account books being used as a ledger. See? Which
happens to be, strangely enough, a doormat. It's not – it's not there. It's something – they just
got it all not-ised.

And if you can get the idea of this fellow sitting in this terribly untidy, completely
twisted-up office without even knowing he has a confused office space, without even know-
ing he has the papers scattered all over the place, without even knowing that he's got the floor
dirty, see, and without even noticing that the lights don't go on and off anymore, you've got
an idea of a thetan sitting in his bank.

And he says, "It's all orderly and it's all straight and there's nothing here and there's
nothing confused." You get the idea? And there he is. "It's all right. So it must be wrong with
them over there. Couldn't have anything here. Because I've got it all straight."

And you look at it, and you say, "You do? You do? How very interesting."

But of course because you can't see the clu tter that he is not taking any exception to,
why, you just put it down to an odd behavior pattern. And you say, "Well, he's behaving
oddly." [laughter]

Well, no. He's not behaving oddly. He's confronting no-ly. He's got a big
not-is going on it all.

Now, when you're running anything, you run it in an orderly fashion. And you will at
once get something done. In the first place, you're giving the person an orderliness to con-
front. And he confronts this orderliness, and he finds out that there is some motion that can
be confronted.

And then he'll confront a little disorderliness, and you'll get a somatic going through.
And then he confronts your orderliness of your process, and then he confronts the disorderli-
ness. Got the idea? And he'll confront a little bit more and a little bit more and a little bit
more.

Now, where you have individuals who are totally insane, you have, of course, got no
confront of problems. So don't expect 1A to work. It won't. 1A does not, anywhere near, go
as far south as the CCHs.

But it'll work on most people. But some of the phenomena it brings up is going to
startle you. It's going to startle you. This fellow's got it all tame. He's making it just fine.

Of course, he's ghnh sick whuu-whuh-whooh gat-an-sau, an-sooo and so forth. But
he's doing all right. And therefore he doesn't need any auditing.
I always feel like taking a violin out of my pocket and playing, "it maybe so, I really don't know, your story sounds so queer". [laughter]

All right. You start running problems on this guy, see? And you say, "Recall a problem. Recall a problem", or "Think of a problem", or "Confront a problem", or anything you want to say. "Recall a problem" is the one you're running, and the best one.

And the individual says, "Suuuuuh. I'm not sure about this." And this'll happen to almost anybody who's a member of the human race, right now, if you ran this particular process on them, see?

"What has Ron been talking about all these years? He's been talking about these things called ridges. Ridges. Oh, well, really! Ridges. People have ridges."

It's an interesting indictment of psychology that they don't believe there are any masses in the mind. "Ridges? Ridges? There are no ridges?"

And you run them on "Recall a problem. Recall a problem."

... [laughter] "Where the hell did this come from?", you see? And the bank starts going solid. And little avalanches occur. And little things occur. And somatics.

Well, you're just calling to his attention the fact that there were some problems around that were confusions, and they were in motion. And therefore the problem motion, of course, in counterpositions – oppositions of confusion, naturally, add up to ridges and masses and so on. So these things really start showing up.

This is the first time, I can tell you truly, that we have a good cure for this type of mass, and so forth, that we run into in the mind. It's good. It's really good. It bypasses the liability of curing it.

We're doing the darnedest things, here in Scientology. I mean, the things we're doing are absolutely incredible, see?

I can tell you absolutely, straight to your faces, that you mustn't solve anything, don't you see – I mean, that's what somebody would add this lecture up to, see – all the while, telling you you can solve it. And then you run it and you find out you can get away with it. That's pretty weird, you know. That's pretty weird, if you think it over.

In other words, we're enough on top of the mechanisms of existence and so on that we can pull the overt-motivator sequence without its consequences. Well, what the hell, you know? I mean, the guy that dreamed up that operation in the first place, that – that's defeated, you see. The problem-solution sequence, you see? And we say, all right, you can sit there, as an auditor, and solve all this pc's problems.

By the way, there's another index in psychiatry. They do sit there and solve all the patients' problems for them. Aaaah. Yep, this is right about craziness. That's for sure.

And the individual – we tell him, "All right. Solutions? Man, the only thing that's wrong, the only reason people go crazy, is solutions. Now go ahead and solve the pc."

But the fellow says, "But how? How could you possibly do that, you know? I mean, if you go crazy solving – gosh! Uh, hm. Must be something very evil about this."
Yeah. Yeah. Only the road out, of course, has no barriers. You see? That's the one thing that nobody ever looks at particularly, you know?

You go out through all the gates of a park and you go through the gates of the park. And other people trying to leave the park keep walking over shrubs and getting branches in their faces and coming up against barbed wire and stone walls. So that proves to them conclusively that you'd better never go out of the park.

And we come walking along, and we're walking along this gravel path and admiring the view. And we see the gate up ahead that we're going through, you know. Walking along and we're moving out the gate.

We look at these people floundering over here in the brush, and we say, "What the hell is the matter with them?" We said, "Hey! Hey! There's a walk over here. Why don't you come over here and walk out the gate?"

And they know – they know the truth. There is neither any walk nor any gate. Don't you get in that frame of mind.

Okay.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: 
PROCEDURE IN AUDITING

A lecture given on 5 July 1961

Okay. What is this, the fifth of July? Do you realize yesterday – yesterday was the anniversary of George III's considerable upset. [laughter]

Female voice: That's sacrilegious.

I did a terribly sacrilegious and irreverent thing, though. I found a guinea, a golden guinea with George III's head on it. Had it made up in a tie pin and took his head back to America. [laughter] Terrible thing. What makes it doubly funny – what makes it doubly funny is I was, of course, on the other side of that war. I was an observer on Howe's staff during the Battle of Bunker Hill. Wasn't even British, but I was there. Yeah.

Well, anyway, I haven't given you a chance to ask any questions for some time, so how about a question? ... Gee, I'm glad you know this stuff. Why, I'm really glad you know it. Yes?

Female voice: Well, I think it's stupid asking this question, but when you're doing Goals Assessment ...

When you're what?

Female voice: When you're doing a Goals Assessment ...

Yes? When you're doing ...

Female voice: ... do you cancel out that there is no more question at that time. I mean really go after it hard ...

Hm.

Female voice: ... before you begin nulling them ...

Hm.

Female voice: ... or is it all right just to take the list the preclear hands you and then start in on that?

Is it all right to do what?

Female voice: or just to take the list the preclear hands you or the list you already have ...

Hm.

Female voice: ... and start in on that.

No.
Female voice: ... I mean you can say to him, "Well, do you have any more goals?" and if he says, "No", not search for them or you can actually search for them.

No, if you're not – you don't have an option. Now, the question is, is "When doing Goals Assessment and you come to the end of your list, should you ask for more goals or not?" Isn't that what it'd boil down to? Or, "Can you get away with just going over your list and not asking for more goals", does that add up your question?

Female voice: Not quite, no. I mean should you actively search for more goals? Actively search?

Should you actually search for more goals? Yes. Well, it's – I think this is the same thing. Should you ask for more goals? Should you search for more goals? Yes. This is mandatory. In doing an SOP Goals Assessment, when you have gone down and finished off the list, you must always search for more goals in all categories. Not just more goals, but goals by categories. Antisocial goals, secret goals, hidden goals, goals that you would like to hide. Any kind of goal that you can think of or goals about health. Any kind of a goal that you might think this pc still has, you ask for this and add those to the goals list. And of course, every time the pc gives you a new goal spontaneously, you also add that to the goals list.

The goals list is a continuing action and it must always be continued. And as a matter of fact, when you think you finally have the pc's goals, you don't, unless you get a null on, "Do you have any more goals?" – You say well, I've got the pc's goal, and it continues to fall, but the checkout might demonstrate that the pc still had more goals. Now, if the pc still has more goals, the one which you found with such ardure is liable to go null.

But what is adding auditing time... And I'm awfully glad you asked this question. It's not a stupid question at all. It's something I should take up. Here I'm neglecting the piece de resistance and talking about the hors d'oeuvres all the time in not talking to you more about SOP Goals. Because it's a pretty precise activity, and if you're going to get anybody Clear, you're for sure going to get them Clear by running SOP Goals and not by doing anything else. Therefore, any question with regard to SOP Goals is very germane. And this is probably the only place in the world right now you could learn the straight dope on SOP Goals. So it's very far from a bad question, Evelyn.

All right. Now, let me give you a rundown on this. Should I? Just let me give you a very squared, cubed, triangular rundown on it that all buttons up very nicely. You are making a mistake in running SOP Goals Assessments, which winds up in getting fantastic numbers of goals. And the mistake is this, and in view of the fact you haven't been told to do it precisely, therefore, it can't be added up as a mistake. But it's one of these things you wouldn't think you'd have to tell somebody.

When you get to the end of a goals list ... I have a feeling maybe you've got some part of your question I'm not answering.

Female voice: Yes, but maybe you'll get there. [laughter]

All right. But what is the part – what is the part of the question I'm not talking about?

Another female voice: What she's – what she's trying to ask is, is that when you get the – you have a preclear and then you ask him for his goals list and he turns you in a list of
goals, should you at that time (before you begin eliminating them) ask him for further goals according to the E-Meter, or could you just begin assessing them?

I see. The question got lost back in the beginning here. Yes. You don't assess the list he gave you. Not until you've got a complete list. That is the precise answer to it. Now I see the tension go off. [laughter]

Preclear comes in, hands you a list of goals; yes, you add to that list, you add all categories to that list. You do not look on his having handed you a list of goals as having anything much to do with it. You're just richer by having a few more goals that you didn't have to sweat for. It is simply an assist. And you would – he'd take his list of goals, and then you start in on SOP Goals search just as you would in any case.

You want goals in all shapes, varieties and categories. And you just go on and on and on listing goals, goals, goals, goals, goals, and you list goals until you've got a null needle.

Now, here's the mistake you're making. You are making a mistake. You're asking for more goals, having nulled a lot of goals without running any rudiments in between. And therefore, you are getting falls, falls, falls that have nothing to do with more goals.

You are getting falls on "Oh, my God! Not any more goals. You mean, I have to give him some more goals. Ohhhh." And you get a fall.

And then you immediately got the fall, and you say "Well, then obviously, obviously the person has more goals, because he has a fall here." Oh, that's not true.

Havingness. There are several things run the same way. You ask this individual, "Do you have a present time problem?" It very often occurs this way. You ask the person ... This is true of meter. This is E-Metering. This is a part of E-Metering.

You ask the person, "Do you have a present time problem?" and you get a fall. Do you know that that can fall on having been asked for a present time problem? He doesn't have a present time problem, but he's upset because he thinks maybe he's going to have to spend the next two hours in auditing, running one, and you already ran one yesterday fruitlessly, and it didn't get anywhere. Or somebody has done something to him, and the present time problem didn't get handled, so he thinks auditing will handle it, and you're getting a fall, you see.

And here you are. You're getting a meter reaction on a present time problem. The meter is never wrong. The meter is never, never, never, never wrong, but you can sometimes ask the wrong question. See, you can ask the wrong question, get a fall, and then get the wrong idea of why it's falling. It's like this silly drill on, "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?", you see. And of course, you get a fall, and so you search it down and you find out that the cat PDHed him on the twelfth of July at midnight, you see. And it all is idiotic. Well, the meter isn't wrong. The meter isn't wrong. You just have asked a dull question.

The pc has a charge on "victim", has a charge on the word "pain", has a charge on the word "drug", has a charge on the word "hypnosis" and drowned a cat at twelve midnight – twelve July, midnight, see. Well, obviously, the whole thing adds up all wrong and backwards. So you have to take your questions apart, and you have to know what you're asking,
and you have to ask what you're asking to find – in such a way as to find out whether or not you're – get a reaction on the sensibility of it or some odd side effect.

So you say to this person, "Have you got any more goals?"

And the person says to himself, "Oh, no!", you know. And you get a fall.

And you say, "Oh, well, he's got more goals." – "Well, what is this more goals?"

And the person says, "Oh, no. I've thought of every goal I've ever had. I've thought of a lot of goals I haven't ever had." [laughter] "I've tried to please this auditor. I've tried and tried and tried to please this auditor and there's just no pleasing this auditor at all. And he hits me, so I'd better create." [laughter] "The auditor hits me, so I'd better create some. So all right. Well, let's see. Let's see, goals ... What the hell is a goal?", you know.

And this is how your lists get so extended. It's because you're not clearing what the meter is falling on.

So I'll give you a remedy for this. Run a rudiment before you ask for more goals. Now that, of course, applies to your question, too. Because, you see, the person comes in; he's got a goals list. He thinks this is all the goals he's ever had in his life. He hands you this list, and you promptly don't go down the list and say, "Oh, well, that's it. That's it. Let's get the show on the road." Instead of that, you ask him for more goals. Well, this in itself is rather odd sometimes. It's not always invalidating, but occasionally even that could be slightly invalidative to the pc, don't you see, in some rather sensitive pc.

So here's what – here's what you should do. And here's what you would do anyhow. You put him into Model Session in order to get more goals. You don't just take off: He hands you the list; you start asking him questions. That isn't the way you do it. You put him in Model Session. So you're in effect running all the beginning rudiments between his having written the goals list, you see, and your asking for more goals.

So, you get an opportunity to sort of clear this subject up because you've got the rudiments, don't you see. And you can ask some burning questions about goals while you're doing the rudiments. "How do you feel about goals? How do you feel about people searching for goals on you? How do you feel about giving up all these goals?" You can ask anything you want to like this. And you start to get a fall on this sort of thing, clean it up. See?

You say, "Well, now how do you feel about – you did all these goals and you've given them to me and so forth, and all right, and you realize I'm going to ask you for even more goals than this. How would you feel about that?"

You watch it. You'll see – sometimes you'll see a fall. And you'll say, "Well now, what's the matter with that?" Well, you immediately believe that he's got some goals he doesn't want to tell you about. No, he may be falling from just the idea of exhaustion. See? So get this cleared up.

"Now, what's that fall? What's that fall for? What does that fall fall on? More goals. What is that?"

"Oh, I don't know. Ah, yes. It's my father. He used to bang at me all the time about what I was going to do in life." Or some poor girl – I've seen a lot of girls practically spinning...
on this, trying to measure up to the ambitions of their parents. Girls seem to get this more heavily than boys. Boys get bored with it and run away. But the girl, she's sort of pinned down, you see. And people come along and, "What are you going to do with your life? What are you going to do with your life? What are you going to be? What are you going to be, little boy? What are you going to be, little girl? Are you going to be a fireman? Are you going to be this? Are you going to be that? What are you going to be?" Of course – the schnucklehead – he's being a little boy. He's perfectly all right. [laughter]

I've seen parents do this on babies and absolutely drive babies halfway around the bend. The kid is only six or seven months old, and yet he is being hammered and pounded. Nothing he can do is pleasing. He's always got to be able to do something else and something more. And they get it hot and heavy, these little kids do. You know?

The kid actually learns to pick up a milk cup, you know? He thinks that's pretty good. He's pretty smart, you know. And right away his parents want him to pick it up with one hand, you know. So he learns to pick it up with one hand, and so he learns to pick it up with one hand and drink it without spilling any milk at all which is rather terrific, you know. Or even actually be able to pick it up with one hand and splash it all over the room, which is equally terrific. [laughter]

And do the parents say anything at all about this? They say, "No, dear, you must learn how to drink milk without or with splashing it all over the room", you see. "You must learn to drink milk differently. You must learn to drink milk differently." So he learns how to drink milk, and now he's got to learn how to drink milk differently. See, here he is busy being a little boy and they say, "Well, you better be a grown man", see. But he's being a little boy, and nobody ever notices that he's being anything. All they notice about him is an alter-is.

Well, this adds up on some pcs particularly to be an allergy, to get – sometimes will get practically allergic to being asked for goals. "What are you going to do in life, little boy", adds up to the auditor's, "Do you have any more goals?" See, it's reactive.

So the smart thing for you to do before you ask for more goals is to run end rudiments or something of that sort. Give him a little break there. Run some end rudiments. Run some beginning rudiments. And now, before you actually ask for the goals as actually part of the rudiments, you clear up this subject of goals. "How do you feel about goals? Anybody ever pester you about goals very much?" so forth.

And the person, "Ooooh, yeah." All right.

You get no reaction on the idea of the word "goals", see – no reaction on this. Dandy. Dandy. Now let's say, "Have you got any more goals to add to this list?"

And the pc will say, "No."

And you won't get a fall on the needle either. But the way you can continue to get long, long lists and add to them forever, you see, is by mistaking what your meter is reading. Your meter is reading on an allergy to giving you any more goals, so you're reading it as though you've got now to get more goals. You get the misinterpretation?

But this isn't as bad as it looks, this isn't as bad as it looks, because a person who is having a rather hard time in life will give you five, six, seven, eight, nine hundred, a thousand
goals. But this at least saves you from getting in the additional two hundred you wouldn't have gotten, you see. I mean they just made up a couple of hundred there just to fill in time or something like this. Something went wrong.

So before you ask for more goals, whether the pc just gave you the list and you're just beginning or if you've just finished working over a whole column of goals, for heaven's sakes, clear the subject of goals, asking for goals and rudiments. And if you do that, you'll find your Goals Assessment goes more rapidly. Okay? Sound wise to you? It is.

Well, that's more question than you asked, but I have had it on the back of my mind for some time to speak to you about this. That okay?

Female voice: That's okay. Thank you.

All right. Wasn't any other part of that, was there?

Female voice: No. I've got it now.

You're sure?

Female voice: Yeah.

You're sure? All right. Any other question? Yes.

Another female voice: This follows right along and is equally – mine's being – quite dumber. When you have been nulling them, you still have not completed your list, do you keep on nulling at the beginning of the next session or do you ever ask for more goals before you continue? Do you ...

No. You just keep on nulling. And when you've totally run out of goals to null – that is to say, you've just completed the list.

Female voice: Yes.

When you've gone through the list once, even though many goals remained live, you ask for more goals. But the smart thing to do is to clear up goals and run rudiments before you ask for more goals. Got it?

Okay. Any other questions? Yes?

Male voice: With Routine 1A, would you run one for one with the Security Check?

Yeah. In Routine 1A would you run one for one with the Security Check? Yeah. But what do we mean by one for one? We simply mean if you're going to spend six hours running Recall a Problem, then you're going to spend six hours security checking and so on. You always bring a process up to a flat point before you do something else, because you're in collision with the Auditor's Code.

And you're going to find out this is pretty hard to do with Recall a Problem, Routine 1A. Pretty hard to do, because you're not going to flatten that very soon. And the guy can practically go on forever with a wobbling tone arm and so forth.

The best way to run Routine 1A in an HGC, would be to take Routine 1A's Problem Process and get that audited in formal session. And then take another auditor or take another period of the day as an entire separate activity and do a Security Check. And this supposes a
unique problem. You actually should flatten a process before doing something else or going on to another thing or changing, you see.

Routine 1A – in its infancy right now – yet shows no great promise of flattening rapidly. Certainly not flattening rapidly enough to do a Security Check. And to follow the rule, well, flatten the process and then do your Security Check, which you should do on the other routines ... You know, you shouldn't do the CCHs. You should bring CCH 4 up to a flat point and then do a Security Check or something like that, you see. Or even CCH 2 up to a flat point and do your Security Check.

Well, you're dealing with one now in Routine 1A that doesn't have such flat points – liable to go on forever. So you could get around this by setting up an entirely different session, see, or atmosphere or period or something. And just break it down so that we're running the pc at one time of the day on problems, and running him another time of the day on Security Checks.

You're going to find out Security Checks go more rapidly with Routine 1A than they have been doing on CCHs. Routine 1A can be terribly slowed down if the Security Check is omitted. And I would never go more than five hours of Routine 1A's Problems Process without doing a Security Check. I know that sounds like a rather involved answer, but I'm having to answer it on my feet. This is a new routine. Okay? Right.

*Female voice:* on this point, you said in an HGC you could do this by having two different auditors ...

Yeah.

*Female voice:* ... doing the job. Well, as a private auditor, could you, by agreement with the preclear beforehand, set aside the morning for...

Uh-huh.

*Female voice:* ... auditing problems and the afternoon ... Right.

*Female voice:* ... for auditing checks.

Yeah. As a private auditor – HGC, you could give them a couple of different auditors. A private auditor could probably most easily set aside a morning session, just as you've said, and say we're going to run problems in the morning and going to security check in the afternoon. Or we're going to run Security Checks in the late afternoon; we're going to run problems in the evening, or however we want to do. Or on alternate sessions, or something like this, we're going to run one or the other.

This does pose a slight difficulty because Routine 1A can get awfully hot. It can get awfully hot. And the pc will feel like you're tearing up the whole universe around him. And havingness gets badly shot in Routine 1A, apparently. And the appearance of the havingness shoot, of course, is the fact that by taking off the confusions, you're knocking out the stable datum which are havingness to the pc.
If the pc is looking on all these stable data as havingness, and these havingnesses are disappearing because you're knocking the confusions off of them, you've got the agitation and confusion of the problem agitating the pc, and all problems are a "can't-have" anyhow. And then you've got the stable data disappearing, and it looks rather – rather messy. And you've got TR 10, which you can always run as part of Routine 1A. I personally don't believe it is necessary, as long as your auditing is pretty smooth. Auditing has to be pretty smooth to run 1A. You can't fool with a beefy process like this with rough auditing

But if an individual is apparently getting very agitated and running down and that sort of thing, be assured that you are running the process which also runs it out. You've got the pc up against all of his "can't-haves", almost simultaneously. So of course, he looks like a "can't-have", you see. It's not really running down his havingness. But he has the feeling that it is. And it makes him nervous and agitated and misemotional and so forth. You'll run a lot of ... This process runs pretty hot.

Now, if, however, this seemed to be too bad or something of the sort, you always could find the pc's havingness process. Or you could use TR 10. I mean, good auditing is good auditing. And as far as cutting off suddenly, running problems – you know, the pc's got this terrible somatic. His head is just half off, and it moved over to just here, see. And now you say, "Well, that is the end of that process." Then you say, "Now we're going to do a Security Check." I'm afraid you'd get a backfire.

So that's why this different sessions or different auditors running the problem and the Security Check or a preagreed idea that at certain periods we're going to security check and at certain periods we're going to run problems. And you don't create the ARC breaks, you see. A pc isn't given the sudden feeling like he's going to be left in what he has just been plunged into, don't you see. He knows he'll have to face that up again tomorrow, so it's all right. And he becomes content to do that.

You say, well, can't we do this in one session and give him understanding in one session? Well, I personally doubt it. I personally doubt it because you're – you're now violating, in the session... One session, you've got a preunderstood situation going here, and the pc is not liable to examine his contract while he's in session. So you better let him go out of session and have him remember his contract, which his contract is, we're going to do alternate sessions on problems and Security Checks. And he knows this. This is easy to remember because it's two different parts of the day or it's two different people. You've – I think you'll find on the whole, it's a much happier situation.

Otherwise, you've got a big problem here. You got a big problem here with problems. It is a problem with running it, and that is that it isn't going to flatten fast. It's not a fast-flattening process.

I was very amused on an auditor's report last night to see somebody said – they said, "Well, tomorrow or the next day when we get this flat, can we go back to something or other?" and I thought, what hope. What hope. It – it isn't going to happen that way, see. He's going to run this on here for quite a little while, and it's just going to go and go and go and go and go and go and go and go. It's a marvelous way to get all of the problems out of the road that the pc's got so he isn't always coming up with PT problems. Your future sessions are going to go
rather easily. But to give this thing a lick and a promise and leave it while it's in high restim would be a dangerous thing to do, and in addition to that to hope that it's going to flatten in the next session or so is not optimistic; it's foolish. It's not going to.

It's just like the guy who'll sit there forever. You say, "Now, how does that problem seem to you?" you know.

And the fellow says, "All right."

And you say, "All right. Now describe the problem to me." And the guy will give you a different problem. Every time you'll get a different problem. When you're running this, "How does it seem to you?" and "Describe the problem." Well, it's, you know, the old – one of the earliest versions of problems: "Describe the problem. How does it seem to you? All right. Good. Describe the problem. How does it seem to you? Describe the problem. How does it seem to you?" And if you've ever had any experience running that, you know, he always gives you a different problem. He never gives you the same problem.

And he comes into session and he says, "Well", he says, "my wife and I have just had a quarrel, and she has just thrown the silver coffeepot down into the areaway. And it was a gift from my grandmother who is about to die at any moment. And this – our total future of economics is dependent on her remembering us in the estate, and she's going to call this evening", you see. It's a very involved problem.

And you say, "All right. Well, now that you described it, how does it seem to you?"

"Oh", he says, "it's pretty grim."

You say, "Describe the problem to me."

"Well, the problem's not being able to work, you see, because I expect my grandmother at all times, you see, to leave this estate."

You say what the hell happened to this coffeepot? [laughter] You know, you've got a coffeepot down in the middle of the areaway. Well, as far as that's concerned, it'll stay in the middle of the areaway for the rest of the session.

That's why we don't use, oddly enough, that is why we don't use any fancy problems processes in rudiments. We don't give them any opportunity in rudiments to do anything but run that problem they came up with. Now, the – Change as a level in the Prehav Scale was developed to cure alter-is. And it turns out that was a stopgap. Good as it was, it was a stopgap. What cures alter-is is problems. And your pc that's obsessively alter-ising anything, he'll run problems like a shot rocket. And problems is alter-is. Because, of course – look at it – the guy has a problem, so he solves it. Well, the solution to the problem is an alter-is of the problem, isn't it. So you get this as being the modus operandi of alter-is. I've made this discovery recently is why I suddenly am stressing and moved over onto 1A. I've been trying to cure alter-is.

Here was the factor that stood in our road from time immemorial The factor that stood in our road was a very simple one. We gave the pc an auditing command, and then he chewed it up and converted it into cellophane and exported it to China, received Chinese taels for it, converted these into rubles, went on an exploration to the North Pole and answered you with
blubber. [laughter] And it might have sounded reasonable to the auditor most of the time, but this tremendous chain of vias was going on. So you couldn't say this process doesn't work on this pc, because the process had never been administered to the pc. You know?

Now, there's ways to counteract that. You sit on top of a pc, practically on his lap and breathing down his larynx, and you say to him every time, "Now, exactly what did you do then?" or "What did you do with that auditing command?" It's very good practice every now and then to ask a pc, "How did you do that one?" You know? And he'll give you... And you will sometimes get the wildest concatenation of transferring tael to blubber, transferring it this way and that way. And then it goes out to a little spot that is eight feet off of the head, and then this spot plays a small tune. And then he knows because his toe is getting warm that the proper answer is... And it'll be some wild via-via-via-via-via, you see.

Well, now, you're running into this so strongly, so strongly, continuously, in running problems that you have to check up on this often, only it isn't "How did you do it?" that you check up on; it's "Did you do it?" You ask him for the problem he just recalled. Now you're going to be amazed if you haven't been already, the number of times the person really hasn't recalled a problem. Have you noticed that? Have you? They haven't really recalled a problem. They've just gotten the foggy notion of all of the confusion, see.

All right. So here's this fellow in a foggy confusion of some kind or another with about three somatics, and you all of a sudden say, "We're going to security check you." Now, I tell you, that's wonderful productive of ARC breaks. I don't care what understanding you've got, what contract you've got written and how many witnesses you had when you signed it with the pc, it isn't going to hold. Not even if you took it to court would it hold on some pc. Say, "Oh! No wait! What do you mean – what do you mean Security Check? What? Are you kidding? My head's – oh! and so on. It's a terrible pain here, and so on. And there's something going on – and you want to security check me. Oh, you're not taking care of me, auditor", see. So he goes right out of session. So you'd have to do it on different sessions or with different people if you're going to run Security Checks before Problems shows any signs of flattening.

I sight trouble up the line with this, that's why I'm stressing it so hard. Okay? All right. I overanswered that one, but I hope that's all right. Okay?

All right. Yes?

Male voice: What's the matter with overcoming the problem of the preclear not actually getting out an answer by having him verbally answer each command?

Yeah. Well, of course, that's time-consuming. Spot-checking was an early auditor mechanism to keep the pc in communication without wasting all of the time. Now, as you know, you've run a lot of pcs who are extremely verbose.

Male voice: Yeah, including me.

Yeah. Well, you give them – you give them an auditing command and you ask them to answer it aloud. You, by the way, would never give an understanding you were going to answer all these auditing commands aloud. There isn't anything like that. You'd have to tell him every time to tell you what it was all about, and by the time you've wasted four or five
session hours out of an intensive just because he was stumbling around on this you'll say, well, this pc would have gotten further if he'd simply recalled it.

So that you're doing a police check really. You're doing a spot check, and that's all you want. That's all you want. You don't want every question policed, you see. But you want it random enough so that it takes them by surprise and keeps them disciplined. Every few commands, particularly if the pc looks a little bit wuuhh, you know, it's a very good thing to say, "Now what was that problem?"

"Oh, oh, what was the problem! I don't uh – what problem?" so on.

And it's about time you said, "I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall a problem."


"I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall ..."

Say, by the way, I wonder if I've mentioned to you, every time the pc says anything or repeats the auditing command after you, or makes any comment of any kind on the auditing command – not cognition – you say, "I'll repeat the auditing command", and do so. Do you do that routinely?

_Audience: Yes._

Well, don't drop that one out of your works, because the pc very often feels he has answered the auditing command.

You say, "Recall a problem", and he says, "Cheesecake." And, you know? Chee – hm – you know. He'll nod. "Recall a problem" – nod, you know. What's happened? He's said to himself "Cheesecake", you know. And well, that's all right. He'll look vague, and then you could check up on it. That's one part of this.

But the other part of this is more important. You say "Recall a problem."

And the person says, "I never knew oak trees grew that large."

You say, "I'll repeat the auditing command", see. "Recall a problem."

"Oh, oh, oh, oh, yes, yes. Ah-ha, yeah. Yeah. I missed that for a minute."

You say, "Good. I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall a problem."

And the pc says, "Yes." He did, see. He gets a feeling that he's answered the auditing command. You can actually get into a silly situation where you think the pc is comm lagging, when as an actual fact, he thinks he's answered the auditing command. And when a pc repeats the auditing command after you, you've got a circuit in bloom. And if you don't repeat the auditing command, he is being audited by his circuit.

So the rule is, when the pc says anything after you've said the auditing command, which isn't an answer to the auditing command, you say "I'll repeat the auditing command", and do so. But there are two versions here of this.

_Cognition (which is an internal comment of some kind or another or a realization; a cognition is a realization): If the words repeating – "I'll repeat the auditing command" –
would tend or look like they were an invalidation of his cognition, you don't use them. You just repeat the auditing command. You got the idea?

If you're very good at this and your intentions are very good at this, there's no confusion in his mind that it is a different auditing command. He knows it's the same auditing command. You see how that works? But don't take a chance. There's two sides of this: (1) You can be so pedantically insistent on repeating the auditing command, the pc feels he can't communicate with you. And there's Clause 16, Auditor's Code, out. You can very easily shut off a pc's communication with this "I'll repeat the auditing command." Let's take the other side of this picture, however, and have the pc saying things and commenting on things and then have him sink back. Well, he must have kept that in some circuitry or some sort to keep the auditing command alive, don't you see. So you have to say the auditing command again. So you have to be clever enough to acknowledge what he said – acknowledge what he said – without ending the cycle of action. It's a semi-acknowledgment, by the way. These are half acknowledgments, and you acknowledge what he said without ending the cycle of the auditing command, and then you say the auditing command, see.

You say, "Mm-hm. All right. Recall a problem." See? You say to him, "Recall a problem."

And he says, "Gee! I haven't – haven't thought of that – I haven't thought of that for a long, long, long, long time", and so forth.

Well, in that case, you're not quite sure so you'd say, "Did you recall a problem?"

"Oh", the person says, "No. No. As a matter of fact, I – I didn't."

"All right. Recall a problem." See?

If you put a little insistence on your auditing command, it doesn't sound like a new auditing command. It sounds like a repeat.

You get how this is? It's an interestingly narrow border. Now you say, "Recall a problem." New command. "Recall a problem."

And the pc says, "Gee, it's getting late, isn't it?"

And you say, "Mm-hm. Recall a problem."

"Oh, oh-ho, oh, you want me to recall a problem, yeah."

"Recall a problem."

"Well, I – I don't know. I'm all confused about it", and so forth.

And you say, "I'll repeat the auditing command. Recall a problem."

He isn't under any illusion but that is the same auditing command that you are repeating over and over, don't you see? If you get good at this, you can actually drop out a lot of this "I'll repeat the auditing commands." If you're good at this.

There is such a thing as half acknowledgment, and there is such a thing as actually repeating the auditing command in such a way that there is no margin of doubt anywhere. He knows it's a repeat of the same command that you just gave him. Okay?
Audience: Yes. Mm-hm.

Right. Always get the auditing command you asked answered, by the way. Always get that answered, otherwise your pc goes out of session. Yes.

Male voice: Ron, could you ask the pc, "Do you still have the auditing command ?"

Yeah, you can. But you would ordinarily ask that while he was comm lagging and drifting around. It'd be almost an emergency situation. Its use would be very rare. Very rare. It's usually a very bad thing to interrupt a comm lag of the pc. The pc is, you know, looking for this. He's looking for it, he's looking for it, he's looking for it, looking for it. And all of a sudden, the auditor distracts him.

The most basic source of ARC breaks with auditors which are legitimate ARC breaks, is the auditor taking attention – the pc's attention off of his own case and putting it on the auditor. You'll find out that statement right there is the common denominator of ARC breaks. In other words, the pc is – got his attention on his case, and the auditor does something to pull his attention off. And that just about will practically finish some pcs. What happens is you get a sudden change of attention. And change of attention is associated in all minds with accidents, pain, casualties and so forth, you see. The fellow was standing there minding his own business, and all of a sudden this sixteen-inch shell hit him in the back, see.

Well, that's a sudden change of attention. And if the auditor yanks the pc's attention off his bank and puts it on the auditor, what the auditor's trying to do or say, then – in the case of an auditor flub, or in the case of an auditor intruding during a comm lag, or in some other case of – analogous – then the pc gets the sensation of having been hurt or struck.

And you have to be kind of careful about this, so that if the pc is sitting there, and you're saying by this time, "Well, good God! Eight, nine, ten minutes have gone by. He sure can't still be thinking of the auditing command", you know. I'd wait till he sort of looked up for a moment dazedly in my direction. I would say to him – not very specific or not very intrusive – "You still got that?"

He'd say, "What?"

You say, "All right. I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Oh, well, yeah. I was drifting off..." And you don't get an ARC break. But the pc is deeply interiorized, and he's thinking, he's thinking. He's running through his mind and through his mind. He hasn't said a thing. He's still got the auditing command. He's doing what he's supposed to be doing. He is the soul of purity and goodness. He's doing everything you said. He is in control. He's interested in his own case. He'll give you the answer as soon as he's got one.

And you stick your number 10's in and you say, "Have you still got the auditing command?"

And he says to himself, "My God, I give up. Here I am doing everything I'm supposed to be doing", you got the idea, "and here you have given me a sudden shift of attention." And then you'll get the blowups and there's your fruitful source of ARC breaks. Okay?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.
All right. You bet.

Female voice: Um, should the preclear ask you to repeat the auditing command or say he's lost the auditing command, is it necessary to say, "I will repeat the auditing command" before you repeat it to him? – should he ask you for it.

Oh, I very often omit it. If you say – the pc thinks he's lost the auditing command and he asks the auditor to repeat the auditing command, does the auditor then say, "I will now repeat the auditing command", and do so? Yes, this is formally, exactly, absolutely correct. That's absolutely correct. It can, however, be omitted as a preliminary statement to repeating it. The pc says, "I haven't got that command. What did you say?" And just simply say, "Well, recall a problem." He won't take it amiss. You bet.

Female voice: Is there any way that you can tell on the E-Meter what the pc is doing, if he still has the command or if he doesn't?

Yeah. Yeah. It'll wander around. Needle – needle will wander around. Tone arm will move. If these things all of a sudden become still and there's nothing happening on the meter at all, it's almost legitimate to assume that he has lost the auditing command or is thinking about something else or is doing something else. You can tell on a meter if you watch the meter whether the pc still has the auditing command and is still doing it.

If the pc is still doing the auditing command, of course, he's plowing through energy masses of one character or another, and this is the first thing that the E-Meter registers. So of course, it does register whether or not he still has the auditing command. I would not say it was totally vital, because I think a pc could give himself an auditing command and give himself some other auditing command, and you'd still get a meter reaction. This isn't a foolproof answer, but it is an answer. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you.

All right.

Another female voice: You mentioned that in running Routine 1A, the preclear may need havingness or he may look as though he needs it, but not really need it.

Mm-hm.

Female voice: Well, you can... Could you just check that up with a hand-squeeze test? I assume you can.

The pc may look like he needs havingness or may actually need havingness. It goes like this: It's how gaunt and wan does this pc start looking. It's a question of degree. You will find in running Recall a Problem, that the havingness will drop and then resurge. You know, goes down and then he comes up and he's all right.

All right. Supposing it just kept going down, and he just kept getting hollow-eyed and he's deeper and deeper and further and further gone over a period of a half an hour or something like this, and the bottom had practically dropped out. Well, I'd bring it up to a point that wasn't disturbing anything, you know, where he had a couple or three answers that were fairly close together, and I'd run some havingness on him. It's a question of degree. It's a
question of how bad off does this pc look. But he can look pretty bad, by the way, without going by the boards. He can look pretty bad without going by the boards.

Female voice: Would the hand-squeeze test not be valid in that situation?

Perfectly valid. Hand-squeeze test would be perfectly valid. But you start running in and out of problems, you're going to get stuck needles, loose needles, stuck needles, loose needles, stuck needles, loose needles. And the fact that a needle is stuck up for a moment or two would not be a criterion that he needed havingness.

You'd run havingness the same way as you always ran it. We could run the Havingness and Confront Process over into Routine 1A as far as that's concerned. I mean, you don't have to worry about that. May do so. Perfectly legitimate. Havingness and Confront Process are not an integral part of Routine 2. They've just been stuck in Routine 2 because we didn't have any other stowage for them. Okay?

All right. Yes.

Male voice: Would Routine 1A flatten a hidden standard?

Would Routine 1A flatten a hidden standard? It sure would. That's a very good thing you asked that, Robin, because frankly that's what it's looking for. The alter-is and the hidden standards – if you can get these things out of the way, man, you can clear them with a swish. And if you – if they've still got hidden standards, even while you're doing Goals Assessments, their hidden standards can remain a little too effective. It certainly gets the hidden standard out of the road. And if you've got the alter-is out of the road, the obsessive change of the auditing command so that you can give him auditing commands (which is what the CCHs are for) – and if you can get the hidden standards out of the road, voilà! You really got it made. Answer your question?

Male voice: Thank you.

All right. Yes.

Female voice: What if you – in running 1A, you have a preclear who volunteers oral answers? Do you tell him to shut up?

In running Routine 1A, what if you have a preclear that volunteers oral answers. Such as what? Now, give me an example.

Female voice: Well, such as for me – it is being run on me – and I have – each time the command has been asked, I have given the preclear a verbal answer. I mean, the – the auditor a verbal answer.

Ah, yeah. Go on.

Female voice: Well, this has been going on for several sessions. Should I quit doing it?

Oh, no ...

Female voice: You know, it's the natural way of doing it.

... no, no, no, no, no.
Female voice: And I was wondering, if – when I was an auditor, if it should be prohibited.

No, no, no, no, no. You see, let's get back to the definition of an auditing command. It goes back to this fundamental: An auditing command when executed has had performed exactly what it said, and nothing else. An auditing command has no understoods about it. There's no prearrangement about an auditing command except maybe learning the language.

So if you have said "Tell me – Recall and tell me about a problem", then, of course, you would expect him to do it always. If you have said "Recall but don't tell me about a problem", you would expect him to recall one but not say a word to you – neither one of which are workable commands. I'm just giving you – they'd have to be that. And that is the only way you would be able, by the Auditor's Code and all standards of auditing, to regulate whether the pc talked or not. It'd have to be inherent in the auditing command.

Now, when you've said, "Recall a problem", you haven't told him to do anything but recall a problem. Now, he has recalled a problem, and if he then elects to tell you about it, all right. If he elects not to tell you about it, all right. That is not part of the auditing command. So you can't have a prearranged agreement with the pc in any event as to anything he was going to do. You got the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

If you understand that very carefully, you never get in trouble with a pc. Remember that it's very difficult to get into trouble as a pc being audited by any auditor if you only do what the auditor says. This is quite interesting. Never do anything else than what the auditor says. Only do what the auditor says. This is an interesting index. It's very difficult for you to get into trouble.

I had an auditor finally get past that one one time by simply changing the command before it could be answered, several times. And that you couldn't do anything about, see. Gave you one process then gave you another process and another process, and each time waited for no answer and said, "Oh, no", or something like this, and then gave you another one. And then finally says, "Well, answer the auditing command." And I had to say, "Which auditing command?" And the auditor practically blew up.

Well, I had to know. I mean, I didn't even have any understanding about whether – whether you answered the first command first or the last command first or what command did you ask first. And I had four auditing commands, and they had all been asked, but no answer had been waited for on any of the auditing commands. Coo! Where did we go? What did we do? So that point of confusion can – could happen, but... or the auditor who just won't give any auditing commands, who just sits there silent. Best cure for that, of course, is go in the other room and get a gun and shoot them, put them out of their misery. [laughter]

But that is – those are the two wild tricks that can be played by a person who is pretending to audit. It'd only be a pretense of auditing, but those are the two wild tricks, is not give any commands – just remain silent – or give a whole series of different commands without wanting any answer to any of the commands. And between those two things, you'd have about all that you really could do wrong in auditing.
Give auditing commands that can't be answered. Don't let them be answered. Don't wait for them to be answered. Give other commands before those commands can be answered, preferably different commands on a different process; or say nothing. That is the most maddening thing to a pc, is the pc gets a horrible somatic and waits for the next auditing command, and there is none. Fifteen minutes go by, and there is no next auditing command. The auditor is just sitting there. Can you imagine that condition occurring? Well, I have seen the condition occur a few times. Quite amazing.

What happened to the auditor? Where is the auditor? Why – and wha – . It's a question of the auditor went totally out of session. You know, he's not supposed to be in session, so he's gone out of session, what do you do about it, you see? There isn't anything you can do about it.

Beyond those two things, you're always perfectly safe to do exactly what the auditor says. And oddly enough, you sometimes make a monkey out of some auditors when you do exactly what the auditor says, when you do nothing but what the auditor says. The oddities of some auditing commands suddenly come to view. I can't think of an example readily on the thing, but you will run into them from time to time. You do exactly what the auditor said, and he didn't tell you to do that. Oh, yes, he did. He said – distinctly, he said, "Think of a time when you weren't answering an auditing command."

And he says, "Well? Well?"

And you say, "I am."

"Well", he says, "when, when?"

"Well, right now. I'm not answering an auditing command."

And he'll say, "By golly, that's right. Well, let's see, I'd better phrase this auditing command so that it can be done."

That little game I used to play. I always used to do the exact auditing command that I was given. They're pretty wild. You listen sometime when you've seen somebody, particularly making up commands of some kind or another.

If a command is unanswerable when I'm being audited, I just simply say so. But this is not even an advice or a discipline to a pc. You cannot give advice to a pc. That's an evaluation. That's telling the pc how to act. You mustn't ever tell the pc how to do the auditing command in addition to the auditing command. It was – all must be inherent in the auditing command you expect to be answered. And that's the only direction the pc has.

If the pc is doing something else, well, you better rephrase the auditing command if you don't want him to do it. Because if by the standards of the auditing command he could do this thing, that would be very incorrect in auditing to censure him for doing it. You got it? That comes under the shuns. I'm covering that rather heavily because it's one of the great fundamentals of auditing. It was thoroughly disregarded in most psychotherapy that has ever been practiced. It just has never been a factor that has ever come up.
They talk about all sorts of things. They evaluate and they invalidate, and they never let the patient give an answer. They don't ever expect the patient to answer all these various things. I hope that answered your question.

*Female voice:* Yes.

You should just go on answering. Your specific answer is whatever the auditor asks, you do it if it can be done. And if it can't be done, tell him so.

*Female voice:* You do it the way – as a preclear, then, you do it the way you would do it.

Yes. You just always do it the way you do it.

*Female voice:* And as an auditor, you don't ask him to do it any different than he would do it.

That's for sure. If you want him to do it some other different way than what he's doing it, you'd better add it to the auditing command.

*Female voice:* Now I understand.

Yeah. So you'd have no understanding going on it. It would simply be a statement. You know, it wouldn't be from – we clear at the beginning of session that each time he answers the auditing question, he's going to put both feet flat on the floor. All right. That's valid for one answer – just one answer – because it's sort of part of the first auditing command, you see.

You say, "Well, now every time I ask you an auditing command – every time I ask you an auditing command, which is going to be one – you put both feet flat on the floor. All right. Now, here is the auditing command. When was George born?"

And you put both feet flat on the floor, and you say, "October the 2nd, 1716, or something."

And you cross your legs. And he says, "All right. When was George born?"

And you say, "October the 2nd, 17 – ."

He says, "Wait a minute. You didn't put both your feet on the leg – on the floor."

And you say, "Well, you didn't tell me to either."

"Let's see. Let's see. That's right. I didn't", you know.

There are no understoods. No carry-overs.

You'll sometimes see one of these things in as a sleeper. You won't notice it, but it's a sleeper. It's a sleeper in a session. And it's actually interrupting the session. You've got some understanding that you're going to quit at 4:15. That's an integral part of every auditing command. See? You can very often introduce these weird things. The auditor makes a contract with the pc, or the pc makes a contract with the auditor that it's going to be so and so and so and so. Well, of course, that's good for the first auditing command. That's all.
There is no contract between the auditor and the pc from the pc's viewpoint. There is a contract from the auditor's viewpoint. The auditor is there to give him some auditing for a certain period of time, but even the period of time disappears as far as the pc is concerned. There isn't anything else. There is nothing but the auditing command. That is all. And then there's this acknowledgment and the various guidance that he gets from the auditor. That's it. When it is given, see, each in each unit of time. Otherwise, auditing scrambles, becomes bunched up, the pc doesn't know what he's doing and is not in-session.

So that you can hang a pc in the first auditing command of the session by having an understanding. You can hang him on the first auditing command, and the rest of the session, he will be on the first auditing command.

And during this seven-hour session, you have asked and got answered just one auditing command. That's all. That's the first command. I don't care how many times you repeated it, you asked the first command. That was the only thing that you asked. Got it?

One of the great fundamentals of auditing: Get an answer to every auditing command, and the pc only has to answer the exact auditing command which he is given at that time. There are no other understandings. There is no understanding that he's in-session. There is no understanding that he hasn't got to have a present time problem. There is no understanding, you see, that at 5:13 he can walk out of the room. There is no understanding for anything. You got it? It's just the auditing command at the moment when given.

There is no way to be a pc. There is no way to be a pc at all. No modus operandi. This is violated in Book One, by the way, with great enthusiasm. Old Joe Winter, and John W. Campbell, Jr., and several other guys around, wrote a pc's code. And they wrote up this pc's code, so I think we shoved it in the book. I don't think I've even ever read it. What trust and confidence I have in some ways.

Actually an HGC contract to obtain auditing is in violation of these principles, but in view of the fact that it's an administrative matter, there it is. But that it applies to auditing, the staff auditor is not bound by it. Couldn't be. The questions in the session are not monitored by it. It couldn't be. The HGC administrative contract has to do with the conduct of the pc when he's not being audited, and therefore that's all right, but cannot regulate the conduct of the pc while he is being audited in any way, shape or form. And no auditor can, beyond exerting control for one question at a time. That is the control he exerts.

Now, you can only get in trouble with this when a pc, out of session, comes up to anger or something of the sort and goes screaming at somebody out of session. And in New York City, they had a pc one time, years and years ago, that would come up to anger and go out and bust up a hotel room or something and would be upbraided by all of his relatives and knocked back into apathy. So the auditor would get ahold of this pc again, and they'd audit the pc, and they'd bring the pc up through 1.5. And the pc would get close to 1.5, go bust up a hotel room or a relative or something of the sort, and all the powers of creation would all come together to smash him back into apathy again.

And you know that this kept up for the better part of a year I think it was. It was a fantastic performance. There wasn't anybody going to let that pc get well, and the auditor audit-
ing the pc had no facilities for restraining the pc in an auditing room for the duration of the twenty-four hours, you see.

What he needed to have been done was auditing in a padded cell; of course, the pc was a psycho. But – that would have worked all right. But that was the most piteous example of the society being totally against anybody getting back on his feet that I have ever witnessed. It really went on, I think, for the better part of a year. Yes?

Female voice: But if you had a case, and let's say that they did answer the problem. They said, well, the problem was how to get along with Joe. And – but then they went on, and then they began to tell you how they first met Joe and how – the reasons why they had this particular problem. Well then, you wouldn't – you wouldn't – that isn't answering the part of the answer to the auditing command. You would try to use your acknowledgments to ...

Yeah. Well, this comes under the skills and tools of the auditor. I was talking about the jurisprudence back of it. Now, far as the skills and tools of the auditor are concerned, he has asked the pc an auditing command. He expects that auditing command to be answered. And that is all he expects.

Now, you get into the control factor of the auditor. This goes over into another field entirely different, and your question, for instance, was, "Well, do you tell them to shut up?" Yes, an auditor can tell a pc to shut up. I have done so. I have said very elegantly in my best possible formal auditing fashion, "Shut up and answer the auditing command." And the pc looks at me blankly for a moment and then answers the auditing command. I never have an ARC break for some reason or other, any more than "Now, sit back in the chair there and answer the auditing command." Pc is going to leave. They're through. They're finished. Anybody ask an outrageous question like "What criminalities have your father ever engaged in?" or something like this. It's insulting. It impinges upon the family honor, you know. "Sit down and answer the auditing command."

And so they sit down; "Yes, he spent seven years in prison." And – some reason or other there's never any ARC break.

This comes under the heading of control. You can control pcs. The mistake is not to control pcs. The mistake is to be kind. I gave you a lecture on that the other day. That's the mistake, man. Or to be social while you're auditing. [laughter] God! Social auditing, kind auditing – boy, they kill more pcs. Pcs get all off the rails. It – in the final analysis, it is much better to say to a pc that is burning up all of his auditing time, "Shut up!"

The pc says, "Aw, I'm talking too much?"

"Yes. Yes. You're covering things I haven't asked you. Now, come on now. Let's answer that one auditing question, now: Recall a problem."

"Oh, oh. That's what you want. Why didn't you say so?"

"I have. Recall a problem." [laughter]

And you'll find your pcs like you better. That's for sure.

Now, there's a polite way of telling a pc to shut up. You say, "Recall a problem."
And the pc says, "Mmm, with Joe. Well, yes. Oh, with Joe. Yeah. Oh, yeah. I had that problem for years. Yes, my mother also had that problem, and my cousin Joanne, she had that problem. And sister Betsy, she had the problem, too. The problem originally originated back in the back hills..." Well, if you've let them go that far, man, you've had it, see.

No, the proper way, actually, to handle it if you can do it, is to say, "Thank you.", you know, plant it right in their skull. "Thank you." They shut up if you're good at it. Look at you kind of blankly. They agree with you, too. They were running off to the hills. Valence is running away with the session. They know a valence is running away with the session. If it can run away with you, too, they go out of session.

Aw, I remember this – one guy, he's had a bad history in Scientology because he keeps falling off the marijuana wagon. And he goes out and gets jobs with bands and so forth. And then he gets to smoking the tea or get – "hitting the tea", I think they call it, or "having the tea pad" or something. And – he goes to ramming around and then all of a sudden, why, he realizes he isn't doing right, and he'll turn up again. He has a bad time, this boy.

He – nobody is sufficiently interested in him. The main difficulty is, is none of his fellow Scientologists are sufficiently interested in – with him to make him sit down and get some auditing, see. He keeps getting away with it. But this guy pulled an interesting, proper trick one time. A very proper trick.

He was auditing an HGC pc. This fellow had a wife. And this wife sounded like one of these tape recorders when Peter is copying tapes, you know, at high speed. [laughter] And he was going over to this fellow's apartment to audit him, and this wife would tear off and tear into Scientology and so forth, and tear into this, and then intrude her own problems, and difficulties this fellow has, and this fellow had always been silly about his mind. And oh, my God, you know. Just run on and on and on, miles a minute and disassociatively, too. You know, start talking about the China teapots and all this kind of thing. So this guy – this guy pulled a Tone 40 "Thank you" on her. He got his face right up against her face, [laughter] you see, bending over sideways as she was talking, you know, and put a Tone 40 "Thank you" right in the middle of her thetan. Bang! You see? And she didn't say a word for two days. [laughter]

And that pc was absolutely fascinated. He might or might not have gotten anything too much out of that intensive, but he went home perfectly satisfied. There must be something to Scientology because it's the first time in his life he'd ever heard his wife quiet for twenty-four hours. [laughter] I remember that silly case. You remember that one?

Female voice: Yeah, I remember that.

Yeah, man. He really planted one. Rest of that day, man, she didn't have a thing to say. [laughs] she had no – no ARC break of any kind with the organization or with that auditor. After that, she thought we were all right. Fascinating, isn't it, huh?

The mistake is not to control the pc. That's the mistake. And your – all of your social training and all of the other trainings which you have, go against that point. And you think a pc is talking too much, you can give them an acknowledgment, just before they – in full flight. But watch it, because you've announced yourself at that moment as a control unit, see.
You've announced yourself as a person who is controlling the pc. And the next few seconds are very crucial. Will you continue to control the pc or won't you?

And if you will continue to control the pc, you're all right. But if you really didn't mean it, and you're going to back out on it and you're going to apologize for having controlled the pc, you're going to be in trouble because the pc will make a test of it. Rather, the valence will make a test of it right at that moment. The valence is running on and on and on and on and on, and very non sequitur, and hasn't anything to do with the session. And you say, "Thank you."

And they're liable to get a little something sometimes, you know: "Well, you couldn't quite have said that. You interrupted me, you know", kind of fishing "Is he going to keep on controlling me?"

And you say, "Well, I'm sorry I interrupted you, really", and chicken out on it, see. You got an ARC break.

They say, "Well, I hadn't finished what I was saying. You know." If you don't chicken out, you get away with it right straight across the boards.

You say, "Yes, I know. Here's the next auditing command."

And they say, "I've met a tiger. Hmm! I've met a tiger with red stripes. I will now do the next auditing command and stop this nonsense."

ARC breaks proceed from lack of control. They actually always proceed from lack of auditing. You don't give auditing to the pc, you don't give control, you don't give auditing commands to the pc or you don't let the pc do the auditing command, you've got an ARC break. That's where your ARC breaks come from.

But as far as creating ARC breaks by being rough with the pc, positive with the pc, definite with the pc, and so forth – no, you do not get ARC breaks. The pc sort of says, "Wheew. I've been sitting here for the last three sessions wondering if this person was ever going to get on the ball and really, really, really get this thing in – into its proper pocket. And he did. Huh-huh! Good! That's really some auditor", they'll think, you know.

I remember one pc didn't make any progress. Didn't make any progress of any kind whatsoever under one auditor who was being very, very kind, very understanding, very sympathetic. Pc would spend about two-and-a-half-hours answering one auditing question, just running off at the mouth, and the auditor would sit there and let her do it. Just burning time, burning time, burning time, burning time.

Basically, what you can get away with is the degree that you can impinge upon the pc. Impingement has a lot to do with this, a lot to do with it. If you haven't made any impingement on the pc at all, the pc isn't going to do the auditing commands easily and isn't going to gain very fast. But if you do make an impingement on the pc, why, fine.

You start making a misemotional impingement on the pc, however, and you have bolstered up the valence which is always – a valence always is, by the way, a misemotional entity, and you've bucked up the valence, and you've permitted the valence now to overwhelm the pc, you see. Valences are usually in a misemotional state and – down under the surface,
and so on. They're low grade. And you've supported the anger that's about to cave in the pc and the pc will cave in. That is the wrong way to go about it.

If you're going to exert control, you exert it just as Tone 40 control. That's all. If you're going to exert fast, hard control, you simply say, "Well, that's it." And you say, "Do it." If you don't like what the pc is saying and you engage in a misemotional debate with the pc on what the pc is saying, oh, you've had it because you have now bolstered the valence which has already got the pc overwhelmed. So you have overwhelmed the pc, not controlled the pc. And there's a considerable difference between these two points.

So if you're going to do any of these things, if you're going to tell the pc to shut up and sit down, don't say, "Shut up! Sit down!" Oh, no. Nice Tone 40, "Shut up. Sit down. That's it. Thank you. Thank you very much. All right. Now, let's get on with this session, shall we? Here's the next auditing command." Bang!

Pc says, "I've met a tiger. Well, I guess these aberrations of mine have finally met their match."

But you can actually drive a pc off his hinges by becoming angry with him or using an angry tone of voice in trying to monitor or control. And if you don't shoot misemotion at a pc, you can say anything to a pc – if you don't shoot misemotion at him.

It's a bum thing to comment on a pc. It's a bum thing to make any comment of any kind whatsoever, on anything the pc has done. The pcs is – practically looks like they're pleading for a comment. They say, "Well, I burned down this church, you see. And I guess that was pretty bad – wasn't it?" And you, you knucklehead, say, "yes". Hmm, you've had it. You evaluated for the pc.

He asked for it. And you evaluated for him. And you say, "Well, then why in the name of common sense have I created an ARC break, and why is this pc out of session, and so forth?" You've made a comment. It is not up to the auditor to comment.

The pc says, "I've been sick for eighteen years, and I've had lumbosis in my zorch. And I have just been caved in all over the place, and that's pretty bad, and the doctors have really done me in, and everybody has done me in, and that sort of thing."

To say "Yes, you're in pretty bad shape", is a lousy thing to do. That's a bum thing to do. Just acknowledge it. Well if you're going to get him in auditing, you're going to get him to be audited, don't run a sales talk that is based upon an agreement with this sort of thing. Just say, "Yes, I am sure you need auditing. Now, the next auditing session begins at 7:30. Now, why aren't you there?" You see, that's the end of it. That's control. That's control.

But agreement about how bad off he is, agreement of how badly he's been treated or anything like that or agree that some auditor has bunged him up, or, you know, make – this is evaluation. Whether you like it or not, it's evaluation. The individual says, "Well, I feel pretty bad about having done that to that girl!", and the auditor says, "Well, I guess you should." You just watch him hit the toboggan. You can – you can – you can drop him two, three points on the Tone Scale tus-ku-whish, like a bang, you see.

Why? Because you are able to control. So therefore your opinion doesn't become an opinion to the pc; it becomes a stable datum. Now, God 'elp you if you are now faced with
the necessity of auditing out all of your stable data. You've made a lot of comments to the pc. You've agreed with the pc on a heck of a lot of how bad it all was and so forth. Now you're liable to get up against the situation where you actually are auditing out your own agreements with the pc on this subject, because you'll come up against them sooner or later. The pc will come out from underneath them.

Don't make comments to the pc. Don't comment on his data. Don't evaluate in any way. A comment is an evaluation even though it's apparently a kind of a null evaluation. I just don't pay any attention to it. I acknowledge it. I do this habitually enough that sometimes people think I've agreed with them when I've only acknowledged them. They want me to agree with them so hard that about the only trouble I ever get into is they think I've agreed with them.

They say, "It'd be a marvelous thing if we took the roof and moved it down on the lake, and so forth." And I've acknowledged that I heard them talking. See? And I'll say unfortunately or something like that, "Good. Good." And they say, "Well, he said we could take the roof down." [laughter]

Well, that's how hard – that's how hard a pc will work to get you to agree with them. You're not out of agreement with them. You're not in agreement with them. That isn't your role. Your role is the role of administering auditing and control, don't you see. That's the way it is.

Well, I've kept you terribly overdue.

Thank you very, very much.

Audience: Thank you.
ROUTINE 1A – PROBLEMS AND CONFRONT

A lecture given on 6 July 1961

Well, this is the what?

_Audience_: Sixth of July.

It's the 6th of July. No kidding! I just read an HCOB upstairs, said it was the 7th of July. [laughter] All right. It's the 6th of July, AD 11.

And I kept you very late. I've been keeping you very late these evenings. Do you object to this, or is this ...?

_Audience_: No.

It's all right? All right. Thank you.

Now you've just had a shift over from the process commands of Routine 1A. That's probably not the last one on 1A, because 1A by definition is simply Problems and a Security Check. And you can't help but run problems and see them run on a great many people, without finding odd factors of one character or another, and refining auditing commands.

The first thing I discovered is when you ran "Recall a problem", the person went first-dynamicy and actually just as-ised his own problems and his own problems and his own problems and plowed around on the valence.

In view of the fact you're running this on people who are very thoroughly fixed in valences, then the obvious thing to do is to boot them out of it. And that's – new command is a six-way bracket. Best way to phrase it is "can" and "wouldn't confront" on self, another and others. Actually the wording of it is not as important as that.

Now you've just had a shift over from the process commands of Routine 1A. That's probably not the last one on 1A, because 1A by definition is simply Problems and a Security Check. And you can't help but run problems and see them run on a great many people, without finding odd factors of one character or another, and refining auditing commands.

The first thing I discovered is when you ran "Recall a problem", the person went first-dynamicy and actually just as-ised his own problems and his own problems and his own problems and plowed around on the valence.

In view of the fact you're running this on people who are very thoroughly fixed in valences, then the obvious thing to do is to boot them out of it. And that's – new command is a six-way bracket. Best way to phrase it is "can" and "wouldn't confront" on self, another and others. Actually the wording of it is not as important as that.

Now, you got an oddity: Whenever you combine an "invent" process – a person isn't inventing, but it's an open invitation to invent, to the pc, to say something on the order of "What could you confront?" see? Well, oddly enough, the cure for the Step 6 phenomena is, of course, Confront. I don't know if you knew that that was the cure for the Step 6 phenomena – you ask somebody to invent something and the bank all goes solid. That's why we don't use Step 6. There were quite a few people that they'd start to invent something and the bank would go solid, you see? The whole bank would start living up.

Well, Confront is the antidote, and a five-, six-way bracket on Confront – plus and minus confront, you see ("What would you like to confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" you know, that – any such wording) – is a cure for this phenomenon that if you ask somebody to create, his bank goes solid. All you got to do is ask him to do some confronting
after that and the bank goes back to size. Do you understand that? So this was why I wasn't much concerned with everybody letting out – not everybody, but a few people letting out pale screams about Step 6.

It was very, very easy to remedy. There are two ways to take the edge off the bank after it has all been (quote) "beefed up."

You're looking at me awful blank. Don't you know this? Don't you know that if you run – that if you run old Step 6, the whole bank goes solid on some people?

_Audience: Yes. Yes._

You know that.

_Audience: Yes. We do._

All right. Did you know there was a remedy for it?

_Audience: No._

Oh, I see what we're falling into. [laughter] You thought it was incurable! [laughter] Well, actually – well, frankly, frankly, there's nothing in the world easier to cure than this particular one. You just say to the fellow who's had this happen to him – you've asked him to mock up, mock ... You could actually run Creative Processes if you kept this in mind. The guy doesn't like men with wooden legs, so you say to him, "Well, all right. Mock up a man with a wooden leg."

He says, "Well, I can't do it."

You see, give him a failure right away. And you say, "Well, mock up the shadow of Treasure Island."

"Oh, I can do that all right."

"All right. Now put a person on Treasure Island."

"All right, I can do that all right."

"Good. Now mock up a pirate ship."

"Well, I can do that all right."

"Now mock up a cook."

"All right. I can do that all right."

"All right. Now mock up a parrot."

"Okay. I can do that all right."

"Now put the parrot on the shoulder of a man."

"All right. I can do that all right."

"Now mock up Long John Silver."

"Oh. Yeah, I can do that!"
You say, "That's okay." He'll never have any further reaction from there on out to a man with a wooden leg. I mean, I'm not joking. That is what you could do.

Creative Processes were wonderful. There's no kidding about it. Because what's it do? It takes over the automaticity of the fellow creating these things in his own bank, you see? And you just take over the automaticity on a gradient scale, and you got it made.

Fellow is an alcoholic. You say, "Mock up a table."

"I can do that."

"All right. Mock up a table. Thank you." "Mock up a table. Thank you." "That's real good. Now, all right. Now, mock up a table with an empty glass on it."

"Uurhh, I can't do that. It gets full of whiskey."

Actually, that's what an alcoholic is trying to do, is as idiotic as that. He is trying to get back to where he was before he took the drink, so the glass has always got to be full. That's why they can't stop drinking. I mean, it's as stupidly idiotic as that. You act like you don't believe me. I mean, it's just as goofy as this – this alcoholism. The fellow sits there and he wishes he hadn't drunk the whiskey and the only way he can get the picture back of not having drunk whiskey is to have a full glass of whiskey in front of him, see? So, you fill up his glass of whiskey and then he's very happy for a split instant, you see?

But then, of course, it's got to be an empty glass of whiskey because you got to make nothing of whiskey. So he doesn't throw it in a spittoon, he throws it down his throat, see?

But the second he's thrown it down his throat, he's got an empty glass, so he has to fill the glass up again in order to be back where he started again. Because, of course, when he started, he had a full glass of whiskey. You think I'm kidding you, but they're this loopy. And that is alcoholism in full parade.

All right. You ask this alcoholic, you say, "All right. Mock up an empty glass."

"Can't do it."

"Well, all right. Now look, mock up the shadow of an empty glass."

"No. I can't do that."

"Mock up a ring on the table where an empty glass has been."

"All right, I can do that."

"Okay. Do that. All right. Now mock up the shadow of the empty glass."

"Okay, I can do that."

"All right. Now mock up an empty glass."

"Huhhh, all right. I can do it. It's all right – tduuhh! It keeps trying to fill up. No, it's going down. No-ow it's going – filling up – oh...." [laughter]

And with a terrible series – experience of relief, he says, "Huh! I can do it! Yeah, I can mock up an empty glass."
You say, "That's real good. Now, fill it up full of whiskey."

"Ulp!"

And you say, "No, no, now. Now, just let it sit on the table and fill it up full of whiskey."


You say, "Well, all right. Just keep putting it back there. Now, just put it on the table and get it full of whiskey. All right. You're all set now. Now you can kind of hold it there on the table. Can you hold it there on the table?"


Sometimes you're not that lucky. It keeps pouring down their throat, pouring down their throat. But any gradient that you could possibly figure out, see? Eventually he can sit there with a whiskey bottle, he can sit there with a glass, he can sit there with a full glass of whiskey. He can sit there with any of these combinations. And when he can do that, he's no longer an alcoholic. Just like that.

You know, the test of an alcoholic is, can he ever take a drink? The test of an alcoholic is, can he take a drink? That's the cork test. And Alcoholics Anonymous say it is impossible to cure alcoholism or do anything about alcoholism, so therefore they must not ever take a drink, because they know this is true: that an alcoholic is no longer – not an alcoholic as long as he doesn't take a drink. But he becomes an alcoholic at once if he takes a drink, so I guess that makes him an alcoholic all the time, doesn't it? That's why Alcoholics Anonymous is – all it's doing is running a terrific "can't-have" on alcohol. Now, where do you think that's going to get, huh?

All right. You can cure all that with Creative Processing. Well, all right. But because you've done this, because you've made the guy mock it up, mock it up, the bank has gotten solid. You know, he feels these ridges. He feels these masses. It is not so good. It's not so good. His chest is caving in and all sorts of bad things are happening to him, see? And he doesn't think this is so good. So you-ou-ou-ou ...

Two things – two things that'll do it. One: "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" Run that for a while. The bank goes thuum.

Now, to make sure that it stays down and make sure the process doesn't get stuck on flows or imbalanced, you run "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" "What could another confront?" "What would another rather not confront?" "What could others confront?" "What would others rather not confront?"

This is carrying it out so the guy doesn't get stuck on a stuck flow, see? And the old confront process, when it was run on self dynamic only, eventually got stuck and became inoperable, see? So we've – you haven't kind of seen the old Confront Process for so long. And therefore it's just used these days for touch-up, various types of Confront. And you'll find
these things are all operative, but they're merely used for touch-ups on a case. But if you go for broke on this and you really start auditing Confront, you better audit with a six-way bracket: plus, minus, and self, another, others – see, plus and minus for each. And you can run Confront forever that way.

Now, a person who is stuck on another confronting, but not stuck on himself confronting, actually will not get anywhere running Confront. That is why Confront ran on some people, didn't run on other people. In other words, people have different kinds of stuck flows. And Mr. A has a stuck flow because another won't confront it. See, he's trying to make another confront, another confront, another confront, see?

Miss B is totally mixed up on confront because she's trying to get others not to confront, "Please, others not to confront." So she's got a stuck flow right on that leg of the bracket.

All right. You try to run "What could you confront?" "What would you rather not confront?" on that person just as those two commands. But Mr. A over here, he's stuck on "another", see? And Miss B. she's stuck on "others", see? So you won't get those two cases; you only get the fellow who is stuck on himself confronting.

So, if you run this six-way bracket, plus and minus on self, another, others, you take in all cases on confront. You can turn on any pictures you want to using confront in this particular way, you see? And this beefs – the beefed-up character of Step 6 disappears when you do this. It goes right down. It disappears right now. There are no consequences to it. It takes a half an hour or so, something like that and it's gone.

And the other one is Responsibility. "What could you be responsible for? Thank you." "What could you be responsible for? Thank you." I mean, something on that order will also take the edge off of one of these banks gone solid. You see that?

You got two remedies: any version of Responsibility on pictures and any version of Confront on pictures, preferably the six-way bracket. These two things cure the Step 6 phenomena and therefore it's not very serious, because even though you do it, you can undo it.

You do too much create on a person and they have a hard time. If you said to a person, "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you", there'd be a certain number of people, all of a sudden, things start to get awfully solid inside their head and solid out in front of their faces and solid back of their backbones. And it gets painful and it gets more and more solid and more and more solid. And you just keep on saying, "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie. Thank you." "Tell a lie..." And it gets more and more solid, and it's getting very painful. Why? These people have an automaticity that if you create anything, everything they're creating gets created.

Now, the bank is an individual creation. The bank is created by the individual. This is actually the series of proofs by which this is done: You improve picture A and then go back and look at picture B. All right. Now come up and improve picture A again – you know, turn on the sonic and visio in something in picture A – and then go back and look at picture B again. You'll find out it's improved in picture B, too. And this is quite curious.
Pick out a picture B as a six-years-old birthday party – pleasure moment, see? All right. Now we're not going to permit any confronting to amount to anything of picture B, this six-year-old birthday party. All we're going to do is improve their confronting of an automobile accident when they were nineteen – has nothing to do with the birthday party. All right. So we improve their ability to confront this automobile accident and we get all the perceptics in the automobile accident up – really, what we're trying to do rather than improve its confronting – get all the perceptics up, sharpen them all up, making them sharper, make them clearer, open that view up of that automobile accident. Let's hear the blood drip, you know? And then take them back and show them this birthday party. You say, "How's the birthday party now?"

"Well, I didn't know there were that many children there. And I can now see the front doorstep. And it's all getting 3-D."

You say, "Thank you very much. Very good. Now let's get it back to this automobile accident. All right. Now take a look at the automobile accident. Now do you hear anything in that automobile accident? Do you feel anything?"

"Yeah."

"Well, what lies over in front of the car?"

See? Just beef it up, beef it up, beef it up, beef it up. It's getting 3-D, you know. I mean, it's getting 3-D, and it'll – eventually, even the person who has a black field, you can talk them into doing this.

You eventually get this picture which is a totality. If they're stuck someplace on the track at some other picture, of course, that is the black field. The field is a picture, you see?

There isn't such a thing as a person who has no pictures. There is a person who has an invisible picture or a person who has a black-field picture, you see? It's not whether pictures have disintegrated and so forth. It's just a picture. And you move them to some other part of the track, or get them to take responsibility for the part of the track they're in, and that black field, invisible field, moving field, something like that, these things disintegrate – if they do the auditing command.

All right. Making allowances for these other various case mechanics, you improve this automobile accident like mad, you keep making him look at this six-year-old birthday party and eventually, my God, they can taste the cake, they can get the heat of the candles, they've got the whole lot, you see? But, what were you doing? You were improving an automobile accident when they were nineteen. Curious, isn't it?

Well, that means you improve up one part of the bank, you're improving up another part of the bank. That's what it means. Who are you working on? You're working on a pc, aren't you? And what are you doing with the pc? You're improving his ability to perceive. Well, to improve his ability to perceive, you're improving his ability to create.

Now, the same phenomenon takes place if you say, "Mock up the park. Thank you." "Mock up the park. Thank you." "All right. Now we want you to do it just a little bit better this time, and get some more leaves on the oak trees, and that
sort of thing. Mock up the park. Thank you." "All right. Now, we want you to do just a little bit – let's get some more water down there in the lake and get a little more space in this thing. Now, all right. Mock up the park. Thank you."

And they say, "It's getting awfully solid out there."

And you say, "That's good. Let's take a look at this six-year-old birthday party."

Holy suffering catfish! You see? The kids are all in 3-D and their screams are coming through their eardrums. You get the idea? So that any time you improve creative action, any time you improve creative ability on one part of the bank, it improves on another part of the bank. It's quite interesting, isn't it?

It tends to indicate, as we have discovered long since, that the only reason you can make a pc well is because he's doing it all himself. He isn't getting any help from anywhere.

All right. If he isn't getting any help from anywhere and he's doing it himself, naturally you can clear him. Otherwise, you'd have to go back and find all the people who aberrated him and get them to apologize to him or something of the sort, to clear him. [laughter]

Now, just the fact that you can change a pc's case shows the – is the prima facie evidence: It shows that you are, actually, working with somebody who is doing it all himself. You know, he's mocking up his own aberrations. He's mocking up his own bank. There is no other automaticity. He's mocking up his own machinery, his own circuits, everything.

All right. So therefore, you improve his ability to do any part of that and then you look over the track as far as he's concerned and you find out it's improved everywhere.

All right. If this is the case, then you have the situation where if you improved the pc's ability to create without improving his ability to confront, you've done him in.

Art school. Art school. Technical schools. Show people how to build better electric motors – build more electric motors, build more electric motors, build more electric motors, build more electric motors, build more electric motors, build ... more ... electric ... mo-

Eventually, they'll do nothing but break electric motors, see? Something They'll start feeling bad. Their study will upset them. Study will upset them. Why? Because you're asking them to create, create, create, create, create, create, see? And the whole bank starts beefing up. But make sure that your school is so arranged that it has no electric motors in it. It just has diagrams – has diagrams and mathematics and slide rules, but there are no electric motors to teach anybody on. Just make sure you do that.

And, of course, you spin in every electrician in the society, every potential electrician. Even though the guy was a good electrician in his last life, by the time you've gotten through with him, why, he's no good now. That's why you can't get any washing machines repaired in this society.

Nobody – it never occurs to anybody, "Oh, you want to work for us as an electrician? Good. All right. Let's see. Have you ever been an electrician?"

"Yeah. Oh, yeah."

"When was that?"
"So on and so on."

"Oh, good. At certain, certain dates. All right. Okay. Killed in World War II. All right. Chief Electrician's Mate. Oh, that's good. All right. Now, that was the US Navy? British Navy? What? What navy?"

"German Navy! All right. That's good. Okay. Now, what part of that life would you be willing to confront? Thank you."

"What part would another person be willing to confront? Thank you."

"What part would others be willing to confront? Thank you."

Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang.

"Now we'll put you to work at $125 a week and there you go. There's the shop." You would have educated him.

No, but you use this other system:

"All right. Now, we're going to teach you to make electric motors and fix up electric motors – particularly make electric motors and create electric motors. And we're going to fix you up. Now, all we have here are diagrams. There are lots of diagrams of electric motors, but not many diagrams actually. It's mostly text."

This sound like modern education? [Audience murmurs in an agreeing way] And the guy never has a prayer, don't you see? He never has a prayer to knock out the creation. So everything he doesn't like about electric motors or engineering or artwork or architecture, or anything else he's studying, will eventually come to the fore, because you're running a "can't-have" on him.

It isn't an educational system, it's a games condition. See, you fix it up so the fellow can't have what he's being educated in. There's only one way to learn how to be an engineer or an aviator or anything else, is go find yourself a bridge or an airplane. That's it, see?

Look at the number of hours you spend – as a student in Scientology – look at the number of hours you spend auditing, being audited, getting subjective reality, objective realities. Look at the number of hours compared to the number of hours you spend on theory. It's different, isn't it?

Audience: Mm. Yeah.

It's a different system.

I say, all right. Look at people's brains. Look at people's behavior. Look at what you're looking at. Look! You know? Get an idea on it.

All right. You take somebody who's been floating along. He'd been drifting along; he hadn't done much auditing. He actually didn't do much studying. He hadn't confronted anything very much. You find all of a sudden – not having done any auditing to amount to anything and not having studied very much in the first place and not having done much observation but has just read some books, and you'll find out he has a very hazy idea of whether auditing works or not. He doesn't have much reality on it. He doesn't really think it works. And the funny part of it is, the more evidence you present to him and the less work he does with the mind, the less he will believe that auditing works. Isn't that interesting?
You could present him with tons of proof, you see, in terms of graphs and testimonials, and all that sort ... You wonder why I don't ever specialize in graphs or testimonies? Why aren't these plastered all over the walls and being shoved under the noses of presidents and tramps and all kinds of people, hm? Well, there's no point in it. There's just no point in it. The guys can't look at problems anyhow. They don't even know there's a problem about the human mind. They'll tell you – parrot-like, they'll say, "Well, out of every fifteen people, there are nineteen of them are psychotic. Yes, we have the figures of the American Psychiatric Association. Yeah, I know. Yes, yes. Big problem. Big problem, big problem, big problem, yes, yes, yes, yes." Hell, he'll never see any part of that problem!

Their own wife and eighteen children might be in the insane asylum and they wouldn't recognize that insanity had anything to do with them or was any problem in legislative action, or the world of operation, or anything else. See? They just won't confront the problem of it. They can't confront the problem of it. It doesn't exist, because they have no subjective reality on it.

Now, actually, the more theory which you present them with, unaccompanied by an ability to confront or an opportunity to confront the substance of minds and the substance of thinkingness, and the substance of beingness in life, the less reality they're going to have on the subject of the mind, so you better leave them alone. You better let them drift in this uncomfortable miasma that they are now in, rather than deteriorate it, until you can get around to getting them audited. You get the idea? It's a different look when you look this thing over.

You say there's no reason to go around the legislative halls, or the armed services, or something like this, showing a bunch of things. I do some token work in this direction. But the more they hear about it without observing any of it, the less reality they've got on it. And that's the hideous way this thing operates.

All training must be accompanied by confronting and all training in the arts or productivity certainly must be accompanied by confronting. Kow! man, you'd better really operate now if you're going into the field of the arts, where it's produce, produce, produce, produce, you see?

Oh, I'd better – guy had better spend one hour a day painting and five hours a day looking at pictures, see? You better let him spend a little while figuring it all out and then actually doing it in the mass, and looking at it being done in the mass. In other words, you got to get the confront up.

Where you have a create, you've got to raise the confront. The cure for obsessive create is confront. This gives you some idea of the value of confrontingness.

All right. Now, let's trace back – I'm not just mad-dogging the subject of education, except we've got to get to them before they do. But here's the thing: If the guy is mocking up his own bank and if the fellow is creating his own aberration, it must be – it must be, perforce – that the road out would be a confront. Isn't that right?

I mean, if obsessive creation or consequences (bad consequences by a reason of creation) – if these are curable by confront or some version of confront (which is to say, familiarity with the subject; let's not just say confront), then, of course, the road out lies in, on the one
hand taking over the automaticity of that obsessive creation, and on the other hand giving him
great familiarity with that obsessive creation. And as soon as he gets these two things, he goes
Clear.

If there's any secret to clearing, that would be the secret. But, of course, you must have
been missing a few links here. The reason I've given you a short talk on this is because if you
didn't know that Step 6 was curable, then, at the same time, you hadn't thought the thought all
the way through that a mind is curable. You see, because all a mind is, is an obsessive crea-
tion. It's an unknowing, obsessive creation on the part of the individual.

There are many factors which enter into it, of course. There are infinite factors, but
there are only a few important factors: create, confront, responsibility, problems, change and
not-know. And these things kind of added up, when you juggle them this way and that, why,
you've sort of got it.

Now goals, of course, prevent the individual from looking at anything. You see, he's
always looking at tomorrow. He's never looking at what he is looking at.

We've got a girl right now who is very interested in going down to the seashore and
she's very interested in having a long vacation and so forth. And she's sitting in the middle
of the swimming pool with lots of help, and so forth. She's got a big goal to have a vacation,
see? And her goal to have a vacation is so tremendously strong that it absolutely prohibits any
observation of where she is. There's nothing wrong with her having a goal to have a vacation,
but you begin to laugh when you look at it. It's silly. She's having a vacation, only she's got
such a goal to have a vacation, you see, that she hasn't noticed.

Now, there's nothing wrong with having goals, but what you're looking for is the ob-
 sessive goal of the case and there's only one of those and of course that prevents them from
confronting anything in that chain. There's nothing in that chain confronted. Why? Because
the goal is so overwhelmingly obsessive that it removes their attention away from anything
that is in that chain to something that isn't yet in the chain. So of course they get no confront-
ing of any kind on that particular chain where they have the most obsessive goal.

And when you've knocked it down to a totally obsessive goal and then you have found
the terminal that represents this totally obsessive goal, you will now have found the terminal
that they have neither ever looked at, inspected, but had then been. It's pretty grim when you
take a look at it.

Get an idea – I see that you're looking a little bit drifty, here, about this thing – get an
idea of looking at this table up here. All right. Just look at the table now. Now you're in the
process of looking at the table, aren't you?

All right. Now look at the ceiling above the table. All right. Now, as you look at the
ceiling above the table, get the idea that it isn't there, and the only thing that is around is this
table. Now, isn't that a kind of an odd sensation?

All right. That's a goal. That's a goal, you see? The person isn't where they are, they're
at an imagined future point. So of course they aren't confronting where they are.
And there's nothing wrong with having goals, but one of these super-plowed-in, obsessive goals leads to the person who most obsessively had this goal, which is the valence, and of course, this is the total no-confront of the bank, is all bunched in that one spot, see, with that whole track around it. Now, naturally, you get all kinds of changes when you start running goals out of people. And the more goals a person has, the less confronting he's done of his immediacy.

Life is now. Life is now. It isn't tomorrow. Life is now. It is right this minute, you see? So if you only looked at tomorrow while living right this minute, along one particular line – if you did this always, forever, and you never observed the immediacy of the situation, but only observed the tomorrow of it – you would eventually have as-ised any future of it at all. Couldn't have any future, so therefore it hangs in time a hundred percent. Doesn't move, it can't.

And at the same time, you've never as-ised any immediacy of the situation. So all the immediacy of the situation is there on that chain and all its future is as-ised. Its future is gone. And there you get your obsessive goal, and there, of course, you get your most solid chain in the bank. And, of course, this is represented by a terminal.

There's why Goals Processing works like mad. But Goals Processing undoes these little mechanisms of no confront – SOP Goals. The assessment itself starts off at a high roar and starts doing this left and right, center, in all directions. And the pc feels groggy and he feels this way and he feels that way and he feels some other way. And you sometimes despair of it. You say, "Well, good heavens, you know, this fellow is just going to go hours and hours, thousands and thousands of hours, it's obvious, before we find any sort of a goal."

Well, it's not true. He'll fall in someday.

But all the time you're finding a goal, of course you're taking off all of the futures and restoring the immediacies. And if you were to do Goals Processing somewhat crudely and slant it in another particular way, you could get an odd phenomenon: You could get an individual totally regressed, so that some back point of the track becomes the total reality. See, there's no present point, there's only this back point.

If you kind of ARC broke it and didn't keep him moving on the track and kind of messed him up in all directions and so forth, he'd find himself sitting in the middle of the Battle of Bunker Hill or some stupid thing, you see? And everything would all be 3-D, too – 3-D in color. And it would be right now, right now.

Running into this right-nowness at points on the track is sometimes very startling. And where they lurk is on the goals chain. You see, they're a moment when the fellow wished to God he were somewhere else. He's got to be somewhere else, but he can't be anywhere else, so he's got a future.

And this thing he's looking at, this totally solid scene, no part of it is observed in any way whatsoever – it's just a total overwhelm – and he's got a future of it. He's got a future, see? He's going to make a future postulate there. And it's that "I don't want to be here! I want nothing to do with this." And it just leaves it on the track as a total solidity. And one day you're running him back down the track, and he now hasn't got the total strain of future, so for
a flicked instant he'll get all the redcoats standing there in 3-D, you see, and smell the powder smoke, and all the rest of it. And he has been tricked, you see, he feels, into being at this spot again. And it won't last long; he will be at that spot and he'll go zoom into the future. He does a bounce.

So you don't see these regressed spots very long. But that doesn't mean the regressed spot is as-ised; that means the pc has gone into the future of it.

Now, as you're auditing it on SOP Goals, it's so rigged that this won't particularly chew up your pc, and you're also going to run some Havingness and Confront. But early in an SOP Goals run, you might very easily find a preclear hitting these 3-D regression points. You know, every time he turns around, why, "What? The place is on fire!", you know? "Oh, well, uh, no, that's – that's an instant of track. Yeah! Pheew!" "Yeah, that's pretty good, yeah. No, it is on fire! By George!" [laughter]

This is the sensation he's getting, you see, because he's never as-ised where he is, he's never inspected that, so he has no familiarity on that at all. He only has a familiarity on elsewhere. Now, naturally, the more familiarity he has on elsewhere, the more elsewhere – with regard to that moment – he does as-is.

So the "elsewheres" tend to disappear and he begins to be more and more fixed in that incident where he isn't, but where he is. This is one of the basic mechanisms of existence.

So these points – when you start to run Creative Processing of one kind or another, these points tend to come up rather easily, because of course he's obsessively creating them all the time. And you find all sorts of 3-D stuff on the track if you're doing this.

But your "confronts" are very good.

Now let's take this thing called a problem, which is the least confrontable thing there is, because it's in motion and because it fixes one with a stable data, and all that sort of thing. And you look over problems, and if we run confront in on top of problems, we're doing a double job, don't you see? Also making it easier on the pc to run it with "other people confronting", and so forth.

He starts out, usually, with the most interesting ideas as to what other people can confront. Takes him a long time sometimes to find out that they haven't confronted any part of what he thought they could confront. He has the idea of, well, his mother, she could sure confront problems. "Man, Mother could certainly confront problems. Boy, that's dead easy. She never did anything about any of them, ever." So obviously she could confront problems, because she never did anything. And then it kind of turns up, as he goes along the line and he looks at this again, and he'll say, "Well, actually, most of these were problems Mother created. Ah, well, that's a funny thing. Well, she could certainly confront problems, I guess. Uh – or could she?"

Then he gets up to the point of, "You know, I don't think she ever confronted a problem in her life. I don't think she even knew they existed. Must have been! Must have been, because she never did anything about any problem. And she certainly created all the problems that she – I can't find anything in the family – anybody creating anything in the family like
problems but my mother. Now, what is this all about? She – no, she couldn't confront problems. She didn't know they were there."

You get the mysterious viewpoints a person takes. One gets a totally false idea, by the way, of what other people are able to confront by what they don't do anything about.

For instance, you see the United States right now and England and NATO at large: they're – communism's perfectly all right. Atomic bomb – "Well, we'll have a deterrent: You hit us, we'll hit you. Yeah, that's the answer to it."

Running problems for a little while, it suddenly dawns on you with a dull crash that these people don't even know where the wall is with regard to this particular problem, see? They're facing an annihilation, a total attrition and they say, "Well, what wall? No problem there. Couldn't be anything going on."

Now, some of these nations, well, they jump on some country or another – the Congo or something – for not conducting its parliamentary debates right. Congo kept trying to conduct them, I think, with machine guns and rape, and that isn't done anymore. And the Congo hadn't realized that it had gone out of style with Empress Eugenie hats. It was quite the style around here a century ago, but it's gone out of style.

And so they were just – they kept saying to the Congo, "Well now, you fellows are out of style, that's all, you know? I mean, it's not done anymore, you know?" Raising hell about it. "And you shouldn't throw people in jail and do all this kind of thing." And whole United Nations comes crashing down on the Congo and everybody starts monkeying around with the Congo, and...

Well, let's look it over. This is about the most pint-size, postage-stamp problem that exists on Earth today. And it has, as its personnel, a lot of people who are rather easily handled. So of course the United Nations can confront the problem called the Congo – not do anything about it; create more problems in the Congo. But nevertheless can almost be familiar with the Congo. Don't you see?

At the same time, two-thirds of the world population are behind an iron curtain, totally denied liberty, justice, fraternity and equality and all the things that the United Nations says it stands for and it doesn't do a cotton-picking thing about it.

Look at that. What an interesting view of the order of magnitude. Here's two-thirds of the world's population: They have to have permission to eat and to sleep and to starve, and permission to not wear shoes, and they are permitted to wear a toothbrush, and I think their – their total possessions, by the way, I think, are a spoon, a comb, and a toothbrush; I think that's about what you can own now in China, by law.

United Nations doing anything about this? Does it ever call anybody to account? Does it ever whistle anybody up and say, "Hey, you know, you blokes are not conducting yourselves with liberty, fraternity and igualidad?" You know? They never say a word about it. They just have conferences on these fellows down in the Congo, which is about one one-hundred-thousandth of the world population.
Well, now, these things become very clear to you when you get a subjective reality on problems and people's reaction to problems. See? I mean, all of a sudden a lot of this stuff becomes explained.

Now, similarly, a preclear's life all of a sudden starts looking much more comprehensible to you. And it looks much more comprehensible to him.

Some pc will run a total irresponsibility about problems of any kind, shape, form, anything else. Yet they see nothing incompatible with having trouble in their life and not confronting any problems in their life, and they think this is okay. And they're liable to think you as the auditor are being mean to ask them to confront any problems. They see no connection. All of a sudden they see a connection, which is a very rapid way, of course, of going about the situation.

Now look-at-here: If a person can't confront any problems, they of course are not going to confront any problems that they've got. Ahh, and we have the clue to slow clearing. See, there's the clue. I'm quite convinced of this now, because I've watched an awful lot of people getting Clear. And the percentage is rather slight and apparently those that get Clear rather easily are able, at the time they get Clear, to confront problems. They just happen to be able to confront problems; this is a fluke, you see?

Well, this is adjudicated by this: Profiles don't change when present time problems exist. You can prove this. You can take a person with a present time problem; he says he's got a present time problem in rudiments, you know? And you say, "All right. Well ..." See, attend to that. "And now, let's see, have you got any ARC breaks with me? Oh, good, that's good. All right. Got any withholds fro-? All right, that's fine. All right, now we'll begin this process. When weren't you successful while thinking you should be in Oshkosh? Yeah, all right. When weren't you successful while thinking you were in Oshkosh?"

And you run this for twenty-five hours or something like this, or any fool process, or TR 10, or any effective process – it doesn't matter what you run. Just neglect, every time you do the rudiments, to take up his present time problem. Just neglect it.

It helps if you know for sure the pc you're using for this test has a screaming one. You know, he has a terrific present time problem, see, of some kind or another. Well, it helps enormously with this test if you know that's the case. Then you neglect it in the rudiments. Audit him on anything you want to audit him on for twenty-five hours and get him tested again.

No change. No change of profile. No change anything. Got the idea? That's the one, see, that can't be bugged out.

Now, if you want to reduce a profile, keep doing bad auditing which is ARC breaking the pc all the time, ARC breaking the pc, and his graph will deteriorate. But the problem one – that's healed, of course, just by good technical auditing. But the problem one – tsk! – that's a hangfire.

Invariably, you see a case that after twenty-five hours has had no profile change whatsoever, you can say instantly this one thing, with great certainty, and always be found right; everybody'd think you're a wizard or something. You say, "Well, preclear had a present time
problem", you say wisely, "Bring the preclear in." You put him on the meter, you say to the preclear now, "All right, now", (you turn your sensitivity up here a bit) "do you have a present time problem?" Bang! You say, "How long have you had this present time problem?"

"Oh, years!" And he says, "Oh, yes, yes. Oh, yes, yes", you know?

You say very wisely to the auditor, "You see?" It's inevitable.

All right. If that happens in day-to-day routine auditing, let's take it on the wider magnitude of people going to Clear. They must have a tremendous number of present time problems if they don't get any more shift toward Clear than that, see, with heavy, powerful processes booting them along.

The wise thing to do about something like this, of course, is just handle all their present time problems. How do you handle all their present time problems? Routine 1A.

All right. Now, if you've handled all their present time problems – let's get practical for a moment here – if you've handled all their present time problems with Routine 1A, you've handled all problems with Routine 1A, you straightened it all up: while running problems in Model Session, would you take up present time problems? You wouldn't take up that rudiment to which the whole auditing session is devoted, because you're going to run a hot problem process – you're going to run a hot problem process – in the body of the session, so why run a weak one in the rudiments? See?

So you ask the fellow if he has a present time problem. He says, "Yes." It falls.

You say, "Good, what is it?"

And he tells you. And you say, "All right. Very good. Thank you", and go on to the next one. You wouldn't run a thing.

Because, man, you're going to slam straight into this present time problem situation, of course, in the body of the session. Right?

Now, you'll find all kinds of hidden standards coming up. Why should you have to labor so hard? Now, I'll tell you another reason why we got Routine 1A, is "yous guys" were having to work far, far, far, far, far too hard to find hidden standards. And you weren't finding them well. In other words, a pc on SOP Goals Assessment had all sorts of hidden standards he wasn't coming up with. And you were having to work too hard to get those hidden standards, and every one of those hidden standards is categorized under one heading: problems.

So, of course, the wise thing to do is to put them on a routine that gets all the problems out of the road and then your assessment should go off like a hot rocket. See, it isn't going to cure the whole case, but it's certainly going to get it there. Okay?

Do you see how this is? All right.

We are always refining in the direction of more effective auditing per unit time, see? All right, if it's going to take you seventy-five hours to run a Goals Assessment, this is only going to be true, really, because the preclear has too many hidden standards. They're difficulties of one kind or another. They are difficulties, difficulties, difficulties. In other words, the preclear categorizes these things as problems.
Now, they can't confront problems. All right. If they're taking a long time, they can't
confront problems easily. All right, if they can't confront problems easily, how are you going
to get the hidden standards?

In other words, this is a bug in assessment; a bug in SOP Goals Assessment is why
you've got Routine 1A.

You go on asking this pc, for seventy-five hours, for goals. And you ask them for
goals, and you ask them for goals, and you ask them for goals, and you ask them for goals,
and they never tell you the hidden standards. Even though sometimes you ask for them, they
don't tell them to you. Why? They don't know they got them. Well, why don't they know they
got them? Because they can't confront a problem. If they can't confront a problem, how can
they say it to you?

It's quite common to audit a preclear for twenty-five hours and then he finds out he has
a screaming present time problem with his mother-in-law and he never knew it before. You've
probably had that happen.

Well, now apply this same observation to Goals Assessment, see? In other words, you
got a slow freight; there is a bug in goals assessing The pc is not confronting his problems. So
you're running a pc who has a legion of problems. These will keep coming up and the other
test of it is this: In running SOP Goals, when you've found the terminal and when you've
found the level, as much as three-quarters of every session gets taken up with present time
problems.

Now that the data is coming in I can tell you some of these things, see? That's fantas-
tic! The number of present time problems these people suddenly come up with. Look, look,
are we going to run goals or are we going to run present time problems?

Now, this has been the reason for slow freight in running SOP Goals and this is the
reason for slow clearing, and I've now put several engram wranglers on it, and I've got all the
reasons rounded up in the south pasture, and I tell you, I group them all up as just "problems,
inability to confront."

Now, "Recall a problem" is the most elementary of these processes, but it has this dif-
ficulty: It as-is the problems the case has. It as-is problems, as-is problems, as-is problems,
as-is problems, as-is problems. That's perfectly all right, although kind of miserable. That's per-
fectly all right – I mean, you could go on doing that – but it's sort of like Dianetics (I've had
the observation, you see): you erased all the engrams in the bank.

Well, Scientologically, there is another approach, which is to improve the ability of
the preclear to confront problems. This is why this – you've got an auditing command change;
I wanted to see you look at it in its raw state first. And I've now seen that the new series of six
commands produces practically the same tone arm reaction as the first command, "Recall a
problem." See, I get almost the same reaction there.

But you'll get a shorter run, that's the main thing And you won't have the bug of the pc
stuck on the first dynamic, stuck on the first dynamic, stuck on the first dynamic, stuck on the
first dynamic, you see? Because this pc was – basically began to worry about problems be-
cause of another dynamic. See, his basic concern about problems was usually an other dy-
namic. He became concerned about somebody's inability to confront problems and then Qed-
and-Aed with it, tried to force the other person to confront problems and wound up valencing.
See, that's the mechanisms back of this thing.

The mechanisms of clearing somebody up are actually not very complex. But it – only
thing that is difficult about it is try to isolate which mechanism it is which is most in the road.
Because you can overcome most anything else, you see?

So I think Routine 1A, if assiduously run before you do an assessment, will give you
Clears rather easily. I'm sure of this. We have not done it, but I'm just showing you this.

And notice that reaction on problems. Have you noticed the pc getting any reaction on
running problems this way? You have noticed some reaction, huh? Hm? Have you noticed
any improvement on the pc today, however in running this? You haven't noticed that?

Have you had any pc just set his heels and practically refuse to run any part of the
thing? Did a pc look like he was going to? Well, all you were running into there was the irre-
 sponsibility for problems. Now you got a pc, of course, who wouldn't blow Clear if he had
this many problems, because you wouldn't be able to clean up this many PT problems. The PT
problems would keep coming up in the SOP Goals. See, it's the time. [You could] probably do
it. You could undoubtedly do it on SOP Goals, but let's look at the time factor, see?

All right, you got a long assessment, seventy-five hours. Why? Why you got such a
long assessment? Well, the person can't confront any of his problems, so therefore he can't
confront any of his goals, you see? By not confronting his problems, of course, he doesn't
know what goals he's had to get out of these problems.

All right, let's take in the actual run, the actual run; and this is true of report after re-
port after report after report that I get back. Five hours auditing, two hours on rudiments; five
hours auditing, three and a half hours on rudiments. You look over and say, "Rudiments!
What the devil is happening here? Rudiments, rudiments – PT problem. Person had PT prob-
lems, person has PT problems, person has PT problems, that person has PT problems, PT
problems. And it's marvelous how fast these present time problems come up while we're run-
ning SOP Goals."

Yes, it is marvelous. It is so marvelous, that SOP Goals, in view of the fact that it
doesn't devote itself to running present time problems, naturally, you're taking a weak process
and you're having to clear up all of the side panels of the case on the subject of problems as
you go, and you've blown, now, another hundred percent of auditing, see? I mean, pardon me,
you've blown the fifty percent. In other words, what you could do formerly in fifty hours with
SOP Goals running you should be able to do in twenty-five hours. So that is quite a saving,
isn't it?

And all these improvements are mainly in the direction of saving time – saving audit-
ing time and making it easier and giving him a faster win. Okay?

Now, I'd say a person who is having a bad reaction to running problems, I'm afraid
their clearing time probably would have been up around two thousand hours. Why? Well,
they're not Clear because they've got problems. It's hanging the fire, see, but they begin to
recognize these problems as they're being audited. And then the auditor has to take up these
problems with a weak process, see, and it's a dispersion all the time that's coming on. But the case is hanging fire because it has problems. And it's one of these cat-chasing-his-own-tail propositions, you see, and the cat just never gets anyplace. You ask Sambo; he's done it up here a lot of times. He never gets anyplace.

Okay. Now, what questions do you have on this particular activity of Routine 1A?

**Yes.**

**Male voice:** Can you mix this Routine 1A with running SOP Goals? In other words, when you run a level flat on SOP Goals, can you take the person and put him on Routine 1A?

Oh, I suppose you could. I suppose you could mix these routines. These routines all mix, by the way. About the only thing that doesn't mix very easily is the CCHs. I wouldn't run the CCHs while running levels.

**Male voice:** Mm.

That's about the only thing I wouldn't do in combining things here.

**Male voice:** Hm-hm.

I'd run Havingness and Confront, as far as that's concerned, on Routine 1A, if I had to. I mean, it doesn't matter much.

Your packages are quite neat and very applicable and you don't have to do anything really much more than the package. But now you'd find out that it'd be unnecessary while running SOP Goals to devote any time to running problems, probably, if problem was totally flat to begin with. But then, at the same time, you might open up a completely new section of the bank. And the test of this – I can just give you this one off the bat; I just know this was the way it'd be – the test would be, is your pc suddenly developing present time problems?

See, you flattened Routine 1A, you've done an SOP Goals, you've run two or three, four levels of SOP Goals and all of a sudden – everything has just been going fine up to this time – and you suddenly ask, and the pc has a present time problem. Oh, I'd let that one go by, I'd handle it, see? And next day, you find your pc has a present time problem. "Oh", you'd say, "come off of it here", and I'd go back to Routine 1A, and then come back to running SOP Goals. I wouldn't change the terminal or anything.

**Male voice:** Mm.

But I'd get their confront up on problems.

That's a well-taken point, Bob, very well taken. You could do that. But I sure wouldn't spend too much time in SOP Goals – the way they have been doing – I wouldn't spend too much time fooling around with the pc's tremendous present time problems. I'd do something much more effective than to run the standard routine, see?

I mean, it's a chronic state. Oh, yeah, a pc will have a present time problem on Tuesday and then you don't hear any more about present time problems. Well, that's all right. But if he hit a present time problem on Tuesday – and he hadn't had any before – and he's got a present time problem Tuesday, and he's got one Wednesday, and he's got one Thursday, and he takes up most of Friday – well, oh no, you don't want to go in for that sort of thing Clear-
ing is very rapid. Shouldn't get held up like this. So it's faster to take up the exact thing which they are hanging on, which is problems. And they're hanging on problems.

We have never really made a frontal assault on problems before. You'll notice we've been working with problems for many years, as a factor, as one of the primary factors of auditing, or it wouldn't be in the rudiments. But we have never really attempted a frontal assault to clean all this up on the pc before we audit him. Sort of like reducing a part of the rudiments and cleaning them all up before we go on auditing the pc. That's kind of where 1A sits. Okay?

*Audience:* Hm-hm. Yes.

*Yes, Robin.*

*Male voice:* Wouldn't a hidden standard be blown open by asking the Joburg question "What would have to happen to prove that Scientology works?"

All right. Now, I didn't quite get the question, Robin, now.

*Male voice:* Wouldn't a hidden standard be blown open ...

Oh, wouldn't a hidden standard be blown open by asking the question "What ..."

*Male voice:* "... would have to happen ...

... would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" Yes. Yes. But you won't – you've got a reality factor. Your E-Meter only registers what is real to the pc. And the pc might have a hidden standard that wouldn't register. He's got some other reality involved and it's certainly a way-outback-of-Arcturus sort of a thing. All right, that's fine. You will get that on the E-Meter. You will clear up the immediately-known hidden standards. And then we advance the case, and he's got a new set of hidden standards.

As soon as his reality improves and his confront goes up, we are liable to find ourselves sitting with a new set of hidden standards. That's why we're tackling Routine 1A frontally, head-on. Okay?

*Male voice:* Mm, thank you.

All right.

Any other questions? Yes.

*Female voice:* I wondered about the order of magnitude of a problem. In SOP Goals, for instance, would they be different, not a broken cup, or something like that. Would it be a more – a bigger problem, something with more magnificence and ... ?

Oh, I see. You wonder about the order of magnitude of problems, and while running SOP Goals, if they wouldn't come up as bigger problems ...

*Female voice:* Yes ...

... the magnitude.

*Female voice:* ... as more weighty problems.

Oh, yeah, yeah. More fundamental ...

*Female voice:* Yes.
... more fundamental problems. That's true. And they will come up that way.

Female voice: Yes.

Now, if you have, however, a person geared in to being able to observe or confront problems very well under 1A, your magnitude of problem will be even greater when it does come up. It has to be greater for the person to do so, because he already can confront the lesser ones, you see?

Female voice: Uh-huh.

So that's why Bob's point is very good. When this starts to happen and these problems just come in, in staggering magnitude, and so forth, you might have to return to Routine 1A for a little while and get this leveled out as a new activity. Yes, they are. They're much more magnitudinous. What will register as a present time problem – this is actually a clue to cases, you know; it's a very important point. What registers as a present time problem on three different people is a total index of case level.

A hair ribbon has been dropped, see? And person A just absolutely has a fit, man. This is a fit. I mean, they all but get down and bite the asphalt, you know? It's just the most God-awful thing that has ever happened, see?

And person B will go tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk.

And person C, on exactly the same problem of a dropped hair ribbon, would simply pick it up and shove it back in the kid's hair, see, and doesn't even think that anything horrible has occurred.

I imagine you've had nurses or mothers or nannies, or something like that, that had different values for different problems. [amused and agreeing noises from the audience] If there's anything drives a kid mad, you know, it is somebody – the order of magnitude of problems. And it makes your parents sometimes completely incomprehensible, because, their order of magni – not yours, but their order of magnitude of problems was out, definitely was out. And you just couldn't see what the hell the problem was, because it didn't look like any problem to you, see? And my heavens, it's going on and on and on, far into the night, and into the next day, and so forth, and ... [laughter]

Order of magnitude of problems. It is that factor which caused me to shift it over to the broad brackets on the thing.

But you can see some people practically faint. And I know I, one time – a very dear friend of mine, an old man when I was a kid; he was a dear friend of mine. He was going along all right. He was a very sunny, cheerful sort of fellow. And I got back to this part of the world and dropped in on him one day and good heavens, he was a shattered wreck – an absolute wreck! He was a gone dog. And actually, within a few years, had gradually gone downhill to a point where he was totally paralyzed and a couple of years after that died; and it was all because of one problem.

He had been working in a bank and he was a shareholder in the bank, but he also had a job in the bank. And when Frankie the Limper took over, he made sure that all the little banks went crash, see? And all the banks went boom! see? And so he gave it all to the big banks
because he thought things ought to be in chains or something. That's right. This is the actual history of it, although I'm speaking about it rather sarcastically. And this poor guy watched one of these chain banks come in and pull the routine modus operandi.

And because there was a bank moratorium, then the bank wasn't permitted, you see, to pay out any of the accounts. If you had a checking account or a savings account, that was seized. But if you had a mortgage and the bank had a mortgage on you, you had to pay it – every penny of the mortgage, see? They got all the cash. It was the biggest raid known in financial history. I don't know, in a few decades somebody will wake up to the fact of what that was all about – "the great friend of the people." [laughter] But it was just that. They then were given the opportunity to seize all the cash in the bank, and then make everybody make good their paper, too.

Well, of course, they pronounced all the little banks insolvent by government order and then they, of course, were grabbed by all the bank chains. So little guys such as this, with a little job and some shares in the bank, and so forth, were just wiped out. Bang!

But this appeared to be a problem of such gross magnitude to him that it pract – it did! It killed him! It killed him. And I remember definitely – (Used to call him Uncle Jimmy.) I looked at him and I said, "But, Uncle Jimmy", I said, "you're still a young man. I mean, all you've got to do is – well, I don't care what: start another bank or get a job or start a feed business, or something. But this doesn't seem to be very great to me."

"Oh", he says, "Ronald", he said, "they just wiped us out. They just stole everything from us. They just ruined everybody", and he just went on about it, and so on and on and on. And that's all he would talk about. That's all he could talk about. That's all he could think about, and so forth. And he just went down, down, down, down, down; overnight, practically thirty years was put on the man's age, you see?

Now, that was a problem he couldn't confront, which was terrific thievery on the part of a government. Well, what else could he expect? It's a government. [laughter] Of course, at that time of life that I was in there, and my general modus operandi, and the way I look at things anyway, this didn't have any agreement at all. I mean, I remember it as one of the wildest points of disagreement I think I ever had on the whole track. I just couldn't get the man's point. I just couldn't get his point, that this was a problem of such magnitude that it would just stop all life right there in its tracks, period. And that's what it did.

Now, his ability to confront problems was poor to begin with, don't you see? And he got one from an unexpected quarter, which gave him a betrayed help, or something of the sort, you see?

He probably was a member of the American Legion, and all of this kind of thing; was up there singing "The star-spangled Banner" with everybody. And he always expected, you know, the whole works to be all good, you know, and kind and sweet and patriotic, and he never realized that politicians were crooked. That's the basic problem that he was into.

So, not having looked at any part of this, you see, it came as a tremendous shock to him. It was just borne home with such velocity that it'd have been kinder to have shot the man with a bullet, you see?
All right. Now you see fellows failing because of business, failing because of nervous breakdowns. These are comprehensible, but there's one that you don't find as comprehensible as that, even. You will actually see somebody dibbling with some pieces of paper, or something of the sort, and he will announce to you that he has just hit the end of track, man. This is it, you know?

And you will just look in vain to find out how this is the end of track, you know? And you'll have – there are fifteen ways of handling this thing. There are fifteen ways of resolving it. There are dozens of ways of as-is-ing it. I've seen fellows, for instance, getting just in deeper and deeper and deeper in some criminal proceeding, you know, that they'd become involved in. And you'd tell them, "Well, why don't you go tell the man?" you see? When you're auditing people, you run into all kinds of weird things, as you only know too well.

"Well", I said, "why don't you go tell the man that you took ten thousand dollars, and why don't you take what's left of the ten thousand dollars and give it to him and straighten it up and say, 'Well, go ahead. Put me in jail', or something like that, and spend your six months, or something like that, or get off whole-hog."

"Oh, no!" you see? "Nothing! Oh, no!" You know, they, "Oh, God, no!" you know? Well, all right, that's comprehensible. But how about something like this: The fellow has to quit his job. He just has to quit his job because the pots and pans aren't the right size. Oh, brother, you look at this, you know, and you say, "What is going on here?"

Or you look at some fellow and he's got a perfectly good berth on a ship, and he says, well, he'll have to leave her at the end of the cruise, and he ...

You say, "Why?"
"Well, just have to, you know?"
"Well, why?"
"Well, I don't think the mate likes me."
"You don't think the mate likes you. How do you know the mate doesn't like you?"
"Well, I've never – I – really, I just know."
"Well, has the mate ever said anything to you?"
"No."
"Have you ever done your work all right?" or so on.
"Oh, yes."
"Well, what is the matter? Basically, what's the matter here?"
"Well, I just don't think the mate likes me and I'll have to leave the ship at the end of the cruise."

And you say, "Now look. Why don't you speak to the man? Why don't you straighten it out with him, and so forth?"
And he says, "I will have to leave the ship at the end of the cruise, because I don't think the mate likes me."

And you say, "Well now, why don't you take this up with the captain? Why don't you speak to the captain about this sort of thing and get this thing straightened out, or talk to the owners, or something like ..."

"No. At the end of the cruise I will have to leave the ship."

You begin to believe after a while that there must be something else here, that that couldn't possibly be the problem he's stuck on – that's the suspicion that you get – and you yourself are guilty of a no-confront. No. That's the problem he's stuck on. That's it. There isn't anything more than that. Only this person's ability to confront a problem is so tiny, and the problem is so microscopic that he can't confront, or the problem is so microscopic that he can confront – you see, these two things meet down toward the bottom; this is maybe the only problem in the world that he could confront, is this one, and so he's got a problem, you see?

You won't be able to fathom it. You say, "What the devil is going on here?" Life becomes very baffling along about this point. But if you remember that the ability to confront a problem is a gradient case index... And you'll see somebody sitting in the midst of ruin, disaster, sudden death and so forth; the columns of the house falling, and the children's bodies flung about, you know, or something like this, you know, something – maybe not so dramatic, maybe it's more just the magazines are flung about and the beds are unmade, you see, and there hasn't been a fire in the furnace for three weeks, and you know, life has just sort of gone to pieces, man. And you see this person just sitting there worrying like mad because the lady next door has bought a new hat. [laughter]

Well, that's the level of problem that that person can confront. And these other things don't exist, and they are not problems. They're not only not problems, they aren't there. And it's just a total vanishment of everything. And you say, "My, that certain – certainly that person sure can confront problems." No, they can't. How can you confront something you don't even know about?

And the magazines flung around the floor, and the dead fire in the furnace, and the cold house, and the dirty sheets of the unmade beds, and everything else, and these things don't exist. And then, here's what's odd: Somebody can walk up to her and say, "Look, why don't you straighten this all out?" and the person thinks the person who just said that is crazy. That's the oddity about this sort of thing. They go around with a very interesting opinion of that other person's sanity.

They think they should do something about it, or they think that the person should look at these things.

And you press it a little bit further and they will give you the most interestingly involved explanations of how it is not possible to look at any of these things. And even if you did look at these things, you would find out they didn't exist anyway. And if you did find out that they existed, there couldn't be anything you could do about it, so how could you even say that they existed? It would be some wild rationale of that character. And you're hitting a person right where he lives when you're getting this one.
You could probably do an intelligence test and not only that but a sanity test and ability test. You could probably just make a gradient list of problems in various spheres, categories and dynamics, you see — could divide it all up here so you got problems per dynamics, and then you got problems per zones of action in life, and then you got problems in gradient order of magnitude. And you just ask him the silly question, which would be silly perhaps to you. You just ask him one question; that is, "In each one of these groups, check the problem." There'll only be one or two problems in each one of these groups for him, although every one of them is a problem. He'll only be able to conceive as certain of these problems as being that. And where he checks that level, there he lives, which is an interesting order of magnitude.

Okay. Well, enough of all this; kept you overtime again. Hope you make a lot of success on this. Probably won't give you a talk tomorrow. One, one last word: Is there anything you feel you should know in running your pc right this minute that you have not asked, or you have come up against, or something has occurred about?

You feel you got it taped? Feel you got it taped?

All right. Confront it. Thank you very much. [laughter]
A lecture given on 11 July 1961

Okay. What is this? This is the 11th of July AD 11. Okay. Eleven, eleven. Okay. Now, are there any ARC breaks? Any ARC breaks? Well, is it all right if I talk to you? [laughter]

All right. Do you have any withholds? And more importantly, do you have a present time problem?

All right. Bringing us up by gradient scale to talking to you a little bit about present time problems and talking about problems in general.

Routine 1A. Routine 1A, definition of: *any combination of processes which combines problems and Security Checks*. And that is all. That is the total embrace. You don't have to say, "Routine 1A is revised", because you are running a different Problem command or it isn't Routine 1A Revised because you are running a different HCO WW Form Security Check. You understand?

So it could be any Problems Process and any Security Check. And when you are combining those two items alone, that is Routine 1A.

Now, this would presuppose that there would be other combinations which included other parts of the rudiments. And I remember an Australian auditor – you call them Australian auditors, but down there they're Australian* auditors and doing very well I may say so.

I've been thinking of sending the whole Joburg staff over to Australia there for a while – and it's horrible, horrible thing to do – and sending the Washington staff to Joburg, and the Los Angeles staff to Washington, and HASI London to Los Angeles. [laughter] I've just been thinking of this, you see. But that's the kind of thing you do when you're overwhelmed by problems, you see.

Problem equals change. Change equals problem. We could presuppose that any rudiment, then, will eventually have some routine number and letter; any rudiment. So that you get ARC breaks and Security Checks. You get the idea? You get various combinations of these items.

Well, right now the most fruitful in production of any known process is Routine 1A as far as it comes to plumbing the Stygian depths of the reactive mind, because it takes care of those two items which are most prone to give the auditor trouble. Constant and continuous PT

* Editor's note: Ron is pronouncing the word with the second "a" like in "father"
problems on the part of the preclear will prevent any gain of profile whatsoever. He's got present
time problems? Powee! No gain. Just add it up. Look, I've been looking at this now since
about 1956. You better look at it.

It just adds up to this: present time problem – no change of profile, no gain of case. I
don't care what you run! I don't care what magic button would suddenly arise in our midst; we
would still not make any gain at all on a case that was being run that had a present time
problem. You might as well just make up your mind to it. And when you see the graphs of HGC
auditors or you see the graphs of a field auditor, and he wants to know why "Recall a ruddy
rod", or something, didn't work on the pc, and you said it would work, but he's proven that it
didn't work because there's no change of profile...

Now, look. You're auditing mechanics all by themselves, just sitting there and going
into Model Session and giving a repetitive command "Do fish swim?" to the preclear for
hours will produce a change on a profile, providing one of three things or all three things
aren't present: first, major present time problem – there's no present time problem (which
could be a present time problem of long duration or present time problem of short duration);
if there's no ARC break; and if there is no major withhold – and if these three things are ab-
sent, "Do fish swim?" will produce a change of profile. You got it?

Now, make up your mind to it. I mean I'm not giving you any datum there that's light.
I mean I want to give that a few neon lights and underscores. And when you end it off, put an
exclamation point after it and a number of rockets going up. And don't add any false stories
about Russian sputniks after it. Put real ones. Something exclamatory.

This is one of the hardest things to teach auditors. Obviously it must be, because from
1956 when problems first made – pardon me, 55 they first made their emergence; but 56, 57,
when they were really being used hard and problems were being pushed – from then on up to
now I have said this many times. I remember that in 1955 telling the HGC, then located on
15th Street in Washington, DC – and Julia was running a mighty good HGC – but I remember
telling those auditors on a telephone auditors' conference (we used to have speaker phones,
and we had our auditors' conference every day on speaker phones) that if there was no change
of the profile, a present time problem was present. No profile. And if an ARC break was pre-
sent, you would get a down drop of the profile.

There has been no reason at all to amend that statement. And the only thing that's been
added to it is, in the presence of a withhold you don't have a preclear even in-session. The pc
is not even in-session. You can't even say he had a present time problem because the fellow
sort of has to – in an auditing session, if a fellow has a present time problem – you've already
said in an auditing session, and the withhold avoids that. You don't even get a session, much
less no gain, see.

The guy will be audited for a little while and he'll blow or, you know, he's in, out,
bang! Gone. And he doesn't know, and so on, and all of a sudden oddball effects to – our
processes don't work. Things all du-hen-di-woa-pu-dawha-boap, and there's just no session.
And you're spending all of the time trying to get your big paws on the pc and hold him still
long enough to keep him from getting ARC breaks and present time problems and everything.
And you just spend all of your time doing this, doing this, doing – you haven't got a session
going yet. See? That's all that – that's what a withhold amounts to. So that's the only thing added to these other two things.

So what are the major barriers to auditing?

The major barriers to auditing are a present time problem, ARC break and a withhold. Those are the major barriers to auditing. Major barriers. And boy, they rear up like the Atlas. They're big.

All right. If that is the case – some Australian once said to me, "Well, from what you've just said then, it becomes fairly apparent that someday we will be auditing only the rudiments." [laughs] Well, you – that is not true. What you could say, however, is for some time after his entrance into auditing, probably the only thing that should be run on somebody is rudiments in some version. Not the rudiments themselves, but the elements of the rudiments, you see. Which consists of what? Present time problem, ARC breaks and withholds. So as I say, you can then expect to get some numbers and letters which will combine these three, one way or the other as the data emerges, and I get bright ideas, and some research material and so forth, you will see some more of these things.

Well, right now you're actually having very good luck with running problems in a most outrageous sort of way. So I had better tell you about problems; and this, therefore, is a lecture on Routine 1A, and I'll also talk about some Security Checks.

You're all using problems at this time, so maybe if I told you a little bit more about them, you would be more prepared to deal with the situation. Okay? Because there are some things to know about problems.

In the first place, there's the definition of a problem. A problem is postulate-counter-postulate resulting in indecision. That is the first manifestation of problems. The first thing. Postulate-counter-postulate. And the first consequence of a problem is indecision.

Now, our next observation is that any time you have a postulate which is a fixed and stable postulate, it accumulates thereunto or came about because of a confusion. So a problem actually is a multiple confusion. And you are looking at two stable data and a confusion phenomena when you are looking at a problem. There are at least two – at least two stable data. That's a postulate that is counter the postulate. See, two postulates in opposition. And these two postulates in opposition are surrounded, each one of them independently, by a certain amount of confusion. So therefore, a problem at the lower stages looks like a confusion-counter-confusion. That's war. When it gets that mesty, it's confusion-counter-confusion; and there aren't any postulates.

You take a fight between a psychiatrist and his patient. I don't think you could ever dignify it by calling it a session or anything like that. But if you take a fight between these two, and you've got what? You've got a confusion versus a confusion. The psychiatrist doesn't know what he's doing For sure the patient doesn't know what he's doing. And yet, boy, are they busy. [laughs] This looks of course idiotic to anybody.

Now, you take a war – I've heard a lot of things called Mein Kempf – Mein Kempf. I don't even know what Mein Kempf meant. I know about Garbage and Herring and the other fellows, but not Kempf. And you know, I heard an awful lot of shouting coming through the
ether. (I think there still must be ether there. The old physicists believed there's ether, so there must be ether. Something's putting people to sleep. That's for sure.)

Anyway, I ran into this head-on, on Riverside Drive. Way back before the war, years before the war; and I was up on Riverside Drive minding my own business. Had a very lovely apartment. And I was doing nothing but writing and getting into trouble and amusing myself. And one fine day there was a horrendous knock on the door and it like to have caved in, and a couple of gents walk in, and they've got the funniest looking space opera gadget you ever saw. And it's actually a radio direction finder, and they have located the insidious fact that my electric typewriter is generating static. [laughter] And I wondered why anybody was so interested in my electric typewriter generating such a tiny amount of static. And they told me that I would have to muffle it all by myself, at my own expense. And so I got a suppressor and hooked it through. And after that my electric typewriter did not generate static. And the electric light company was very, very happy and so were the people next door.

And unbeknownst to me, during my writing time, they had not been able to follow out their favorite vocation which was listening to Hitler, from whom they had escaped with their lives. [laughter] And that's all they did morning, noon and night with a high-power, high-velocity transatlantic radio receiver, you see.

They were listening to Garbage and Herring and Kempf and [laughs] – and the second the static was missing in the apartment building, which was my poor little electric typewriter, they could turn it up full volume. And while I was trying to write about this and that, I was entertained with Garbage and Herring and Kempf. And the superemotionalism, the shaking emotional tones of that voice and so forth were really marvelous. Absolutely marvelous. One didn't have to understand a single word; and it's a good thing because there weren't any there. There wasn't a postulate in the lot.

You take his speeches apart, and you find out the German people should have been going north because they should have been going south, you know – except for the times they should be going east and west. And it's all for the best, in this best of all possible youth Sportplatz groups providing they had free love – the Germans must be pure and virtuous. Everybody is being an inferior race. Everybody is inferior, but the Germans are superior. And the Germans are a superior race, but the only slight difficulty with the Germans being a superior race is a lot of the Germans are inferior. [laughter]

And by the time this had entered into Chapter One, Chapter Two, Chapter Three, I'd decided that these refugees had tortured themselves enough. And I would go and get my electric shaver [laughter] which put out good static – high-velocity static – and I would keep it there alongside of my typewriter, and I'd turn it on, and that would be the end of Hitler. [laughter] I would turn it off again and they would become very interested after another hour or two to see if the static was gone. And they would turn it on, come on full blast, he'd get right up to his freund Garbage and on would go the electric shaver and off would go Hitler.

I probably saved those people from numerous anxieties. But they sure must have been in a confusion. They escape at Lord knows what cost and travail with their lives clear across the Atlantic, and then they sit on Riverside Drive in a perfectly decent apartment in a free country and can't do anything but listen to Hitler. They were in a confusion, weren't they?
Well, Hitler was sure in a confusion. The man didn't know whether he was going north, south, east or west, fighting Roman legions or cat fur. He was a madman, but a very intelligent madman. He sounded so real, you know. But he was a confusion.

Now, very probably, there is a problem. And a problem is something like this: "Young centurions of Roman legions should not lead punitive expeditions through villages which have not offended against the Roman frontier." That's probably the problem or something and that's probably been the problem ever since; and there's probably no problem in Germany but this one. Only of course there are no centurions; there are no legions.

So the original postulate, lacking its own confusion, has accumulated confusions ever since. And this thing has rolled along up the track madly. And here we've got it amongst us – still today. I'm sure they are still expelling the legions. I'm sure of it. Or preventing themselves from being expelled by the Russians, or something. But there's some basic and fundamental postulate in there. There's some basic and fundamental appositive – or a positive postulate that is against something, see.

And then this adds to its confusion and then it's completely lost in the shuffle. Only it attacks things and makes confusions, but these originally have a postulate like "We must repel the German hordes." See, we must repel that. Well, that postulate all went to pieces because nobody could do it. Then that added to itself a great deal of confusion. So we have – that original idea is totally wound up with some resistive effect against Germany. Only it gets lost in the shuffle and nobody can find it in the confusion anymore.

So we have a confusion of Germany's "warlike spirit" (quote) (unquote), and the confusion of something else's unwarlike spirit or something of the sort. And these two confusions are absolutely pressed tight together, and they keep bursting forth at the drop of a hat. And they've been doing it now for about two thousand years. It goes back almost that far. It's way, way back. And if anybody can tell me what these wars are all about, I'd like to know.

I at one time had a good solution to the thing. I went down over all the terrain, the common invasion terrain that goes from Germany into France, you see. And you've probably heard some tape or another with a dissertation on it, because I did solve it. I did figure out what the wars were all about, is that the Germans are basically at heart cattle rustlers. And they every once in a while go on cattle rustling forays, because that's all there is down in the part of France that they ever attack are a few cattle, do you see? And there's a lot of things that you can work out with this. It's an interesting premise if you start going along this line. You eventually get all wound up in various aspects, but you do come up with this one fact, is that's probably the only possible reason they would ever go across the border.

There's nothing in that country, by the way. They've overrun it so often that you could drive the length and breadth of it, and there are just – I've noticed the villages along the route, for instance, are built out of stones unmortared. They're all set to be blown apart again. [laughter] And after they're blown apart, well, there's no difficulty in putting them back together again. You just pick up the stones and pile them up one on top of another, you see, and you've got a village again. You mark it the next time you go through there. That's the way those towns are built now. In other words, they're all ready to have another confusion, see. And their own structure has gone into a confusion, and so on. Well, these are the problems.
Now, when you see it on the order of magnitude of some great psychotic force in the world, like Hitler, and opposing forces and postulates which gather to themselves confusion, and now we look at it twenty years later, and what do we find? We find there's still innumerable signs of these confusions still around, sewn into our industry, sewn into our various political principles. For instance – I don't know, American troops aren't goose-stepping yet, but almost, almost. And you get various aspects of this. It's all over the place. It's all over the place.

Economics expresses itself in these talks about common markets. And you see this. It just keeps echoing these waves of this tremendous force of opposition – of two or more great forces which were in opposition – and the confusions still continue, you see. They go on and on, and they roll down through the years. And all of a sudden – these confusions – somebody gets ahold of this, and he makes a big deal out of one of these confusions, you see. Adds a new spark to the thing, gathers new confusion to it and *boombo!* And goes off up in some new direction, you see. Finding some other force to oppose, you see.

Well, it's a good picture of a reactive bank – the only reason I'm bringing it up – good picture of a reactive bank. This fellow set up or iginally some idea that he should oppose some other idea, you see – probably quite logically, you see – only this idea that he should oppose, in committing overt acts of confusion or which confused the other idea, you see, got back in turn confusion. And the other idea, of course, counterattacked this idea. And you had eventually two confusions, one going against the other. And then you got more confusions. And then these confusions go rolling down the ages, and nobody can identify them. See how this is?

Now, you try to take apart a reactive mind. What are you taking apart? From a standpoint of problems, at least this one aspect of the reactive mind and a very powerful aspect it is, because it has endurance; *it continues* – you've got a continuance of these old problems. So that you have a problem, and then a solution, but the solution becomes a problem in itself. There's that mechanism. There are other mechanisms, you see, aside from this, all of which add up to what? Duration.

Now, the one thing you could say about the reactive mind: that it is right here right now, performing right here right now as it should have been performing at some other period or time.

All right. How do you take it apart? You should understand it from the standpoint of problems. Problems are in the reactive mind. Problems do exist in the reactive mind. How many ways could you take that situation which I've been describing here – trying to put it on the third dynamic so you could easily see it in the first dynamic – how many ways could you take that apart?

Well, you could take it apart in the form of motion. You could take it apart in the form of looking at two things at once. You could take it apart in the form of getting confusions of comparable magnitude. You could do all kinds of different things to resolve this particular situation *without*, remember, adding a new solution. Ah, that's the one thing that has never happened on the track.

That is why Scientology in this particular department is doing something which has *never* been done before. Scientology at large is doing something that's never been done be-
fore. But here, vis-a-vis, you've got something that just was never done before. Solving problems without finding yourself with a new solution. Incredible. Incredible. You don't lay a new solution in to get the old problem solved.

Now, let's compare that with psychoanalysis. Do you see that psychoanalysis lays in a new solution? See, there's a new solution for the old confusion. Which will only add to what? Which will only add to a new confusion with a new solution, which of course gathers to itself a new confusion, and then you've got to have a new solution. And then it adds to itself a new confusion, and then you've got to have a new solution, haven't you? So you get interminable branches of psychoanalysis – all different, all solving what? All solving the original confusion which gathered around the original postulates of psychoanalysis.

Well, the thing starts to look like a field full of black puffballs, all of them rolling against each other. And you wonder, "Well, there could be no end to this. There is no end to this. It'll just go on and on forever." Yes, as long as you add new solutions to get and gather to themselves new confusions. And you start adding new confusion solutions and new confusions, you'll all have – always have new confusions and therefore always have a reactive mind. And that's one of the reasons it has continuance.

Now let's look at it from the standpoint of confrontingness. You realize if somebody has to have a solution, they didn't confront and therefore as-is. You see a solution, then, is always a no-confront. So you can put that down as a stable datum: solution equals no-confront. And confronting equals vanishment of problem.

Now, there's the equation on which all of these operate. Everything along this line operates that way. If you look at it, factually it vanishes. But if you solve it, it persists.

Now, if you're ever having any trouble with getting something to persist, one of the best ways of handling it is don't confront it. I mean you can use this in reverse, see. It's not necessarily a destructive or an as-ising mechanism. You can use it as a persistent mechanism. Look at it, you see, and you'll see that if you wanted something to persist, absolutely to persist, then you prevent – let me phrase it better – you prevent all confrontingness. You wanted something to persist, you'd prevent all confrontingness and we get back to the original mechanism. The original mechanism of structure in this universe happens to be preventing the solution of the problems of the universe to guarantee the persistence of the universe. So that anybody who solved problems with regard to the universe was non persona grata with anybody who was trying to get a total persistence of the universe. You got that?

Audience: No.

You don't get that.

Female voice: Say it again.

Well, this is an interesting problem in itself. How would you guarantee the persistence of something? Well, if you prevent confrontingness, you will guarantee its persistence. Let's be extreme. We have a monument and we fix it up so that you can't run into it, the wind can't hit it, nothing can touch it, nobody can look at it, nobody can come near it. And to do all these things, of course, we have to hide it, say it doesn't exist, we have to deny it in every possible
way we can, prevent confrontingness. And sure enough, nobody will ever touch that monu-
ment. You got the idea? If you did all this. All right.

Now, let's take and blow that mechanism up to universe size, and say, "All right, we've
got some space and we've got some time and we've got some plants and dirt and various things,
and some myths and legends." [laughter] Now, let's – let's take this thing here, and now, be-
cause it's so very hard – very, very difficult – you see, this is the problem that this other thing
solves. It is impossible to create and say that something will persist. You see? That's the idea
of the problem.

Now, this problem thing that I'm talking to you about is the solution to this "impossi-
ble to create." See, we can't create, so therefore we've got to preserve what's been created.
Well, the way you preserve that is to get this exact mechanism that you're trying to undo in
the reactive bank, because it's a preservative mechanism. "Anybody who solves problems is a
dead duck. Horrible things will occur to anybody who solves problems. And we will prove
it." And everybody agrees 100 percent and everybody does it to everybody, and you get a
physical universe fact which enters the mental field. And here is where structure and mind
take their first divergence. This is the first time these two things start separating.

And we say, "Anybody who solves any problems is going to get the problem in his
face like a custard pie. He's going to really get messed up. Now, you solve any problems and
boy you've had it."

Now, what is this? This is a protective mechanism. If you've got a universe which is
persisting – you've got a universe that's persisting somewhat, limply – and you want that uni-
verse to persist solidly, completely and forevermore, you've got to prevent the solution of its
mysteries. You've got to prevent it from being confronted.

So how do you prevent it from being confronted? You say, "Anybody who tries to
solve this thing is going to get it, man." And you're going to get a total persistence of the uni-
verse. And this goes over into pcs trying to solve their problems from day to day. The terrors
of solution then bring about all of these other mechanisms I have been talking about. I'm just
giving you the exact bedrock genus of the problem. So eventually it becomes absolutely, fantas-
tically impossible to solve problems. You must not solve problems!

It's all borne out of this one fact: The universe must persist! See, we mustn't let any-ody go around and take a look at these pillars and rocks, planets, space, time and find out
anything about them at all because they pose a problem, don't they. Why is it here? That's the
first problem they propose. Why does time go clickety-clickety-clickety-click? Why?
Big problem posed, isn't it?

Well, we right away have to rush around to somebody who's taking a look at this, and
just as they did in the Middle Ages, we'd have to say to him, "Tsk! tsk! tsk! No, no, no, no, no,
no, no. We'll have to burn you at the stake." [laughter]

"Oh, you're researching into why time is here. You realize that's sacrilege? Uh-huh-
huh-huh-huh-huh-huh." Even in ancient Greek times, it was sacrilege against Cronus to investi-
gate time. The Greek broke free, but everybody was being prevented from solving problems,
then you got a total persistence. And then in a more self-centered sort of a way, the fellow
who could be a tremendous mystery, of course, thought he could guarantee to himself a tremendous amount of persistence. Obviously, it would follow.

So the way to live was to be mysterious. And if you were totally unknown and if everything remained totally unknown and you confronted nothing, why of course, you would just live on and on and on and on. This was obvious – except what were all these funny black masses and this – so on – that's gathering up? And "Why are we unhappy?" and so on.

So we developed a whole genus of thetan, developed not to solve anything. If you solved anything, it was dangerous. And this is proven by the fact that if you just simply ask a pc to solve something, solve something, solve something, solve something, masses close in on him. He goes through the exact I'm-supposed-to. He dramatizes the cure of the impersistence of universes.

Do you follow that now?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Do you see what that is? And that is exactly how he got that way. Basically and fundamentally, there's nothing wrong with solving problems. But when you've got tremendous overts on people who were trying to, of course it becomes impossible.

So we find this dear old lady who never did anything in her whole life. I remember the history of one of these as a pc one time. And we couldn't get her going as a pc until we had solved innumerable second dynamic affaires de coeur. All of them in direct violation of the basic principles of matrimony. We get this dear, sweet old lady standing on the corner, innocent, you know, silver hair, as a halo about her head.

She's standing there and she can't make up her mind whether to cross the street or not to cross the street. You can label her. She's no victim. She's somebody who has forbidden, forbidden, forbidden, forbidden the solution of any problems or the knocking out of any mass or the vanishment of any universes. Which arrives at what? Total indecision. Because you've got problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. And you don't dare solve any problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. And you mustn't look at any problems, problems, problems. So what's going to happen? And you get a dwindling spiral. And in terms of problems, that is the dwindling spiral. You can't solve them. You mustn't confront them.

Now where are we? We stand one-half a block north of the southeast corner of nowhere. You see where this is? And you see somebody saying, "Well, I just don't know. I should have – ooooh, no – now – no. I think I – ooooh – well, I – ooooh . . . Mmmm- mmmmmmm."  

You say, "What are you trying to do?"

They say, "Well, I'm just trying to make up my – well, as a matter of fact – well, the truth ..." [laughter]

They can't even tell you what their problem is. And when they can't tell you what their problem is, of course, hammer and tongs along with this, hand in glove, is they don't dare solve it either. They can't look at it. They don't dare solve it. Boom!
How did they get that way? Well, it's overts against people trying to solve problems. That's all. So solving problems had a consequence connected with it and the consequences was you got packed in black mass or something or the other happened to you, and "Everything collapsed on me." You'd have no universe left. You'd have no space left. All of these various consequences, consequences, consequences, you see. And they keep piling them up. "You mustn't solve problems, you mustn't solve problems, you mustn't solve problems." And the fellow finally just says, "What are you talking about, problems?"

They say, "Well, you know all those things you can't see and you don't know about? Huh-huh. You know, all those things you can't see and don't know about – well, those are problems." Well, isn't that the way it's normally defined?

So we look over this pattern – we look over this pattern – and we find out that it can be used two ways. You can make something persist with it, and you can get somebody real loused up with it. Therefore the persistence of the reactive mind is Q-and-Aing with the persistence of the physical universe. Therefore you find most of the physical universe principles which affect the mind are in the zone and area of problems. There are other things, you see, which affect the mind besides what I'm talking to you about. You see this? It's physical-universe things, you see – gravity, motion, energy, being still, being fixedly located or trapped.

Being trapped is a direct result of solving problems. "If you're going to solve this problem, we're going to put you in jail." They did it a few hundred years ago. I don't know how long they kept poor old Galileo – they let it out now that he had a rather not unenjoyable captivity. He was merely kept away from his instruments and things of this character, but that sounds like to me like captivity.

"You solve a problem, we'll put you in jail." So the fellow has a problem. He doesn't solve the problem. He doesn't confront the problem. Therefore it doesn't create any space between himself and the problem – which is the real closure of the mass, you see – and of course he gets embedded in a sort of a black basalt of energy of some kind or another, you see. He solves the problem and jails himself. You see, he knows what he's supposed to do: "If you solve problems, you jail yourself: That's the way it is; and if you confront a problem, you're going to get confused. That's for sure."

See, these are all fundamental, pattern arrangements which have been laid out in order to protect various monuments, planets, thingamabobs and whatnots, all of which are based on an upper-strata failure, and the upper-strata failure is a create failure.

Now, the consequences of creating are something we've been told all about since we got into Step 6. I didn't know there were any consequences to it, but there obviously are. Amongst a lot of people there are tremendous consequences to creation.

So after the universe was all figured out on the basis that: If you create one, there are terrible consequences. Therefore, it is impossible to create another one, see. So therefore, your havingness would all be shot to pieces if you knocked out the one you've got because you can't create another one.
You see you've already had earlier on the track these tremendous problems on the subject of creation, you know. It isn't enough just to create something and say, "That's it." Everybody had to decide, well, it's very valuable, and nobody can ever create another one like it.

You go around art museums sometimes, and here's some horrible daub, you know. Some painter has been by there carrying a bucket of paint on the end of his ladder, you know. And in some of these museums, particularly down in Greenwich Village or places like this, this is what happens, you know. The interior decorators and people like that got careless and just slopped up the canvasses that were there, and eventually this is what you've got, you know. That's the only way you could explain these things; and here – I'm talking about – [not] necessarily about classical cubism or immersionism, but I don't think they're talking about art.

Anyway, here is a – here's this idea of "It's very valuable. It can never be replaced. There is only one like it. There was only one Van Gogh or Van Went or something, and here he is, see. And therefore this is terribly valuable, and we're going to prove it. Now we're going to have an auction and the highest bidder gets this totally invaluable thing which he can then hide away in a private study which will never be confronted, you see. And he gets to pay 8,765,000 quid or something like that for this painting." Aw, this is nonsense. It's nonsense, man, but that's protecting the valuable, you see.

You make it valuable by protecting it. You make it valuable also by never being able to replace it. And these are all mechanisms of value. These are all mechanisms by which people try to get you to lay off most, see. These are the mechanisms of "don't touch it." These are the mechanisms of "preserve it", but fundamentally the mechanisms of "no create" – the penalties of creation. And when these things have been exercised to their full and everyone is totally convinced that creation now carries such fantastic penalties with it, that nobody else is ever going to be given a show of any kind, then you get this problem sequence. Why? Well, you have to protect the things that are created because they're liable to get as-ised.

You see, you unfortunately possess the ability to look at something and have it disappear. Unless you look at it cross-eyed or upside down or something like that, something is liable to happen to it. And of course, this gets very upsetting to somebody who is already convinced that it's impossible to create or make anything.

So he will tell you at once the solution to the problem is going to get you in plenty of trouble. The confronting of this thing is going to get you in plenty of trouble. Medusa's head – the old legend that dramatizes this and so forth. You looked at it, you turned into a stone or warriors turned into snakes or cat's fur or something. I've forgotten. I'll run into the preclear someday that made that up. Pandora's box – her curiosity, you see, and when she finally opened the lid, then all the evils of mankind came out. And they scattered all over everything, and man has been in trouble ever since. Now, isn't that smug. [laughter]

These are the kind of legends which they generate on the basis – they say, "Don't look, don't look, don't look, don't look, don't look. Don't investigate. Don't go anywhere near it. Get ah-da-da-ah-ah-ah, you're too close to that, man. And do you realize that if you solved the problem of time, all time would cease. All the temples in the world would no longer chime their bells, and Big Ben would no longer strike, and everybody would be totally motionless where they as ..." You know, the most fantastic nonsense you ever heard of.
If you solved the problem of time, the consequence to you would be, you would have to put it there again. Mass without time, of course probably could not entrap anybody. So nobody would be held motionless.

I was running a process one day "Look around here and find something you can have" and stopped all the clocks in the house. This was rather upsetting to the auditor. Well, I looked at my watch, and I said, "Well, I could have the time", and at that moment my watch stopped and all of the clocks in the house stopped. And there was a kind of a – an odd white streak appeared on the consecutive time track, you see. You know, there was a zero, a zero. And the watch stopped and it wouldn't go on running and the watch stopped elsewhere. You get the idea?

Well, this was terrible, wasn't it? But the only reason the auditor got the least bit upset about it is I – it actually encroached in the direction of time. And that's something we mustn't create. That's something we can't create, so therefore we mustn't confront. And you get how creation and confront and problems and solutions and these sort of things proceeded in their evolution. Now, if you understand some part of that – if you understand some part of that – you can see what's happening to your preclear.

Now if you said, "Face a solution. Thank you. Face a solution. Thank you. Face a solution. Thank you. Face a solution. Thank you", he would be very disturbed. In the first place, solutions are the easiest things that a thetan does and the easiest things to create. And so he'd get his head practically knocked off by the confusion which was around these solutions and you didn't have him looking at the confusions, you only had him looking at the solutions. So of course things apparently get more and more confused.

Well, undoubtedly somebody could go through the door like this, but it would be terribly uncomfortable. It would be very, very, very uncomfortable. That's the least I would say about it. Because you're bound and determined to overlook and not confront any part of the confusion which surrounds any of the solutions. So you then never have any reason why any of the solutions ever occurred. This is strictly problems now I'm talking about.

So if we say to them, "Look at the confusion. Look at the confusion. Look at the confusion", why, they haven't got much of an inkling of where the confusion is but these two things packaged together are rather communicable to man, and that is "problem".

We're asking him to look at the confusion or the difficulty. We're not asking him to look to the solution of the difficulty; we're asking him to look to the confusion or the difficulty and in view of the fact that the difficulty also contains other postulates, he's also looking at the further solutions, isn't he? He's looking at the solutions then which cause the confusions to some slight degree. So you get an as-isment of problems when you have him look at problems.

Now, the basic thing you're trying to do is get the fellow, not to solve problems, not to erase problems, but to become habituated and accustomed to and get over his stupid nonsense about the terrible liabilities of solving things and the horrors of problems.

You're trying to get him to recover from these things which were set up on the earliest, earliest, earliest part of the track. These are very early track. You're asking him to get – re-
cover from his inability, apparent inability, to examine confusions, apparent inability to re-
solve them.

A person who can't confront problems, of course, does not ever exhibit very much judgment and we have the cue to judgment in this. This is judgment. Judgment – so-called "sound judgment" – can only take place in the presence of observation. Now, we can observe synthetically, but it is nevertheless observation. Well, you observe synthetically when you observe with mathematics, when you mock something up, you say, "Well..." – or think it over or try to approximate the various conditions which exist and then you can come to a judgment about it. You can come and – to a conclusion. So judgment is completely absent in a person who would be completely unable to confront a problem. That would be the total missingness of judgment. You'd get zero judgment.

Now, if you want to choose an executive, just test him on the subject of problems. A few of the briefest questions on the subject of problems which establish immediately his index on judgment. Just instant, almost instant coordination on these points. If he can't confront problems, he won't have any judgment.

Now, similarly in auditing, the auditor who cannot confront the problems of the pc, of course will pay no attention to these things because they won't seem to him to be problems. Therefore he will not handle these problems and therefore the pc will make no progress.

So, completely aside from the fact that it resolves cases, it also resolves auditing. The more confrontingness that the individual has, the greater his ability to confront, the sounder his judgment will be with regard to anything; and of course, an auditor with good judgment is a very valuable auditor.

Now, let's see how you would get there. Now, I've given you the various ramifications and the discursives, theoretical this-is-where-it-came-from. How would you get there? Well, you'd get somebody to basically not really confront, not really do this, not really do that. We don't have to be very specific beyond this one thing: we'd have to get him familiar with prob-

Now, we take this fellow out. He can't drive a car. Every time he comes near a car, the door falls off, you know. He doesn't even have to come near it – very close to it. He brushes against the rear fender, and the whole radiator goes splat. You've run into such people, I'm sure. And here's this bloke, and we want him to get to pass his driver's test and be able to drive a car so he isn't a menace to his license plates or something. And all we do is get him out there patting fenders, you know. Just let him reach and withdraw from fenders and the bonnet and the radiator cap and the hood and the top, and – mix up some American and Eng-

The first thing you know, this individual can pass a driving test like a breeze. Why? It's familiarity. You don't have to say it's confronting. You don't have to say it's reach and withdraw, because there are probably tremendous numbers of ways to gain a familiarity; lots of ways to become familiar with something. Lots of ways, in other words, to know something better and these are mechanisms by which you can know something better.
So when we say "the process for problems is", and then follow it with some auditing command, we have actually fallen short of a complete statement, so this is what you're up against right this minute in your auditing and handling of pcs. You're up against only this one fact, is I said "Recall a problem", and then gave you a five-way – six-way bracket about problems and so forth, and several of you at once started writing "1A Revised." So let's put this one right.

1A is simply familiarization with problems and getting off the fellow's withholds with Security Check. That increases his knowingness by getting off the not-knows he's running on the rest of the world – see, the Security Check decreasing not-knows. Now you're increasing his knowingness by getting him to be familiar with problems. Not necessarily get the solution out of the problems in order to know it.

People will do that, too. It's quite interesting They take all the problems and they take the solutions off of them. They put the solutions in their pockets so they'll know something and then let this problem just go adrift, you see.

They never face any of their problems. They just get – they're like stamp collectors or something of the sort – they just get an innumerable library of solutions, you see. One of the best books on the subject of survival that was ever issued was issued for United States and Allied pilots during World War II on the subject of survival in the jungle, and there was another one issued which was survival at sea. And it was quite fascinating – if you were down in a dinghy or something of the sort or off a torpedoed ship. This little booklet of survival at sea was a whole method of navigation. And what they had done is just take the ancient method of navigation used by the Polynesians, researched the thing completely and turned it out in a booklet form and gave you all the hot dope, you see.

Now, those were fairly practical books. But now let's get up to An Encyclopedia of Camping Lore. Coo, you know. Talk about people making something out of practically nothing, look over sometime A Complete Encyclopedia of Knots – you know, knots that you tie. It's fabulous, you know. How many ways are there to make a piece of rope hold itself by binding against itself? That's all a knot is – all a knot is. It simply is something you do with a piece of line to make it hold itself with itself And there are various complicated methods of doing this. And they get more and more complicated, and they finally go off into art [laughter] as they naturally would, you see, having no in – no practical value of any kind whatsoever. But this is a Turk's-head, and this is a double, superplated Turk's-head with the twelve inner strand type of Turk's-head, you see, that is used to make mats for admirals' barges, you know. And I imagine down here in the – in the nautical books available in the Admiralty and so on, there's all kinds of this stuff. It is just innumerable. It's just so fantastic. There are about eighty-nine hundred ways of making one type of lace out of rope called Spanish lace and there are just innumerable methods of doing this, you see. And this is what you would call the collection of useless solutions.

Because man and boy, I've been going to sea quite a while. I never found use for more than about three-four knots. [laughs] Yeah! It's fantastic, you know. It's just fantastic. I look around. Decorative purposes? Yes. Yes, you can make everything look very pretty, you can put walls and crowns and Matthew Walkers. And if you haven't got anything to do some sun-
shiny day, and you want to make everybody believe you're busy, why, start preparing heaving lines and things like this, tying various complicated knots of various kinds. It gets an awful lot of admiration – but of no value – of no value at all.

The collection of solutions. Science now includes in its ranks innumerable subjects which are merely the frantic collection of solutions. They haven't anything to do with any problem known to man or beast. But boy, can they collect solutions that might someday be of use to somebody, possibly.

Botany. Botany is a most interesting subject. You probably never collided with botany – not head-on, not head-on. But it's a classification science. Botany. After you've classified all the herbs and flowers of a district and area, you'd think that would be plenty. But no, they've got to correlate the confounded things. [laughter]

And I was reading the other day on fauna – not allied to botany – on the island of the Azores. Finally a great mystery had been solved by examining the inner ear of a shrew. And they found that it was really, actually related to the subgenus clasamatus. It was not actually related at all to the subgenus clasamotus. [laughter]

Now, I sometimes start giving this kind of thing the ha-ha by calling it "the little facts we cannot possibly live without."


You walk through the place – I've often wondered what would happen in some universities if I simply moved up a moving van and started moving the library out, moving the prexy's office out and that sort of thing. I walked into the president of a university's office one time and took all the famous, ancient prints down from the wall, took them down to the photolithographer's, had them all photolithographed for a school edition of the paper and took them all back. Nobody noticed they were gone. By their terminology, there must have been a hundred thousand pounds worth of prints on that wall, those walls, in those offices. They were absolutely invaluable, see. They had ceased to confront anything, but boy, they sure had an awful lot of answers, you know?

Now, get that extremity with the fellow who will have nothing to do with the solution, but must live in problems. Now, he's just got to live in problems. You find him normally down in skid row. Brother, he is really a gone dog. Of course, he's just totally caved-in all the time about everything and you would be utterly fascinated to find the number of things which are to him a problem.

And you start examining this, and you absolutely fail to be able to classify them because they don't seem like problems to you. Because he'll give you facts as problems and his problems are always facts. He never announces them as problems. He never announces them as "how to." He never announces as to "what is" or any question mark. There's no question
marks connected with these problems at all. They're all problems, but they are announced as facts. You say, "Tell me a problem", and he'll say, "the sidewalk." [laughter]

Now, any time you enter a problem chain on a preclear you will find either one or the other of these two conditions existing. If it is a type of problem that has – the preclear has never been able to handle, he will either be in an obsessive automaticity of solution or he will be totally immersed into the confusion of the problem as a fact. One side or the other, he will be on both sides of this, but he'll never be in the center line of "these are problems."

So you have a preclear all of a sudden waking up to the fact that he has problems, which startles the life out of him. Well, you could have told him that. The fellow has never been able to eat lunch in his life. He gets violently sick at his stomach at exactly 12:02. And one day you've got this fellow in session. You're auditing him and so forth and he announces to you as one of the most classical statements of all time that he has a problem at noon every day. He can't eat lunch because he gets sick at his stomach; and that is quite a problem to him. Only he announces it as a fact.

He doesn't announce it as a problem. He doesn't announce it as "Why do I get sick at my stomach?" see, or something of that sort. He announces it as fact. Or he will say, "I wonder – I wonder if there's any connection between my taking Tums – I have to start to eat Tums, let's see, at 11:50. Yes, I always eat Tums at 11 – I wonder if there's any connection with that and the fact that I get sick at my stomach at noon?"

And you look at this and you'll say, "For heaven's sakes, what is happening here? What is this? You mean the guy doesn't connect these things?" Well, it's worse than that. He never thought there was anything significant about his eating Tums at 11:50 and he didn't think it had anything whatsoever to do with anything because he never eats any lunch.

There's no problem there, don't you see. It's just this vast vista and he's got the total solution: You eat Tums and that's the solution, but there's no problem. And you're auditing him, and all of a sudden he relates this solution to some extant condition, and he says these two are related. Well, you could have told him that. Only that's his reactive mind at work, not yours, you see? You see how this is?

So they go in one of two different directions and you can always tell when you run a problems chain of one kind or another, because the fellow starts coming up with solutions, and then on a gradient will start to relate them to facts, which turn out to be unpalatable facts, which turn out to be problems. Or he just goes into it head-on on the subject of facts, facts, facts, facts. Only every fact he announces is actually a problem. It's not a solution to anything. It's just a problem. Each one is an isolated, distinct and different problem. So you don't think you're listening to problems.

You say, "Tell me a problem."

He says, "The sidewalk."

And you say, "Whaaa – wha – what?"

"Well, yeah."
He thinks you're stupid, man. You can't see that a sidewalk is a problem? Why, of course a sidewalk is a problem; and you start to think of ways and means by which a sidewalk could be a problem. That isn't what he means at all. He means a sidewalk is a problem.

There is no further ramification. There isn't any puzzlement about it. There is no mystery about it. There is no relationship of the sidewalk to anything else. The sidewalk doesn't give him any difficulty that he could enunciate or talk about. It's just the sidewalk is a problem. And that is the behavior of a chain and you'll see it yourself as you're running them.

These cannonballs fly overhead and of course we all agree that a cannonball is a problem. But then we have done the mental gymnastics of dressing up the cannonball with all the ramifications which make a cannonball a problem: (1) It is fired usually in anger, (2) it has a target, (3) if it hits anybody it's going to blow them to smithereens; and naturally you have to avoid them, spot them, and not be in the place that they are hitting. You can think of all kinds of problems, but the pc isn't doing this, you see.

So you say "problem", he says "toothbrush." Now, you go ahead with an automaticity, trying to make a problem out of a toothbrush to see what he's looking at. Well, that isn't what he's doing He just says "problem – toothbrush." That's it. There's no further ramification then.

Then off of this toothbrush peels the first onionskin of a problem and he starts telling you "Toothbrush, toothbrush. Yes, I've recalled a problem – toothbrush. I've recalled a problem. Toothbrush. Toothbrush? Yes, that's it." And he'll go on about toothbrushes and glasses – glasses that you put toothbrushes in and all of a sudden will recall that he has been severely beaten at some time or another for having not washed his teeth.

We're getting somewhere now, you see? And then we'll get a little bit further, and all of a sudden, "I wonder why I always had to wash my teeth. I wonder if it's true that teeth are preserved if you wash them."

Now you'll start to see problems coming off, you see. The skin is coming off of the onion and eventually you'll get down to the fact that this is a hard fact which has now disintegrated or deteriorated in something by observation and familiarity. And you ask him if he's worried about it. No, he isn't worried about it now. Well, what has exactly happened to this toothbrush that was the problem? Well, it's gone through all the stages of all the problems a toothbrush has ever been to him, down to a point where he decided to get even with his mother, you see, by doing something like dipping the toothbrush or dipping her toothbrush every morning in a bottle of vinegar or something of the sort.

We get an overt around it, and it's a solution to something or other, and then it got to be a problem, and that all blows. And that whole thing has been confronted and it's gone. You get the evolution of that? Or he will tell you overt, overts, overts, or solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution. Problem, problem, little bit of problem, little bit more problem. Little bit more problem, more problem, more problem, more problem, more problem, less problem, less problem, some kind of a solution. And all these solutions go. See, you can enter this thing from both sides. Actually, they're both the same mechanism. It's just the stage you enter the mechanism.
How do you take these apart? Well, you simply get the pc more familiar with them. Well, how do you get the pc more familiar with them? You get the pc to look at them. How do you get the pc to look at them?

All right. Now, right where you sit, you can develop, undoubtedly, ten or fifteen different ways of getting a pc to examine problems; and all of them probably would be perfectly legitimate running Routine 1A. The first and original command on it is "Recall a problem." The next command combines Confront with Problems, which is the most logical way of getting somebody to confront something. But not the most logical way of plowing up his bank. So you could combine these two.

You could run "Recall a problem" for a session, and you could run Confront on Problems for a session, and you'd find out it was something like mining, and then getting all of the ore up out of the mine on the mine dump, and then going over the mine dump, do you see, to find out if there was anything of value in it, don't you see. And that would be the Confront Process, is pulling apart the mine dump after you've mined it and the Recall Process would be mining it. And you could keep doing this one after the other.

Well, there's a liability in this. If you have run "Recall a problem" on a pc and have not followed through the cycle back to PT with his problem, you have probably hung the pc, so Confront will not operate on him. You see that? Confront won't operate on the pc unless he's been cycled back to PT. So any Problems Process that is combined with "Recall" must be run with Model Session cyclic endings.

In other words, you've got to bridge it with getting him back to PT and ending it. Not two more commands and ending it. You got it? That is a must. If you don't do that, you can actually hang your pc up in some old, powerful problem and now you're going to start to run Confront, but that hasn't anything to do with it because he's back down the track, and he isn't in present time, and he hasn't handled that problem. The Problems Process isn't flat to his sense and you have transferred the process, and he is hims – you have become a problem to him; and he's liable to fix on the problem of the session rather than on other problems. You got it?

So any recall Problems Process must carry with it the absolute rule that it has to go through a cycle and back up to present time. You've got to make sure it is and if the person is very unstably in present time, run the cycle through again till he's nice and stable in PT. Got it?

All right. There are various ways, then, of handling this. There are various auditing commands you could use, but these auditing commands must all contain the word problem. That is the simple thing. No matter what you're going to do with these problems, you're going to get him familiar with them.

Well, what auditing commands can you use? You could sort it out on an E-Meter what the pc would best respond to, if you were being very expert and very able with your E-Meter, and you would actually get some version of Problems that would fall, and that is what you would run on him. He might not fall on "confront problems" at all. He might fall very nicely on "recall problems." You see, you get a meter reaction on "recall problems". You don't get any reaction on "confront problems". So you could sort out any version of a Problems com-
mand until you got the most active meter on it. Then you could follow through this type of cycle of mining it and then overhauling it.

Now, there is another Recall Process which is a killer. This is even worse than "Recall a problem" which tears pcs into small strips and this is much worse. Infinitely worse.

And the auditing command is "Recall a present time problem". This situates of course, the pc in the immediate instant of time as to when he had the problem. So you're running him through a whole bunch of consecutive moments of time when he is right there and of course you're not doing any alter-is of time while you're running it. It's sort of a head-on sort of process like you turn the freight train loose and let it run into the station, you know. Head-on! Crash! Boom!

Now, if you were going to run anything as violent as that particular process, you sure should follow it through with some kind of a bracket to compare and get him to confront problems for a while. In other words, you really ought to alternate that with something else. That's awful strong mead. It's something like feeding the cannibal on nothing but human flesh day and night and expecting him to remain docile and gentle.

Give him a chance to confront it. But of course, you're actually confronting it all the time you're running "Recall a present time problem." So I would only bother to shift this when it apparently was sort of flat and had died out. Now, in view of the fact that a problem was originally originated in its aberration – the aberration about problems and solutions were originated to protect the universe or various works or mechanitions – you of course find the early end of a problems run – appearing to run forever. Because the basic aberration about problems was planted there to secure persistence.

So Problems in running has a peculiar behavior pattern and that is early on in it, it looks like it's just going to slog and plow forever. It looks like you're never going to get rid of any part of a tone arm motion. The pc isn't having any cognitions. There is nothing happening, except it's just slog, slog, slog. And you've seen that happen with lots of pcs. Well, that's what actually they're floundering in when it happens. They're floundering in the middle of a problem. Only they've got a present time problem and you're not auditing it, so they don't come out of it.

But you run through this exact mechanism when you're doing problems. You say, "Recall a present time problem" and then you go on like this; and honest, he gets no cognitions, no new problems turn up. The tone arm is very active. He knows it isn't getting him anywhere; it doesn't seem to be doing any good. Nothing is happening. He is doing the auditing command, and this is going to go on forever. And this is sort of the atmosphere that seems to surround the thing early on in the run, you see. And this gradually starts disintegrating and the onionskin starts coming off, you know, and all of a sudden he's liable to pass then to either side. These are facts and he starts announcing these facts, you see. And they're very didactic facts. You know?

"Recall a present time problem." "The sidewalk." You go on, wait for him to say something else. Well, I'll tell you right now it'd be an error for you to coax him to say anything else because he's answered your auditing command to his best ability. A sidewalk is a
problem. You see, you don't have to say, "How is it a problem?" "Why is it a problem?" Don't get him to elucidate. I would call that bad auditing.

We did it one time back about 56. We were asking them to do all sorts of things with problems and we found it inevitably knocked the people out of session when we were doing this. So the best way to approach it is accept the pc's answer. And that's an auditing maxim anyhow, which is a long-duration auditing maxim. He thinks he's told you a problem. Okay. Don't disillusion him. The problem is – the problem was a sidewalk. Okay. It was a sidewalk.

The pc, then, in the basic part of the first grind run is liable to move off to either side of this and all of a sudden starts to give you solutions, solutions, solutions, solutions, solutions or is apt to get 8 thousand, 762 million cognitions per square inch. Pandora's box indeed, you see. Or on the other side of the thing just starts telling you a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact. And then he will be in a far goggier state of mind than he would be if he were telling you solutions. But he can alternate between these two extremes.

You ask him for a problem; he gives you a solution. All right. Buy it. So what?

You say, "Tell me a problem."

And he says, "Airplanes. The velocity of flight of airplanes. The velocity of flight of airplanes which suspends them and permits heavier than air flight – the, ah, the wind passing underneath and creating a vacuum above the edges." [laughter]

Seems like a problem to him, so that's a problem. Got the idea?

Now, in handling the Security Check, which very briefly should be mentioned before we wind up – very, very briefly – the Security Check will vary more in its character and quality while running problems than most anything else. It'll move all over the place because you're moving him to different spheres of the mind and area and so forth. But the type of Security Check which you should run while you're starting a pc off and using Routine 1A to start him off with – the type of Security Check, the best one is of course the most general Security Check – that is the Joburg Form 3 – unless you have a specific Security Check that fits his exact case.

Let's say he's been an old-timer. He's been an old-time auditor and that sort of thing. Well, give him that old-time auditor Security Check, you see. Work that one over until it's clean as a wolf's tooth. Then go on to something else, don't you see?

If you haven't got a Security Check that exactly matches the pc's case or that comes close to it or characterizes it well, you would do best just using the Joburg Form 3. But in any event, you would not consider that he had gone through Routine 1A until you'd worked through any and all Security Checks you had that fitted his case or not, as the case may be, and had completed successfully, so that he could do easily and not forever, Form 3.

In other words, it'd finally have to come down to Form 3, no matter what else you did and he'd have to do it easily. Not thirty-six hours for one pass through the Security Check, you understand? He's got to be able to go through this Security Check zippety-bop, like a flat rock skipping across water, see. Bangety-bangety-bangety-bang! He's got to be able to really go through that Security Check.
Now, if you ran these two things one against the other and ran them in that, you have set up a case so that it won't have any PT problems and it won't have actually any major withholds for quite a while in auditing.

But now, does problems – do problems appear again anywhere else in auditing? Yes, they appear in rudiments. You handle them ordinarily as they come up in rudiments. But if you're running a process on problems, for heaven's sakes, don't waste any auditing time taking care of the guy's PT problem, because he's just about to run it anyhow with a better auditing command, you see?

Now, how about running SOP Goals on somebody and he comes up against the fact that he's starting to develop PT problems of some kind or another or "problem" starts falling? Well, it would not do any harm to revert the case to some Problems – to run some Problems until that factor seemed to be kind of cared with and go on with your SOP Goals run.

As long as you can keep rudiments in easily on either Routine 2 or Routine 3, you would not do anything extraordinary. You just let them run. As long as you can keep routines in easily. But the moment routines – the routine seems to be having a hard time because it's running up against a lot of work on rudiments – every time you run rudiments – then you certainly had better handle the thing with Problems – Problems and Security Checks. Got it? It's a kind of a return to Routine 1A to get this thing out of the road although these things will later on have different names. Okay?

There – you will find that most cases going for goals now – going for Clear on SOP Goals Processing – most cases are halted or slow gain simply for one reason only: They've got problems and problems have got them stopped or... we assume that their withholds have been pretty well cleaned up or are kept cleaned up. But between these two the problems and the withholds, I don't care what goal you try to run or what terminal – if you found the goal, if you found the terminal, if you tried to run these things, you're going to stack up just hundreds of hours of auditing.

So you had better get rid of Routine 1A, and you had better get rid of it and straighten it up and finish that up with the pc no matter how many – how long you've got your goal or how well you've got the thing pegged, because he's not going to make much gain.

Nothing in SOP Goals has occurred to alter any consideration concerning the value of a problem or a withhold in stopping a case from making progress. These things still stop cases from making progress whether on SOP Goals or not. Okay?

Now you've got all kinds of Security Checks. There'll be more Security Checks. In running SOP Goals, about halfway through the run, going up that direction, you've got a Whole Track Security Check. Person's memories are opening up and so forth, and you actually are getting a case there that is being held up by the reason that he can't get off his withholds on the whole track. There's no way he can do so, you see. But you've got a Whole Track Security Check. But you for sure would never use a Whole Track Security Check over here in 1A, you see. You wouldn't monkey with that over here in 1A. Okay?

Now, I hope I've squared around most of the problems that you have or will be having about problems and I thought I'd better give you a good look at this. And I want to say I want
to thank you for buckling in and making the fur fly. Sitting over in my office over there, you see little bits of paper flying out every once in a while and you see little tufts of fur going out every once in a while out of the auditing windows and so forth. It's a very, very satisfactory state of affairs.

So thank you very much.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: ANATOMY OF MAYBE, SOLUTIONS

A lecture given on 12 July 1961

Thank you.
Well, I didn't mean to interrupt Suzie's talk. What is it? The 12th of July?

Audience: The 12th of July.

All right. What she can tell you is far more practical. And she can tell it with a lot more bayonets probably.

Well, you haven't had a chance to ask any questions, and I've been informed by Mary Sue that you are now getting into a shape that you know what you don't know. [laughter] So, what question would you like to ask today? ... [laughter] Great, isn't it?

Female voice: Don't disappoint me.

All right.

Female voice: I was wondering when you decide and how when to put the ten-way bracket from a five-way bracket. When you decide?

When you decide to go from a ten-way bracket to, pardon me, a five-way bracket to a ten-way bracket?

Female voice: Yes.

Ah, well, you're dealing with a problem which has actually no basis in mechanics beyond this: The reason you go to a – from a five-way to a ten-way bracket is the plus-minus proposition. It's covered in the anatomy of maybe and I think that is covered in what? That's Scientology 8-80, isn't it?

Female voice: Yes.

And that's the anatomy of maybe. And a continued uncertainty on the part of a pc – a continuous no-cognition, the pc who says – never says, "What do you know?" is hanging so hard in maybes. And his maybes are so fantastic that as you look this thing over you'll see from the anatomy of maybe that the way to take it apart is take it on the plus side, take it on the minus side. "How have you done it? How have you not done it?" "How have you coughed? How have you not coughed?" You get the idea? And his idea of "Maybe I will cough" disappears.
"Maybe" does not have in itself, you see, any faintest reality in fact. It is simply a manifestation of a positive and a negative; and your positive and negative manifestation add up to maybe.

Now, problem one consists of postulate A versus postulate B and between these two postulates you get an indecision, don't you see? But usually postulate A is "do it", and postulate B is "don't do it." That is the commonest variety of a problem.

And if you ask somebody that you're trying to take problems apart by solutions – which can be done; I'll tell you how to do that in a moment – you would say some version of "do it", "don't do it", and then the decision can emerge. But as long as he's hanging on "I've got to do it. I mustn't do it", then no decision can emerge. And "maybe" is simply a counterbalanced insistence on "must" and "must not", or "it is" and "it is not". And these things equally insistent, addest up into the indecision of maybe, but the indecision of maybe is not itself a fact. Have you got the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. If that's not a fact, then you've got to take apart the thing by taking apart its two sides. And then the indecisional character or the maybe character, the uncertainty – and this is quite important in psychotherapy because we're not handling the whole subject of anxiety. The whole subject of anxiety is resident in this anatomy of maybe.

Well, anxiety simply is – consists of "must" and "must not", "is" or "is not." And these things are so counterbalanced that of course, the person can't make up his mind, and anxiety is simply a heightened or frantic state of maybe, you see.

So, all right. Let's – supposing you have a terribly, terribly, terribly anxious or nervous pc who is very indecisional and doesn't know whether to come to session and doesn't know whether not to come to session and thinks there might be great consequences in coming to session or not coming to session, and wonders whether or not they should do it this way or should do it that way and they are just dramatizing indecision all the time, all the time, all the time. Actually, you should know that it is a mistake to run a five-way or six-way bracket on them. You would have to run – pardon me, a five-way bracket – you'd have to run one of these ten-way brackets on them. Got the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

Because they're – they cannot land. They're incapable of landing on plus and incapable of landing on minus, so the longer you run anything in the middle that is avoiding this tremendous condition in which they find themselves, why, the longer they're going to be in processing.

And this is the case that never says, "What do you know?" You've run this case, you've run this case. This case gets no cognitions. This case doesn't ever say, "Well, I'm getting better." This case never says, "Well, there's some way out of the hole." Or the case never even says, "I'm getting much worse." You know? It just goes on grind, grind, grind, grind. Well, you've run into the anatomy of maybe. And the total absence of cognition winds us up into the total presence of uncertainty and anxiety.
"I don't know whether I should be processed or not, you see, because if I am processed, da-da-da – you never know. And if I – I – I don't know. I – you know. I – isn't there ter – some terrible consequence? Are you very sure that it doesn't hurt the mind?" And so on and you'll run into all of this.

The person is saying to you "maybe." The person is saying to you, "indecision", "anxiety", all that sort of thing. Well, practically every process you do on them, you ought to somehow or another bend it around so there's plus and minus, plus and minus, plus and minus, plus and minus, see.

Never run a plus, plus, plus, plus, because you'll get a stuck flow promptly; and never run a minus, minus, minus, minus, because you'll get a stuck flow promptly. And that is what decides it. The condition of the pc is what decides it.

Now, about one pc, maybe, out of every – this is an inaccurate figure, but it's just somewhat of idea of order of magnitude. Maybe one out of twenty never says, "What do you know."

All right. Well, that particular pc – when you're sizing them up, you run them for a little while – just make up your mind, everything on this pc has got to be run plus and minus. Everything.

So, this would make the rudiments sound like this: "Do you have a present time problem? Is there a present time problem you don't have?" [laughter] Got it?

Female voice: Yes.

"Do you have an ARC break? All right. Is there an ARC break you don't have? Thank you very much."

"Are you withholding anything? All right. Very good. Very good. Is there anything you're not withholding? Fine. All right."

You could even go to the reductio ad absurdum of asking such a pc, "Is it all right if I begin this session now? What would happen if I didn't?" [laughter] And you'll find that your noncogniting pc will all of a sudden be saying, "What do you know?" you know. And this long grind, grind, grind will tend to disappear and go into limbo.

So, that is when you decide this. The greater the anxiety, the greater the indecision, the greater the uncertainty of the pc, the more you must run both sides of an auditing command; and it just depends on that. And most pcs – the large majority of your pcs – this just falls into place and you can do it most any way you want to do it. And it'll go along. And you would do a Prehav Assessment and it's Failed Leave, well, you don't have to run Leave. They may dramatize Leave a little bit immediately after you've run Failed Leave, but doesn't matter. You can get away with it, don't you see.

But if this person is one of these "can't change", "don't go anyplace", so forth, you assess them on Failed Leave, you know instantly if they're going to blow straight across the scenery, they're going to disappear on you if you say "Failed Leave" about twice without saying "leave." Got the idea?
You should recognize this as that particular case, because I think that case is the bane of your existence. The case actually will change, but never seems to notice it. Yeah. Well, that's how you handle that case. You can take that case apart like you can count pennies on a table. Okay?

Female voice: Just something more to add here. Would it also depend on terminals — running terminals? SOP Goal on the terminal or on the pre ...

No, ma'am. Doesn't ...

Female voice: — only on the precl ...

... doesn't determine. Terminal has nothing to do with it. On most SOP Goals cases, you just run the level ...

Female voice: Right, thank you.

... and that's fine. But if you've got a superanxious pc who is being very doubtful about everything ...

Well, this kind of a manifestation — you're running — you're running a terminal — you're running a terminal "whizzlestick." And this pc just doesn't know if that's the level or not. You've assessed Cause. "Whizzlestick, Cause. Well, I don't know whether that's the level or not. I wouldn't be sure that's the level. Are you sure that's the level? That couldn't have fallen on that, could it have? That isn't the level then, really, is it?" Well, the auditing command you put together had better be Cause-Not Cause. Okay?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. You bet.

Male voice: Ron, on Routine 1A, when you're running "Recall a PTP" or one of the processes, can you change during a session, and when?

All right. In running Routine 1A, and you're running "Recall a PTP", or whatever you're running, can you change within the session? The mildness would be the determination. The answer is "yes". Not ordinarily, but it could be done. And it would be determined by the mildness of reaction, not the violence of reaction.

If you're getting tremendous tone arm reaction, and you're getting tremendous pc reaction as a result of running such a process as "Recall a PTP", it would be an Auditor Code break to shift it not only in the session but in the intensive. Because it's running too hot and it's running too heavy, and it would be too painful a shift to suddenly alter the auditing command.

But the other side of it, you can. The thing doesn't seem to be doing very much. You're — you know, you're getting some tone arm action. You're getting a division of the Tone Scale or something like this, and the pc seems to be doing it rather easily. And they were having a little difficulty a short time before doing it, but they all of a sudden start doing it easily or something, and it looks like it's getting a little too easy with the pc or something like this. You could shift. You could shift to Confront.
This is something like I was saying, you dig up the ore from the bottom of the mine and put it out on the dump. Well, you could shift over onto Confront. And all of a sudden watch that tone arm fly again, see? You can do an adjustment like this. You can always do an adjustment on processing when the process you are running is no longer producing marked results. But, if you change a process before the rule of change has occurred – the twenty-minute test has occurred – you have committed a serious blunder not to go back sometime and complete that process. You got the idea?

*Male voice:* Yeah.

It basically would mean that you probably made a mistake. It comes under the heading of rectifying an error. A person would – would run all right on Confront, but won't run at all well on Recall, and you ran Recall; and Confront won't get a heavy needle reaction, and so forth, but then, a heavy tone arm reaction. But you don't get much on Recall, see.

Well, it's actually the correction of a blunder. What you do would bring him, by cycle, up to PT whether running Confront or Recall or anything else. You get him solidly in PT and shift.

And that would be the main thing that would determine whether you could shift or not, is can you get him into PT? See? If he's out of PT and the tone arm is moving like mad, well, you wouldn't shift. You'd carry on, that's all.

Any auditing command, of course, can be modified. If you weren't able to modify an auditing command or change a phrasing of a process or a different approach on the same subject, of course you'd be hung with your own mistakes; and you'd also be hung with the diminishing change.

This pc, you've run him for – you ran him all day yesterday, and you run him on "Recall a Problem", just as simple as this, you see. And that tone arm was just whizzing, man. That was going over and jumping on – hitting the needle on the head, and turning the sensitivity knob up all by itself, you know. And just really whizzing.

When you bring him into session, and all of a sudden it isn't whizzing. Check your rudiments. Your rudiments are all in. Just not getting any reaction on that process today. Well, don't waste auditing. Don't waste auditing. Shift it over. See if you can assess another command here that does get a big heavy needle reaction, and run that one, and that would be your basic criteria. I'm not trying to give you anything complicated.

By the way, if you ran "Recall a Problem" during the whole of that session and the next session, it'd probably come back to doing its business all over again, you see. It's just what's faster.

As long as you're running Problems, run them any confounded way you want to, or in any fashion you want to; but there are certain rules that have to be followed if you're going to do a good job of auditing and one of those rules is you don't change a process which is producing marked change on the case. If your process is damped out and isn't producing very much change, why, shift it in its type or wording, making a big loud note in the middle of a – in caps on the middle of your Auditor's Report – that "this process was changed when not
flat” or something of that sort, see. At least let somebody in on the secret. That answer your question?

Male voice: *It does, thank you.*

All right.

I'd like to say something more about problems and types of processes that could be used on problems here, and here's a good time as any to say them. Here's an interesting point about problems and solutions.

I may have given you too much of an impression that it is impossible to run a solution. Now, no, that is not factual. You can run solutions. There are many ways of running solutions and getting away with it. But I'm talking about running something like this, preventing the person from examining the problem and always insisting that he run a solution. Yes, that is impossible. But you run solutions on cases all the time. SOP Goals. What is a goal? A goal is a solution to some problem. You've learned that already. You've seen that.

All right. Another comment I'd like to make here is it seems to be tentatively true – from observation of reports and from what Mary Sue says – that those people who are being run on Problems and being given Security Checks and being assessed on SOP Goals are getting rather rapid trouble-free assessments on SOP Goals. Does that confirm your understanding of it? And those people who aren't being run on any preparatory processes and Security Checks at the same time are making poor, long-term, scramble progress. Is that the way it looks like? Hm? Well, tentatively, we make the observation that a case runs faster in a Goals Assessment if run on Problems and Security Checks at the same time – at different periods of the day.

All right. Now, let me say some more about this solution thing. There is a whole problems process, a very old one – at least three years old, two – two, three years old. It's probably older than that. I'm always finding something new had a precursor, or some two or three years before that it's already occurs in the notebooks. And that is, you take the condition of the pc, off your own bat, you *assume* that it's a solution to a problem. Of course, you'll be right. But you *assume* that it's a solution to a problem. This is the way of doing this, you see.

And then you ask the person, "What problem could that be a solution to?" Now, this fellow's got a headache. Got a continuous headache. All right. So you say, "All right. Now, what problem would a continuous headache be a solution to?" Now, obviously, they're looking at a solution without examining the problem, right? Now, this brings us forward to a method of nulling goals which would be too insidious for words and it is not usable. I underscore that. *This is not usable.*

This could however be done: We've assessed this person for a cadet. This is the final terminal that emerged, and so on. We could say, without using the Prehav Scale, if we didn't have a copy of one or something – this is not recommended, see; this is not a doable action – "What problem would a cadet be a solution to?" That's the pc's terminal.

You're going to produce action. That's for sure! [laughter] That's for sure, because you're going to run him into every problem he's ever had for the last two hundred trillion, or
ever since he's adopted this particular terminal. You're going to run him into every one of them. So, clang! clang! clang! Expect action.

It is a thing that could be done which you might get away with. It is not a recommended thing to do. You got it?

All right. Now, I'm just giving you examples here of what you can do with this. You take the – the stable datum and you ask him, "What confusion was that a stable datum to?" you see. You're saying the same thing as, "All right, what problem would a continuous headache be a solution to?" See? You're asking – you've taken the stable datum, which is a headache and you've asked him for the problem. Because he never confronted that or he wouldn't have the headache, you see.

To get him to confront this, however – this is not always successful. This is successful enough to be very useful to you. This is a good way of getting rid of a chronic PTP or something like that. It's not always successful because you may have put him up above the level of his confront, like crazy.

Well, he can't even confront the headache, because he's complaining about it and yet you're asking him to step back into the further never-never land of unreality and confront the problem that that's a solution to. And on some cases, you're going to lay a complete ostrich egg on this, you see. Their confront just is not up to this. That is all. But it is a useful mechanism and is something to know about and it is usable. You can do this.

Now, you can take a goal. Here's something you can't do. You can take a goal and you'd say, "Tell me a problem that goal would be a solution to." We've assessed the fellow, and the pc "to be unencumbered." All right. This was the goal.

All right, and we say, "Well, what problem would being unencumbered be a solution to?" And of course, this is something like picking somebody up and throwing them into the tar pit and say, "Swim, you –." But the – these are heroic things, so heroic that they will exceed the level of the preclear's reality quite ordinarily and easily.

You could, however, take a present time problem and try to run this with it and you would very often succeed with great rapidity. It would be quite astonishing to you how often you would succeed in taking this difficulty the pc has and assuming, just whole hog – it's just assuming that it must be a solution to a problem and just telling the fellow to look at the problem and it would blow up with great rapidity.

You take some fellow who's worried about – well, let's take a very common one. Impotence. This is very common. And you say, "Well, what problem would impotence be a solution to?" You know, you keep talking about this.

Or the fellow keeps giving you this hidden standard, and this hidden standard apparently has absolutely nothing to do with his Goals Assessment. You know, the Goals Assessment is here and the hidden standard is over there in the corner, but he tries to find out if the Goals Assessment is working all the time to find out whether or not it turns off the burning in his right ear. We want to get rid of this hidden standard? This is a good way to do it. You see?
It has lighter usages than Goals Assessments, according to my experience, at least, this far. It has lighter usages. You can get rid of PTPs, of short or long duration this way. You can get rid of a chronic somatic or something of this sort rather easily.

And the auditing command that would go along with this is a very pat one. It's just: "What problem would a (whatever it is) be a solution to?" Quite useful. A useful gimmick. You'll get an awful lot of chronic somatics and things like that off your pc with no consequence. We're doing the oddity, you see, of solving problems without the consequences of problems and solutions, which is the greatest oddity in the world.

Scientology is full of these oddities. It's the oddity of getting away with it. We're doing the impossible, living in a universe that is tailor-made never to get out of, you see. Tailor-made. Tailor-made for you never to let anybody else out of it either. And we're in situations which are all tailor-made to stay in. And hitherto getting out of them has been attended by all the consequences of a jailbreak, you know. Complete with sirens and police dogs! [laughter] It's all booby-trapped.

You solve problems, solve problems, solve problems, you've had it, you see. That's booby-trapped down the line. All right. So all of a sudden we solve problems with no sirens. The front gates of the prison disappear, the prison disappears. We get out of the prison by dropping the prison, not by busting out through the front gates and making some ironmonger a lot of work.

And we've got a lot of these – a lot of these in the works, and we do this quite a bit. It's the only way it could be done, don't you see. You can't cure, as man has been doing it, without consequence because it's rigged the other way.

So here is a universe – well, I'll give you an example of the rigging of the universe. You know, ministers can marry, but they cannot divorce; and you look around you and you'll find everywhere in this universe there's mechanisms of that character. No prohibition about getting in; every prohibition about getting out. [laughter]

Take the, take the armed services. You walk up there. My golly! The recruiting sergeant is nice, man. [laughter] Next day they've fed you cold beans, and you say, "Well, the devil with this." You've run into a subaltern or something and you turn around and you go back to the same recruiting sergeant, and you say, "Give me my papers back", and by golly, he won't do it. [laughter]

And then you've got a universe that – and a civilization, and all of its customs are more or less tailor-made in this particular direction.

Well, we even do it ourselves to some slight degree. We have some Book Auditor out someplace, and he's just found out that music processing is the various thing that's in now. In North Fernando Valley or something, why, he has eight pcs sit down, and they all raise their shirts and contemplate their navels, and they play Bach. And he says, "If you've done this now for 289 hours, why, you will be Clear as near beer. And you're all set." you know? And he's just a Book Auditor. And we say, "Oh, well, for God's sakes", you know. And that's the limit of action.
But the guy is a professional auditor. Oh, hell, man, the sirens go, and the police cars start wheeling, see. "What the hell are you doing?" See? It's all on the basis of "You know better than that." This is always quite astonishing, you see.

Because the universe is so thoroughly rigged this way, why, it happens to be the only method by which you could ever make any progress out of it is to approximate some of the progresses in and that happens to be one of them.

If you're a professional auditor – if you're a professional auditor and you know better, well then, don't do it. And if you're a Book Auditor and you don't know any better, well, so what? You got the idea?

I mean, some professional auditor is expected to go over and say, you know, "If you – instead of having them raise their shirts, have them sit in chairs like this, facing each other and then run TR 0 on them for a while." [laughter]

But that, you see, is even present to that degree in the administrative lines of Scientology, much to my shame. But there's other mechanisms that are survivals of this sort of thing.

Apparantly all resistance is to prevent oneself from going any further down. The resistance is to go down. It's quite amazing the difficulty you have, actually, in worsening somebody's mental state. It's fantastic what you would have to do to worsen somebody's mental state. Really. And how anybody would achieve this, actually, it's to the utter shame of psychology and psychiatry that they're really not able to. They temporarily do it, one lifetime or something like this. I suppose if they gave the guy enough motivators, why maybe it would even run out some of his overts. You could look at it in some kind of a reverse mechanism. I think that's the mechanism on which they must operate.

But most of the resistance is to getting worse and you stop pressing against the resistance to getting worse or if you resolve the resistance toward getting worse, just that, the guy will get better which is one of the goofier things. You see? That's goofy.

You don't try to make the fellow well. You just stop him resisting getting worse. He has terrific resistance to getting any lower down than he is, and there's practically no resistance to getting any better, which make one look at an auditor who isn't getting results wondering what on earth he must be doing, you see, because it actually is a very easy one to reverse this because there's practically springs back of it. The fellow's mainly concentrated on keeping himself from getting any worse. That's how his mind is rigged.

He's preventing deterioration or something like this. And he could get it all – all sorts of complications where his prevention of deterioration looks like he's trying to deteriorate. And that's really true, too, but it's nevertheless rigged as a resistance toward degradation. And all an auditor has to – has to do is convince a pc that he is not trying to degrade him, is not trying to make him any worse, is actually not trying to cure him – because he might have resistance to being cured, too, because he knows how much worse you can get when you're cured. The cures for broken arms which they rebreak two or three times you know, can be quite heroic.

And all you'd have to do actually is to convince a pc that you weren't trying to push him further down on the thing and just had a heart-to-heart talk with him about whether you
were or weren't and all of a sudden, he'd get better. Because the fact that he's resisting getting worse is pinning him into getting worse. See, that what he – which he resists he becomes, see. There's a lot of goofy little mechanisms here that operate on the side of the auditor. You really have to get pretty wild to violate all of them and not get a case to improve at all. Okay?

I want you to remember that particular process though as a – as a good patch-up process. You're just sick and tired of hearing about this burning right ear. He knows he will get better because his ear will stop burning.

"Well, did you make any goals during this session?"

And a moment of comm lag ensues and then he says very brightly, "Well, no, not really."

And if you don't follow through immediately afterwards and say, "Well, what didn't happen?" You sometimes will miss the hidden standard. "Well, what didn't happen?"

"Well", the fellow says, "of course, my gall bladder isn't burning. When I get better, my gall bladder always burns, so I know I haven't gotten any better." We haven't run out that particular somatic. Ha, ha, ha. Here we've got it, see? We've got a hidden standard here.

There are ways and means of smoking these hidden standards into view. Of course, they're idiotic. You didn't have anything to do with a gall bladder. You weren't – you weren't even processing him on anything that would have helped his gall bladder, and yet his whole test of whether or not he met his goals in the session is whether or not his gall bladder had altered. Or got worse. Gall bladder didn't get worse, so he didn't improve. You got a fellow in an interesting condition of being in a games condition with his own gall bladder or something. See? You can! You can have a fellow in an interesting games condition with his stomach. You know, he's trying to get even with his stomach. Auditing isn't working – his stomach didn't get worse.

All kinds of crisscrosses here. The reactive mind – the reactive mind, of course, is not sensible, so you get all kinds of unsensible responses where it comes down home close. Okay?

All right. Any other questions? ...Oh, I'm glad the rest of you are caught up to it. I'm glad the rest of you are right up there on the ball. Yep. Yes?

Female voice: we were working on the third-of-a-dial drop for two days with a good squeeze and we noticed an improvement. That's a good thing When you have a sensitivity that's very easy and then a reading that's not easy, where – where you don't get drops, you're just sort of diagnosing on change of characteristic ...

Uh-huh.

Female voice: ... as the sensitivity is very free and – and practically hits the pin ...

Yeah ...

Female voice: ... the actual needle action on the ...

Is very slight.
Female voice: ... assessment is – is very stuck.

All right. Here it is, Bobby. You'll run into this rather constantly. Its – your needle – using a sensitivity knob for diagnosis, and your sensitivity knob has a low setting for a third-of-a-dial drop, and yet you're not getting much needle action. Well, that is why an E-Meter can never have its sensitivity knob adjusted to read low. There – a sensitivity knob can only be set as it is set on the Mark IV. That's about as good as you can do. Because if you start setting the sensitivity knob lower for less drops, then the drop that would be observed will drop out. Do you understand what I'm talking about? You will no longer be able to see any drop. You got it?

So the person that you're discussing is actually getting up into – well or in – they're a Release and haven't found it out yet and they're getting a tremendous drop on zero setting practically of the sensitivity knob – terrific action – and then when you try to assess something, why, horror of horrors, that needle doesn't move very much. Here's a very loose can-squeeze test and not much of a motion in the needle.

All right. Now, let's look over the characteristic of an E-Meter. An E-Meter is registering amount of charge or disagreement. Charge and disagreement could be said to be synonymous and to make charge more understandable, use the word disagreement. If you're getting a bad fall, you can always get your fastest cognition on the part of your pc by asking, "What are you in disagreement with?" This doesn't fit in well for most of your questions, and so on, but you could always bend it around so that you can use it.

This pc, "Do you have an ARC break? Do you have – do you have this or that or anything of the sort?" You finally say to this person, "Well, do you have a disagreement with anything?"

And all of a sudden you'll observe this fall that you have observed so fleetingly, because it is the fundamental reaction is caused by disagreement.

Now, as a person gets up toward Clear – they're getting closer and closer in this particular direction – of course, their wild disagreements, aberrational disagreements with existence, are much less so there's actually much less charge on the case. And the needle will only register to the degree of the charge remaining on the case. And so you have the oddity of the closer a person gets toward Clear, the looser is the needle and the less is the actual reaction on questions. And you will get to a point – . It's a good thing for you to bring up because it's a good diagnostic point.

You're eventually going to have to raise the sensitivity knob up for a person who gets toward Clear just as you had to for somebody who's way down at the bottom so that you could read the needle at all; and this becomes very difficult. The can squeeze test makes the needle go over, bang! And it hits one pin and comes back and hits the other pin. And it's crash! You see? And you say, "Well. All right. Now, do you have a present time problem?" The fellow looks like he has a present time problem or something like this, you know. To get a read, you have to actually increase that sensitivity knob, in spite of the wildness and violence of that can drop.
So your can-squeeze test ceases to be valid from Release on up. When you can no longer retard the sensitivity knob on a Mark IV British Meter to get a third-of-a-dial drop, from there on – this is something that is not in the text – you had better be suspicious that you are going to miss falls. And you'd better start advancing the sensitivity knob. Do you see that? It's – there's something to know there. Now, that's quite – quite amazing. You'd say, well – but you see all aberration is a mockery of Clear and you've got down into the lower scale mockeries of Clear. Of course, you'd have to keep a highly advanced sensitivity knob to get any reading at all. The case is actually below having charge on it.

Now, as the case gets better, you get a third-of-a-dial drop, which is somewhat the average case. Now you've got a pretty good charge, see. Your charge is quite heavy. And you get nice readings and everything is fine; and one day you're auditing the fellow and you say, "All right, now, squeeze the cans", and it goes over and hits the pin at the other side. And you retreat with that sensitivity knob reading. You say, "Give the cans a squeeze", and it goes over and hits the pin. And you've got the sensitivity knob down, and you just can't turn it down any further. And you say, "Well I ought to fix this meter." And I actually fell for this myself some time ago – ought to get these meters fixed, you understand, so that they can be turned down to a third-of-a-dial drop.

No, when that condition begins to exist, then you, to find charge, had better start advancing the sensitivity knob. And you'd better start advancing the sensitivity knob to magnify these little remaining disagreements that don't amount to a hill of beans. Well, the difference is that when the fellow originally, to get a third-of-a-dial drop, had to have his sensitivity knob well advanced, well, he was below disagreeing.

Now, he comes up to a point where he can disagree with things fundamentally, and you of course are getting terrific reads with the thing down here at the sensitivity knob reading at its lowest set. You get big reads and everything is fine. And then you process the fellow a little bit further along the line, you're going to see a change of characteristic here. At zero set, you're going to get more than a third-of-a-dial drop. Well, from that time on, you had better start advancing the sensitivity knob to get your reads. Not for the rudiments, but for Security Checks and goals. You can do it with Goals Assessments, too. Actually, rudiments and Goals Assessments are a cousin in the way they're read.

Security Check – you'd better start really revving that thing up because you're not going to find much on it. The fellow just isn't reacting. He isn't as reactive anymore, so the needle isn't reacting. But that is your fundamental test of whether or not the case is going Clear. And when you see this first start to occur – of your third-of-a-dial drop squeeze – that's – that's a gone dog as a test. That's no good as a test anymore. You got Release – that's good enough to just check out a Release right there.

And after you get up to a point where you just cannot retard it and it just hits pins and caroms back and forth and flies all over the place, and you have to – in order to get a read – have to advance it up to 3 or 4 on the sensitivity knob setting. You know, "You got a present time problem?" The fellow says, "No", nothing happens. So you advance it to 3 or 4. "Have you got a present time problem?" you know. Bang! You get a terrific read of about two divisions, you know. [laughter]
Now, the test – cross-test is that it blows that fast. Guy's got a present time problem, he tells you about it. Now, you can't find it again. Gone. See, the thing's blowing. When this condition completely disappears and advances to a point where you just can't – well, the can-squeeze test is just all over the place and 16, you can't get anything falling. You can't even do an assessment anymore, something like that. You'd better bring yourself up with a – with a sharp halt. You've probably been looking at a Clear for the last few hours and haven't noticed it. That is the gradient scale of Clear test. It's unmistakable when it happens to you. Unmistakable.

If a case is not changing in characteristic of can squeeze as it goes along, it isn't making any advance – and that would be checked out, by the way, by giving them continuous profile tests. It's not making any advance. The can squeeze test is not varying from one session to the next, see.

They still have to be here at sensitivity knob setting 2 to get a third-of-a-dial drop. Next session, sensitivity knob setting 2, to get a third-of-a-dial drop. Next session, sensitivity knob setting is on 2. You say, what's going on here? PTP, ARC break, withhold. There's a rudiment out, man. See, the rudiments are out.

The speed with which you can detect this, is sufficiently good that if your processing is advancing with all of your rudiments in – this is an important thing to know – if your processing is advancing with all rudiments squared away, see, rudiments all in, everything's all straight, you should be able actually to detect, from session to session, a difference in the can-squeeze test. Gives you some index of how far rudiments are probably out on most cases that are being processed.

Now, as the case goes to Release and from that point on, your mid-session break ought to find a difference. See, the difference between your – your first part of the session and your second part of the session when you start the session again, you ought to see a difference in the can squeeze test.

Minute, but detectable. And they should advance that rapidly.

You can tell, very quickly and very immediately, that a case is not advancing because this phenomenon that you've just brought up is not taking place; and if that phenomenon does not come into being on a case in some finite period of time and – you just can't set the sensitivity knob back, you see, far enough, you still get too much drop no matter what you do with the sensitivity knob; and then your detection of Security Check questions becomes very difficult because you're not getting much needle action.

Well, if that doesn't take place, you just better take a case practically apart, you know. What's wrong with these rudiments? What's the hidden standard? What's missing here? What's holding up the show? What are you doing out of session? You know? What's going on here? Got the idea? Just really chew into the ground on it. Your processing will advance as fast as that happens. Thank you for bringing it up. It's a point which happens to be missing. Okay? Does that answer your question?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Any other question? Yes.
Female voice: Would you tell me the commands on CCH 4?
What did you say now?

Female voice: Would you tell me the commands on CCH 4?

Commands on CCH 4. Oh, I don't think I have to tell you those. In the first place, your verbalization is not your process, and you may be getting much too precise. I'm not going to tell you those. I think they're in your bulletins and that sort of thing. No point in it. Okay?

Female voice: That's just the ...
Hm?

Female voice: ... that's just the book motion process.
That's just the book motion process.
Female voice: I couldn't find a bulletin that did have the commands in it, so ...
Male voice: Never was one. Never was a separate one ...

Never was one.

Female voice: Okay.

All right. Issue one, Suzie.

Female voice: All right.

All right. Okay, Virginia, it's actually – if you want to know the commands of any of the CCHs, get your minimum effective statements to get the motion done.

Female voice: Mm-mm.

That answers the question. Command verbalization is tremendously important in every other routine than the CCHs. That's why I'm not going to give you a set of auditing commands right here and nail them down in brass, because there have been, I think, a dozen versions.

Anything you want to say to the pc, more or less repetitively, which shows him that you're going to do this and you expect him to do it just like it right afterwards, and then that demonstrates that you are interested in knowing whether or not that he's satisfied that he did it, would be the commands of CCH 4. Got it?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Any other questions? Yes.

Female voice: In a longish sentence on Form 6 ...
In the ...

Female voice: In a long sentence on forms – Security check Form 6, a long sentence ...
Mm-hm.

Female voice: ... and check on sensitivity 16, and that needle wiggles while the sentence is still spoken – should it stand quite – quite null during the whole sentence?

Yes, ma'am.
Female voice: Yes.
Yes, ma'am. Quite null during the whole ...
Female voice: ... whole sentence.
... sentence. On a Security Check question or any question you're asking a pc on an E-
Meter, you have this liability. That there are sections of the question ...
Female voice: Yes.
... and each section may fall ...
Female voice: Yes.
... so if you've got a long section, you have no option but to clear every part of the
question.
Female voice: Yes. Thank you.

This is so poorly understood at large that it has actually let Scientology in for some
brickbats. Because you can ask almost anybody anything. You can ask a girl, "Are you a vir-
gin?" If she's a virgin, the needle falls, see. And, "Are you a virgin?" And the girl, "Oh." There's just charge on this word "virgin." Hasn't anything to do with whether she's a virgin or
not. It's "virgin" that's falling. It's not "Are you a virgin?"

And you can get led very far astray with this with an E-Meter if you don't take them
apart. So the basic rule is that you would ordinarily, to begin with, take that long question to
pieces, so eventually having taken it to pieces and gotten it all straightened out with the pc, you eventually would be able to read the whole question from beginning to end without any
reaction.
Female voice: Good. Thank you.

All right. Okay.
Female voice: On that particular thing, you wouldn't suddenly – you're reading it to
him for the first time, you wouldn't suddenly stop.
No, no, no, no, no...
Female voice: You'd read it to him.
... no, no, no. You just read it to him. Don't even look at your E-Meter. Find out what
they said. And they said, "No." All right. Read it to them again, looking at your E-Meter. And
they say, "No." So you read it by sections to them again looking at your E-Meter, questioning
each section. And get all sections clear. It's sort of like clearing the auditing command. And
then read the whole thing again now that you've got all sections clear and you get a fall and
they say, "No." I guess your work's cut out along about that time. Okay. Any other questions?
...

All right. You seem to be well genned in today. Well genned in. As a matter of fact,
you're changing... I'll pull a California gag on you – your auras are changing color. [laughter]
It's only stated in two places in the world: in Chelsea and Los Angeles.
Anyway, we've stepped up the velocity. Have you noticed this? Oh, you've noticed this? [laughter] And there's something goes along with this which I had better remark to you about since I haven't put a bulletin out on it.

It's expected that at the end of thirty days you will have completed your checksheet. I just thought in view of the fact that you were still taking it easy I had better add that. At the end of thirty days, you should have completed your checksheet. That's pretty grim, isn't it?

_Female voice:_ Yes.

Mmmm. But I will say this. We won't instantly and immediately hire skywriters in your home town to fly overhead and paint a sign in the sky that you have not gotten a course completion at Saint Hill. That is, within thirty days we won't do that. [laughter]

Yes?

_Male voice:_ Ron, I came up against something recently on CCH 4 which might be useful. I found that auditors were using sort of – sort of a standard command on "I want you to make a – I'm going to make a motion with this book, and I want you to copy it mirror-image wise." And then they were using this check question, 'Are you satisfied with that duplication", or something of that nature after every command.

_Hm._

_Male voice:_ And I found that this was causing an invalidation on the preclear when the auditor wasn't satisfied with it and then went on with the same command.

_Oh, yes. It will. It will. You have to be very smooth._

_Male voice:_ So I told them they should only use that satisfied check question when they themselves as auditor were satisfied and were prepared to leave it.

Well, this – this can cause quite a bit of randomness. The original reason "Are you satisfied – ?" was used has to be researched. And that was because invalidation was occurring – here you've got – er, occurring. Here you've got the cure-problem phenomenon, you see. And the cure is now causing difficulty. But the tendency of the auditor to critically do the command again caused tremendous ARC breaks and would actually cause the process to be totally inoperative. So, "Are you satisfied with the auditing command – that you did that?" rather, was introduced in order to cure this particular situation.

Now, it is not necessary for the auditor to duplicate the exact command they just did. It is not necessary that they do this. After all, they're not trying to duplicate, duplicate, duplicate because it's not particularly duplicative. It's duplicative enough that the auditor does it and then the pc does it. So what they do is they find the pc is very weak on a circular motion. So they just go on making varieties of circular motions. And they just put him over the jumps on circular motions. But they're not always the same circular motion, don't you see, and this prevents the thing. Now, that's another cure, and that undoubtedly will produce its own problem in the future. Your point's well taken, Vic. Right.

Okay. Any other questions?
Have you been doing anything in your processing lately that you didn't think you really ought to be doing but were only doing it because you had been told? Come on, let's see if anybody's brave enough to say anything to this. Yes, Virginia.

Female voice: Well, for a while, when I was doing the one about – I can't even remember the command, but anyway it was a five or six-way bracket on –. Well, my goodness, I sure did lose it. [laughter] I didn't like doing it because it was – oh, 'where you wouldn't, or somebody wouldn't do it", and "you shouldn't do it" or something like that. Well – oh Confront! That's the one it was. [laughter]

Female voice: Well, I – I could think of the – that they might not do it or when I could see that they wouldn't do it, well, I wouldn't be so sure about that because if I could say, "Well, you wouldn't polish my shoes. But, if I ask you to do it and you were confronted with the problem, you might at least confront it."

Well, you were running a command that you hadn't any agreement with as an auditor. You thought the command could have been ...

Female voice: I was the preclear.

You were the preclear

Female voice: Yes. I didn't like it. Well, I just kept on doing it because I was the preclear, and that's what we had been told by ...

Yeah. All right.

Female voice: ... but I didn't like it at all.

All right.

Female voice: Because I kept running up against that same sort of thing. Well, practically everybody I know when asked ... If I asked them specifically, or they knew about it, I think that they would be willing to confront it. They probably wouldn't be willing to do something about it, but they'd be willing to take a look. Be interested.

All right. Did you clear it with your auditor?

Female voice: Well, I told her about it, and now I'm not running that process anymore, so...

All right. Okay. Okay. All right.

Now, is – anything you've been auditing that you felt you were – shouldn't really have been auditing. Anything you've been auditing you felt you shouldn't have been auditing. Why, it'd take a brave auditor to answer that question. You look back on most of the processes you're auditing are laid down by me very specifically.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: I have one question, Ron. In answer to your last question about doing something you didn't particularly want to do. I felt that, giving withholds up on a Security Check as an auditor, writing each withhold down was irrelevant. I thought the nature of the withhold was irrelevant and it took up time.
Mm-hm.

Male voice: *I feel that also it rather tends to cut down in two-way comm with the pc.*

How would it do that? Because he feels that his withhold will be further exposed or something like that?

Male voice: *No. I think it rather – it sort of takes time writing the thing down ...*

I see. All right.

Now, let me – let me clarify this. Let me clarify this. Your point's very well taken there. And it's never intended that everybody should write down every withhold that the pc ran across because you would run into the – you'd run into the British Museum Library [laughter] every time. But something that was very difficult to clear – something that literally took you an hour or more to clear or something of this odd nature. It took you a half an hour to finally get down to it – what was it? Now, that appearing on a Security Check as what the nature of withhold would be – that would be this rough to try to clear – would be of value, only to me on research.

And eventually I'd be able to go over a tremendous pack of written Security Checks, don't you see and be able to establish the type of withhold which was most closely pressed to the bosom, and perhaps adjudicate something out of this that would get us along a little bit further. So your resistance toward that is quite proper because writing down every line of the pc – every withhold he had, writing it down on a Security Check – that would be a poor show. But those that are very resistive would be of great interest to me. Not as a character index on the person but just as a general run.

"The human race most closely withholds the following: ..." And then you just make some great long column of the types of withholds. You get the common denominators in these withholds, you'd probably find a hidden button that we didn't know much about before. Okay? That's the only – only thing I want, and if you'd write that sort of thing down. You really had to struggle for this one, you know. You got in there and you ask him, "Well, have you ever raped a cat?" you know, or whatever the security question is, and you go on and on and on and on and on; and you just cannot get any clearance on the thing at all, and then you find out that it's something – some odd shading of the command or something like this, or of the question, that was really holding it up. Well, for heaven's sake, write it down.

Female voice: Oh, he's complaining about that because I asked them to write it down. And the reason I do is because we have different auditors giving Sec Checks from the different auditors who were processing them and the auditor wants to know whether hisPreclear's case is improving, whether apart from running, more withholds are coming off.

Well, you mark the fact that you've got ...

Female voice: They also want to check to see if his withholds – if the Preclear's withholding anything from him, the auditor, that he's told another – the Sec Check auditor, but hasn't told the auditor. You see what I mean? His real auditor. So, I mean for all purposes of this course is that I think they should jot down – they don't have to write down every word the
preclear said, but they can at least note it, you know, "stole apple", they just write down "apple", you know.

Hm-mm.

Female voice: so ...

All right. I've given you my requirements – what I'd like to see on a Security Check. That applies very broadly whether you're doing them in Northumbria or any other unlikely place, and so on. Now, Mary Sue, to facilitate running the course – which would probably then apply to facilitate running an HGC – wants a shorthanded notation of the withhold that was there and was given up, like "stole apple" and she puts down "apple" and somebody then checking back across this thing – he's looking through this on rudiments or that sort of thing, he finds out that he's got a whole chain of withholds that doesn't – that hasn't been given up to Security Check or something of that sort. Don't you see? Nobody expects you to make any stenographic heroics or become very heroic stenographically along this line. Okay? Does that answer it, Robin?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: In the bulletin instruction about sending all Sec Checks – forwarding them in to you ...

This applies ...

Male voice: Does this apply to all auditors?

No, this applies – this applies to Sec Checks on Scientologists, and is an old regulation and has been thrown pretty much adrift whether or not Sec checks when completed should be sent in to me. This has gone adrift. That was the old security program of getting up a policy of Scientology and clean hands, don't you see.

Male voice: Yes.

And this was actually a preventer. It wasn't that I wanted to know these things. It was that there was some feeling about, when this was first begun, that such data might be used for blackmail or something like this. And of course, if the actual Security Check is sent through and it's already resident in a safe someplace in the world, it's – couldn't so operate, ever. You got the idea?

Male voice: Yeah.

So that was its basic thing. Now, there is another check, purely organizational in character which is just now being worked up. We got the Joburg, and the Joburg passed immediately over into processing. Now, it had left a need for an actual Security Check which some HCO Area Sec or a D of T or somebody like that could give rapidly, or the Assoc Sec Sec could give for employment or for a course admission that didn't take seventeen hours of auditing or something like that to deliver. And it must be at the absolute outside, about thirty questions. That would be the absolute limit that the thing could possibly tolerate. You see? Preferably less.
All right, so let us say that a person has been accepted for employment in a Central Organization, then I would expect to see their employment check sent on through with the record and fact that they had been employed. You got the idea?

Male voice: Yes.

Now, that would also then keep Central Organizations from bypassing this particular step because you would notice that there was a lot of personnel there that you had no employment application form for of any kind and that would mean the security had dropped in some particular area; and if you want trouble in an area, drop its security, I can guarantee you'll get trouble in the area.

All right. Now, if a field auditor wished to do this, and the field auditor were giving this Short Form Security Check to people that were operating in some area or something like that, and they wanted to send it in to me, why, they should do so. It isn't a required proposition, however.

A Clean Hands Check has now become so difficult to do, because the Security Check so rapidly changes its character under processing and so many security factors emerge which were totally unreal before, that a Clean Hands Certificate or seal on a certificate is now only going to be issued as a result of being audited on these routines which have repetitive Security Checks mixed up in them.

Now, therefore, it – you could not do what was originally intended which is you simply drop in on an HCO and get a Security Check and they give you a Clean Hands stamp, and that's that. That's not possible. But you could forward the evidence of having been audited all the way up the line on a routine, you see, with consequent Security Check, with copies of the Security Checks either in an HGC or in the field. Hand those over to HCO and a Clean Hands seal could be then administered. But it would now be as a result of auditing – auditing on the routines. It would not be as a result of simply a Security Check in an HCO.

Male voice: How much auditing on the routine?

How much?

Male voice: Yes, Sir.

Well, I don't see that there's much reason to drop below the level of Release.

Male voice: Thank you.

I'd say auditing to Release and that's about the only thing that'd make it safe and secure. Washington's all excited right now. They're going around in small circles and being very proud and that sort of thing. They just committed an administrative blunder. They left the D of P on a pc and that mustn't happen. Ds of Ps, even acting Ds of Ps must not be given a pc, you see.

That's an old piece of policy because it skimps, then, auditing on all the rest of the pcs in the place. But they've got somebody going through to Clear. And this fellow was appointed acting D of P who was auditing somebody, and this person is just – just flicking the edges of Clear, see. And Washington went into a panic because all of a sudden the Assoc Sec was transferred over on to a course, temporarily, and the D of P was transferred over on to a
course and somebody in – just as he went off post thought, "Well, this is a good auditor. He's had lots of good results, and so forth. We'll just make him acting D of P.", without finding out how many weeks he had left on a pc or what state the pc was in.

Everybody takes a look at this and finds the pc busy – almost Clear, you see, and going to Clear. And it just caused a fantastic amount of randomness, let me tell you. Because it was in effect, because of this erroneous appointment – in effect, they had almost been told not to clear somebody. Got the idea? And boy, that put everybody in a sweat. That certainly couldn't work that way, but this is the first Clear of recent times they've made in the HGC. So that this activity was being stepped in the road of, of course had rockets going up in all directions, you know – white lights, burning tar barrels, and flags flown upside down. Don't do this to us, you know! Of course, the fellow who did it to them is probably safely over on course now. [laughter] Very interesting.

Australia and Washington are starting to boom and they are going at great guns. Their Academies are getting fuller and fuller, and their HGCs are fuller and fuller. London right now is getting in a desperate state. Some of its leading lights are here, and all of a sudden had – didn't have to, but did bust policy and take List One and Two, which is the Staff Staff Auditors, off staff and put them on outside pcs. Oh, oh. But when it had been found out that this had happened, it was already a day or so's auditing deep into the outside pcs, you see. All that means is, is that the Acting D of P denied sources for Staff Auditors, and so forth. Just was straight up against the wall, see. In view of the fact the temporary D of P London is down here right this minute, why of course this is all up in the air with a screaming Chunk.

There's two things that happen: you just mustn't have the Director of Processing auditing a pc and running all the pcs, too. That just doesn't work. You get no results anywhere.

And the other thing that mustn't happen these days is the staff mustn't lose its list auditors. It just mustn't. Because I think staffs of, say, all of Central Organizations and the HCOs have a right to be Clear. And they're all getting real on it, you know. They've gone along for years without having very much reality on clearing.

And we've been wading into them with seven-league boots as far as – as doing it right and squaring it up. And their willingness is terrifically high, and they've been getting up to a high level of duplication, and so on. And all of a sudden their results are coming up, coming up, getting better and better. And they're moving up, and they're moving people easily now up into brackets of Release. And they're looking right ahead. And suddenly Clear is getting real to an awful lot of people in Scientology it was never real to before. I never thought it would take me eleven years.

But, give you an idea right now. The only reasons why clearing is not being done are scandalously huge. They are never minor errors. They're errors of such magnitude they would just stagger you, you know. Tremendous errors. The two people in Joburg who were hanging up on whom rout – I posted the notice on your board in here. Did you read it? The two people there in Joburg who were hanging up, and cables were flying back and forth – Routine 1 was not working on these people. All of a sudden they – the Course Instructor waded in with all flags flying, and grabbed ahold of the pcs and put them on a meter. And they had screaming present time problems of long duration that should have been caught in the Security Check
Model Sessions – every session – but had never had any attention paid to them. And she found the present time problems on these two people and they instantly broke into tears, both of them, you know. Just cracked right up, and so on. Boom!

And all of a sudden Routine 1 started to work like mad. That is what is called an error of magnitude: is running somebody with the rudiments out; and these things certainly must have been showing up on some rudiments.

No, it takes an error of magnitude, something like the auditor didn't come to the session for three weeks, and the fellow didn't get Clear, you know.

And this should start to be getting real to you. You've noticed when you came here you were probably pulling a lot of wild blunders of one character or another. Okay?

And you've noticed these things smoothing out? Right? All right.

And you've noticed that there was something to smooth out, didn't you? Understatement of today. [laughter]

Your next lecture is Friday afternoon. Okay?

Thank you.
CHECKING RUDS AND WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 14 July 1961

Thank you.

Okay, what is this? This is the…

Audience: 14th.

…14th of July, AD 11. Okay. I can at least remember the year. All right. It's a very difficult subject that I have to touch on. Very, very difficult subject: is you're dragging your heels. You've been out-passed. You've been out-passed. They just made three Clears in South Africa, on the course there. Clearing goes by contagion. It's contagious. You make a Clear, now look what happens. Went down to South Africa and on course made a Clear, see?

All right, a big reality was established right at that point. Promptly and immediately Peter Williams goes back over to Australia and makes two Clears. See? Boom. This Clear, now teaching a course down in South Africa, has cleared some fantastic percentage like – I don't know what it is – three out of four, three out of seven, or something like this, that was on this unit.

Interesting, isn't it? Who's going to be the first Clear here tomorrow? Tomorrow. All right. Let's get on the ball. You've got to create a new reality and set a good example and stop setting this aberrated example to people. Now, let's set a good example to people.

Now, you're doing all right. What we've been doing – I'll tell you what the difference was, what the difference is. All these Clears have been made very close to assessment only. You understand? It's practically nothing but Routine 3 that is clearing them. Got it? But let me point out something very drastic here. A very small percentage is making it on Routine 3. Yeah, it's making it, but a small percentage is making it. Now why?

Rudiments are so far out on the vast majority of people that putting in the rudiments becomes a fantastically arduous proposition – not necessarily difficult. But a whole activity has to be devoted to this thing called rudiments. Hence you have the first part of a session – if you've ever cared to notice – is getting the pc under control. You at least have to get him to sit down in a chair before you can establish rudiments, you understand? Routine 1.

All right. Now, out and above that comes Routine 1A. That takes care of the alter-is characteristics of the pc and takes care of present time problems as a bugaboo from there on,
because the only people she didn't clear were people who had screaming present time problems that nobody'd located. See that? It's a common denominator.

All right. So our next part of the program, of course, is to get these present time problems swept right straight off the slate – just set this up and set up this wide percentage, you see? And get all of these withholds that are slowing it down to a walk, off. Hence your Routine 1 and your Routine 1A. These are preparatory.

We're not looking for an occasional Clear; we are looking for very broad clearing, you understand? Any time, for years, I could have made a Clear. Well, I did and have done it. So what? See? Where has this gone? Well, I could probably sit down and do nothing but audit twenty-eight hours a day and I could probably turn out a few dozen Clears in my lifetime, and that would be dandy. And then I go out and get mixed up in an altercation called life, or something like that, or the body decays, or something like that and nobody else makes any Clears. And then you've got Buddhism. That's pretty good. That would be nice. That's just what this planet needs – just exactly what it needs. Just needs a bunch of brass idols. That's just what it needs. Because that's all anybody has ever understood out of Buddhism.

All right. So that obviously has been tried. And I wouldn't advocate that particular route. It has already been tried. And it's actually strewn with the whitened bones of busted psyches. That whole route looks like a chart of Death Valley.

There are so many routes been tried – so many routes – that one of the most difficult things is not getting curious when you cross some of their old ruts. And you know, you say, "Oh, isn't it interesting. Look at the Oregon pioneers and they went up that way. Well, all right. Let's walk through that woods. That was very interesting. And look at that water hole all surrounded by bones and busted wagon wheels and let's go a little bit further, maybe somebody found something out there. And there's a range of mountains over there. Yeah, well, maybe somebody can cross that." And the next thing you know, why, somebody's sitting and there is no way out, see? They can't even find the trail back, man!

So frankly, the piloting of Dianetics and Scientology is not so much through a wilderness or an untrodden desert waste, you see, that nobody has ever been in; the trouble with plotting Dianetics and Scientology is, it is nothing but solid trails. Something on the idea of tracking five hundred horses which have gone in all directions, you know, and you're trying to find – you're trying to find a new trail in the middle of all these horse marks. And that's all they are, too, horse marks.

Okay. Now, as we go forward here, we find that it'd be very easy to trip up and to take some old cockeyed route that has never led anywhere and never will.

And this is pretty darn good that somebody else is clearing. This is pretty darn good. And we're clearing close-up and then they're clearing at a distance. And now they're clearing at a bit of a remote distance in time. This looks very promising, see? Looks very good.

But the only flaw in all this is broad clearing. You want to be able to take Joe Aloysius Q. Doakes – that was not his father's name but we'll let it pass – and by getting – without getting fancy and without having to become screamingly brilliant in all directions as an auditor
and without having to sit up half of the night figuring out the star-plot of George Q. Aloysius Doakes, why, clear him.

All right. Now, we're on to that right now. We're on to that right now with Routine 1, Routine 1A. And I have not said very much about Routine 2. There's only one addition that has Routine 2. This has been hanging fire for some time.

I better give you the changes which have taken place in the Prehav Scale. Change number one is drop "No Motion." Drop the line "No Motion." Just leave it blank, leave the number blank. Now salt through the lot – beginning up around one and so forth, salt through the lot of it – which way they go and where they belong isn't very important – every basic emotion you have ever seen on a Tone Scale, as part of your routine and ordinary assessment. You know, "serene", and all the rest of it on that line. In other words, put all those emotions into the Prehav Scale. There is several ways you could do it. You could put them all in their proper place on the scale (well, leave that up to me, I'll do that, sooner or later), or you could just take those emotions and just read them off every time, after you've read the Prehav Scale. See, there's not – I don't think there's thirty of them. There are a very few number.

Now, people that get stuck in a chronic tone – and you can get rid of that chronic tone. You can get rid of it. It's a good thing to do. And you'll find your pc will fall on that chronic tone. You just run it Routine 2, see? Or if it falls while you're running Routine 3, why, you run it on the terminal. You know, "Would a god be angry?" You know? "How would a god make you angry?" Thank you. How would a god make you angry? Thank you. How would a god – how would another make a god angry? Thank you. Or -- no, "How would a god make another angry?" Thank you. How – would another make a god angry? Thank you. How would a god make a god angry?" Or "How would a god make himself angry?" That would be your bracket, you see, if you ran across this Tone Scale.

Now, it would follow and fall right along with the Prehav Scale, you understand? It follows the same characteristic; it has no special activity, read, diagnosis, anything; it's just – it's more levels of the scale. And you assess it by elimination, and so forth, and you just go over those things, too, every time. Those things have been with us since the earliest days of Dianetics, and there is no sense in neglecting them now that we got it on the run. All right.

Now, we're looking for very broad clearing – very, very broad clearing. And we want to take somebody that's lying unconscious up in the hospital, non compos mentis, and haven't known anybody for eighteen years, and run them through to Clear. Get the idea? I mean that – that is the reductio ad absurdum on the thing.

I wouldn't say, and I am not on the track of, some things that would work this way: You find a thetan after he's just dropped a body and you audit him through to Clear. See, now, we haven't got any summated data that leads on that track – that's not an examined road. One of the requisites of Clear right now is the odd limitation that the thetan must be in a body. So that's as far south as we happen to be going at the present moment, see?

In the first place, you'd have to be something on the order of OT before you could pick up this character and audit him. See, so that requires a different skill and a different lineup and a different location of the pc and a different version of CCHs, and the lot, you see? "Give me that – give me that beam. Thank you!" [laughter]
But there is about where we are.

Now, we are doing this, and with your Sec Checks you're taking care of withholds, and with your various problem factors you're taking care of problems, and those are the primary hang-ups. I am perfectly prepared, as I have said before, to suddenly find out that ARC breaks might constitute some specialized activity. They basically, however, fall under O/W, do you see? And they are junior to withholds by considerable.

But you still might find some pc who did nothing but ARC break, and if he did nothing but ARC break, I imagine the oldest remedy we have on that is "Recall an ARC break." And that's quite a slippery one, man. That's quite a process. Any process ever calculated to turn on track and tie double carrick bends in the preclear that was it! "Recall an ARC break." They all do. Because, you see, they run themselves backwards on it all the time, you know? They call it motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator: George did this to me, and Bill did that to me, and Mamma did that to me, and somebody else did that to me, did that to me, did that to me, did ... that ... to ... me umm, boomm, boomm... They go down scale in a hurry.

But if you kept on pushing it, they eventually come up and find out they did something, too. It's a workable process, the process is perfectly workable. I would say offhand, if I were auditing somebody who was consistently and continually ARC breaking and I just couldn't get them into session because they were ARC breaking and all that kind of thing, I'm afraid I would be more inclined to "Recall an ARC break" than I would be to go out on the CCHs. Person is perfectly capable of running a communication process, you know, of one kind or another. So we say communication process, "Recall an ARC break." He will do that. He is ARC breaking. You are paralleling what the mind is doing, and I'd say it was perfectly legitimate as an activity, if you ran into this factor of somebody did nothing but ARC break.

And then you've pretty well covered the rudiments, because you've got "Find – " the Have process, you see, and that gives them the room. And you've got lots of rudiments processes, which are the best ones, to find the auditor. The best way to find an auditor is, of course, the CCHs, and the processes which already exist on Model Session. The old "Look at me. Who am I?" is kind of a weird, lethal killer.

When columns A, B, C, D consistently and continually register as low on repetitive examination of profile – that is profile, every intensive, and you find A, B, C, D, that area in there, low – you can make an adjudication out of that. The pc has not found the auditor.

Now, there are two causes for this. The auditor is incapable of making an impingement on the pc, see? The auditor thinks he'd better audit, sort of in the back of his head, you know… And nobody ever quite finds out whether he's auditing or not. That could happen, you understand? That could happen. Or, the commoner cause of the pc just cannot register an effect – cannot stand or tolerate an effect of any kind, cannot stand or tolerate control of any kind. And on a pc whose profile continues consistently and forever low on A, B, C, D, and you are trying to run problems or you're trying to run some other remedy on this pc – formulas, problems, something, just anything to get him off the bottom there – you're wasting time. You're just wasting time.

Now, let's say we audited somebody just fine on problems for twenty-five hours, and when we examine their profile the following Monday for their next twenty-five hours, we find
out he didn't get off the register on A, B, C and D. See, they're all low, and they didn't move, and nothing happened. Well, don't come on down on the auditor with a thud, and so on. That's an entirely different activity, training auditors, and setting them right, and so on. The auditor probably was not effective in some fashion, or he didn't get the PTP, or he didn't get the withhold or he didn't get something.

But there's a very easy way to short-circuit this. You already must credit the fact that the auditor was undoubtedly trying to do something for those first twenty-five hours, you see? He was trying to do something, and you could go in and check it over and you'd find the PTP. You would, you'd find a PTP if you looked for it hard enough, and so forth. The easier thing to do, however, is just say "1A. Run 1A." That's a good, broad remedy for an HGC – a D of P, Assoc Sec, HCO Sec sort of remedy.

They just see this character is hanging up, and then without going and inquiring and running a congressional investiga –. Oh, well I'd hardly say we'd ever run a congressional investigation. We're not trying for publicity. That's all a congressional investigation does. You should hear those guys, by the way. "Let's see, how can I get some publicity so I can be re-elected? Well, I think I'll investigate Scientology. Yes, that's it. That's a good idea." You'll hear that someday. But remember that if you ever do hear it, to immediately convene an investigation of Congress! But the upshot of a hung profile at levels A, B, C, D – those levels are down there about minus seventy or more – your standard remedy is Routine 1A.

All right. Now, if Routine 1A does not budge this in twenty-five hours… I'm getting – talking about awful difficult cases here. I'm giving you a good way out, see? You tried Routine 1A the first week, and the case didn't move. Let me – let me review this. Just scrub what I said.

Routine 1A didn't move the pc, see? When we assume, then, that while doing the Security Check and everything else, certainly there was every opportunity to find withholds, there was every opportunity to get the case started, and instead of just being critical and coming down on the auditor and batting our brains out and that sort of thing, shift them over to Routine 1, got it? Run Routine 1 for twenty-five hours.

Now, quite amazingly, it will now be possible for you to check over the case if it still didn't move much. You see, but that would be at the beginning oaf the third twenty-five hours. Now, what do you do at the beginning of the third twenty-five hours? This case didn't move for two consecutive intensives at columns A, B, C, D of the graph. What do you do? Well, certainly don't let it go any further than the beginning of the third twenty-five hours before you act, but don't much bother to act until then. That would be the rule you should follow when you're monitoring cases audited by other people.

You should saw in now with your E-Meter and get clever, with the sensivity up to 32. Funny thing about it is, at twenty-five hours of problems, if they wouldn't show on the profile, has still done something. And twenty-five hours of the CCHs, although it didn't show on the profiles, have still done something. But all they have done is arm the firing mechanism. This is why it's really fruitless for you to have tried anything before this time, or have scolded auditors or jumped up and down, because all they've done is arm the firing mechanism.
Now, you're going to ask this case, you're going to talk to this case, you're going to talk to this person personally on a girl-to-girl basis or a man-to-man basis or a man-to-girl basis or versawise. And you're going to say, "Now, put all your hairpins on the table, because here we go." And just check those rudiments until they just about fry the atmosphere, see?

"Are you withholding anything from the auditor?" We've got the sensitivity all the way up; we can hardly read it, you see, because the thing is – the needle is so drifty. Sensitivity all the way up. And we say, "All right, are you withholding anything from your auditor?" See? And you don't get a reaction.

"Have you thought of withholding anything from your auditor" "Have you ever discussed it with yourself whether or not you should tell your auditor this?" "Have you ever decided that it was no good to have told your auditor this?" "Have you ever decided that it wouldn't do your case any benefit," really, because 'a little thing like that' – which you haven't mentioned, and you don't know – 'a little thing like that, certainly, wouldn't hold up a case.' Have you ever thought that?" You get the idea? It's awfully, awfully, right-down-to-rock drilling, see?

And on questions of this character, which are all cross-leading and which are rather unsettling, you know what the person has done. Sometime during that period of time they have undoubtedly come up and said, "Well, I probably ought to confess to the fact that I did rob my piggy bank when I was three", you know? And have said, "Well, that couldn't possibly have suppressed my case." And so they have not-is-ed it. And for a moment, it was on registry, but immediately afterwards wasn't. Well, you've got to kick it back on a nonregistry – off of nonregistry and back onto registry.

The way you do this is run a not-is type of questioning. On all of your rudiments. Now, what do I mean by a not-is type of questioning? Well, I just gave you an example. "Have you ever thought that it really wouldn't hold up your case any if you didn't tell your auditor something? There it is. What was that?" And of course you're sitting right on it. What have you done? You've done the not-is, see? You've picked up these moments of not-is. Because you're going on the assumption that this case has been thinking about something, or this case has been stewing about something, or this case is reacting about something during that whole fifty hours of auditing, have you got it? The ease must have sooner or later come through something, and factually it'd be impossible if the case hasn't.

But remember that a case that hangs fire has this wrong with it: It has an automatic not-is. And when you've got an automatic not-is, it can wipe out the needle read. Thing comes up to reality, the person pushes it back. See? Not-is. For a split instant, when it came up to reality, it registered, and then the person said, "It doesn't exist." See, and the not-is machinery took over and said "Nu-unh." And it went right back out of sight again and didn't register on the needle after that.

In other words, there's just a fringe level. Now, this is a case that could go out and murder half a dozen babies and have an opportunity to shoot a policeman and didn't. This is a case that could have all sorts of oddball things in its background and tell them to you in just a steady stream on a Security Check without your ever getting a reaction. Got the idea? You just never get a reaction on the Security Check.
You say, "Why on earth isn't this reacting on the needle?" Well, it isn't reacting on the needle because it isn't real to him, he doesn't think it's bad, and he is actually running on about the second inversion of the not-is. See, he knows about it but it's all not-ised. You won't get any registry. You won't get any case advance either. Those cases are hang-fire cases.

So you get very expert in taking them apart. Don't, however, get into a state of outrage when you do this with the auditor who has done the auditing, or even with yourself if you've done the auditing, for that first fifty hours. Don't get in a state of outrage and say, "Well, he missed it! And I had to dig it up!" That is not a correct statement. "I had to dig it up" is a correct statement, but "he missed it" is incorrect, because it normally wasn't there. In the first place, he was busy running "Give me that hand" when it came up. He didn't even have the person on an E-Meter. It registered for a moment; it got awfully real for a moment. And the person said, "Oh, my God, I – uhhzzzzzzz" – not-is. [laughter] Out she went, you know?

Now, your line of questioning can actually dig it up out of the auditing. You're not trying to dig it up out of his life, you're trying to dig it up out of his auditing. The lock at the most is – even if they're being run fragmentarily, is only a few weeks old. Dig it up out of their auditing. And you talk about auditing all the time you're checking this person over who has had no gain for two consecutive intensives, see? Just dig it up out of his auditing. You'll find it's there. You'll find it's there. You'll find an amazing number of things that come up during the auditing they just had not mentioned to the auditor. You get the type of questioning this would amount to, you see? The type of questioning would be a very simple type of questioning which is about him and the auditor – him and his auditing.

"Now, at any time during your auditing have you felt that it was improper to audit in that particular auditing room?" All right, now you've put it on a via, so therefore it's safe. See, the question is on a wide via. If you say to him, "Is it all right if I Security Check you in this room?" or "If I run these rudiments, or do a scout of rudiments on you in this room?" that's not real. Unreality is the common denominator of this case that doesn't make the advance, you see? That's unreal.

But asking him about being audited in another room that you are not now in – that's safe. See, that could be real. And all of a sudden comes up with this remarkable series of complaints. "Well, I just never mentioned it to the auditor, but there's a lavender picture on the wall, and I've always detested lavender ever since I broke a bottle of it over my grandmother's head, do you see? And I've always detested it, and..." They don't remark the idea that the smell of lavender and the picture – color lavender have nothing in common except some letters in the English alphabet. You pick things up that way – pick them up on a via.

That isn't the only trick in doing a research of this character on rudiments – that isn't the only trick. But it is a very good trick. You should ask any way you possibly can, "Is there any time in your life you ever felt that you were completely beyond help? Ah, what was that?"

"Oh, well, that was when I was eighteen, and, uh – goodness, I'd forgotten all about this, but this was when I was eighteen, and such-and-so happened, and I didn't dare tell my parents and uh..." Uh-huh-huh-huh-huh.

"Well, have you told your auditor?"
"Oh, well, no. You see that was a long time ago and that was when I was eighteen, see?"

You get the tricky way of going about this? In other words, you release the not-ises. "Have you ever felt that you were beyond help?" Well, obviously the guy had just done something and the person must have been withholding something even if it was just his body during such a period, don't you see?

So you can indulge in a tremendous amount of very tricky questioning. I could probably write down a series of thirty or forty rules or types of questions – they'd probably be very handy to have – but I haven't developed them. You usually look at the pc and you size him up and you find out about which way this thing is going. And you count on the fact, then, that during a period of CCHs, during 1A, something has come to the surface and has possibly disappeared. And it isn't registering now but it came to the surface during auditing and anything that happened during auditing, you can make it reregister on an E-Meter. So you get the registry of the registry. See, it's too direct to get a registry for this pc, but you can get a registry of a registry – get a via. You get how you might go about this type of questioning?

Well, you should study to get clever about this. You should study how to get clever about it. It's just cleverness, that's all. You sit there and the person says, "Now, have you failed to tell your auditor anything" and you don't even get a disturbed needle. It just sits there, calm. "No, no. I've told my auditor everything." Well, technically in a childlike way, this is true. But the reverse question is quite interesting, you see? "Have you ever thought of telling your auditor anything and then didn't do so?"

"Ohhh! Oh, well…" and you get a needle read. You see, this is an equivocation. The person really has told his auditor everything. "That he thought he should tell his auditor" is the qualifying statement which he doesn't add on to it. And the not-is machinery is, of course, why it's sitting there. And you could study to get very clever with this and it requires a bit of cleverness. The bit of cleverness will save you any quantity of auditing time. You get clever right about this point.

But I wouldn't bother to get clever at the beginning. In the first place, nothing's been plowed up. It's like trying to plant seeds or reap grain off of unplowed, unsowed ground. He's been going along like this all of his life and he knows it's all right. He knows it's all right to live like this, you know – constant migraine headache and sick stomach and hating everybody. He knows it's okay. That's normal, isn't it? That's what a psychologist would tell you. Normal state of man? Just read what his opinion of man is and, of course, you get what he thinks the normal state of man is. And it's pretty wild!

So this is all right, you see? Well, of course, people rob banks and rape billy goats, and so forth. So it's all right. See, everything is all right. And you get out a meter – well, of course, you're asking for a disagreement. The only thing a meter ever registers on is disagreement. I pulled one right straight on the groove not very long ago and I just chucked all silly questioning and I said "Well, have there been any disagreements in the last few weeks with anything, anywhere?" You know? Of course, I got a registry. I got tired of talking into
the blue, you know, and I just got a registry, bang! "All right, now what were you disagreeing
with there?" See?

"Oh, well! At wholly…" You know, I mean a whole bunch of stuff comes off on this.

"Now, have you got any – have you had – ever had any disagreements with me about
what's going on here?" and so forth. Clang! You see? And immediately before this, "Do you
have an ARC break? Do you have a present time problem? Have you got any withholdss?" All
blank, blank, blank, blank, blank. But now, a sudden dissertation on the subject of disagree-
ments. "Do you have any disagreement with what's been happening to you in the last couple
of weeks?"

"Oh, well. Comes to that, that's another proposition!", you see?

You say, "Well, have you had any unkind thoughts about your auditor?"

"Oh, no!" No registry, see?

"Do you have any disagreements with what's been happening to you in the last couple
of weeks?" Clang! "Well, now, what was that?" And we get this on a via-via-via. We have
gotten – hit the jackpot. They sit there all the time thinking unkind thoughts about their audi-
tor, see? Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa!
Only, you see, this is ordinary. And it's what everybody does.

I refer you to Dianetics: Evolution of a Science, the "everybody knows."

Because what you're running into is the "everybody knows" when you're trying to
cross-check rudiments. See, this is normal. You know, horses sleep in beds. Bang! Normal.
Everything is normal! Everything is normal to this pc.

Of course, nothing is normal in actual fact. The pc has migrosis and his zorch is out of
place. And all this is pretty goofy, see? And he really knows that it is not normal. The pc
knows, but the valence that he is being considers it all normal. You sometimes, just for fun
and just for exercise, should just lay aside your knowingness hat of you know what is going
on and start asking somebody just right off the bat, "What is life really like?" You know,
some raw meat someplace, and just ask this character, you know, "What is life really like?
What are people really like? What are things really like?" and so forth. And just get treated to
a ball. It's pretty wild!

Now, you go to a jail and start asking this question and you get some of the wildest
answers. Actually, it's better than a comic book, practically. They just stagger you all over the
jail aisles. You just ask prisoner after prisoner. Each one of them knows what normalcy is –
each one of them. They know it perfectly. And they're the wildest divergencies of anything
you ever heard of. And they have some of the wildest opinions on things you ever heard of
They couldn't possibly be further off of the line, you know? You could take a tractor or a
tank, and drive all day and all night at right angles to any known highway and you still
wouldn't get as far off the line as they've managed! And then they say, "Well, life just doesn't
run right for me", you see? Well, this universe in which they have gone up the pole, of course,
hasn't anything to do with it.
So you start asking anybody about the rightness or wrongness of their deeds or actions, or the rightness or wrongness of their opinions, or the differences of their conduct when all of their conduct is aberrated, and of course you get no falls on an E-Meter. See? I mean, that's all usual. So there can't be any disagreement because they're in total agreement with themselves while being in total disagreement with everything, and you don't get a fall on the E-Meters. Do you understand how this is?

We described this in various ways. We say, "Well, it's below the fellow's level of reality." Well, what do we mean by that statement, exactly? Well, we mean something very precise by that. We mean that he has some specialized, compartmented values of existence which have nothing to do with existence. It's below his level of reality. Well, his level of reality is the clue. What is his level of reality? Well, it's up some fireman's pole someplace, that hasn't anything to do with the sun, moon or stars or another human being anyplace or anything, you see? It is a total unreality. But of course this is reality so, of course, it doesn't register when you ask him for a difference. You say, "Have you had an unkind thought about anybody lately?"

"No."

And it would even be too much insight for them to say, "Not any more than usual!" But that's what they mean. "Have you had an unkind thought about anybody lately?" Well, they'll give you all kinds of qualifications about this sort of thing. But, of course, it doesn't register on the meter because it's totally rationalized.

You know, just going around nattering about everybody and how bad everybody is and how everybody ought to be shot. And somebody hands you a sandwich in a restaurant, and right away there is a long stream about how their thumb shouldn't have been on top of the plate and the plate should have been set down in a more geographical position in the middle of the table, and all of this sort of thing, or let –. The fellow says, "Well, this is life!" It never occurs to him that he could sit in a chair and have somebody simply bring a sandwich and put it on the table and that he sits there and eats the sandwich. That just is not life, you see? Reality is natter, natter, natter, natter, and there's always something wrong with the sandwich. See? It's all awry.

But the very complexity of the disagreement with everything adds up to a no-registry because, of course, the disagreement is in total agreement with the way things should be. And when a disagreement is in total agreement, why, of course, you get no registry.

So that's the kind of a person you're trying to run rudiments on and check rudiments and do a rudiment scout with, after, let us say, something like a week of 1A didn't move anything – like a profile. A week of CCHs – didn't move anything, see? Aw, hell, man! That is something – that is something on the order of putting somebody in a flour barrel and then bringing them out and there is not a speck of flour on them. Believe me, it's impossible! It just couldn't happen.

Something has happened, but the automatic not-is will be of such magnitude, the automatic disagreeer that is in such disagreement with everything that you are in perfect agreement with it, this thing has been disturbed by that auditing. Fifty hours of this and that didn't get disturbed in any way? Well, at least you'll find the periods of disturbance. All of a
sudden you will find these periods of disturbance, and that's what you're trying to find. And these things will kick. These things will go bang! And follow them down, follow them down, follow them down, follow them down. "No, I don't have any present time problem. No. No, I haven't had any present time problems during auditing. No. No, I haven't been worried about anything." No registry on the meter either.

"Well, is there anything you should have been thinking about, other than auditing?"

"Oh, well yes, of course." Registry on the meter.

"What's that?"

"Well, it's my divorce." [laughter] "Yes, I should have been thinking about my divorce." You got the idea?

You say, "What divorce!"

"Oh, well, didn't you know?"

That's always part of the response on such an interrogation. It always has a lot to do with "Well, didn't you know?" or "I told you all about it", "Don't you remember that six or eight months ago you met me on the corner of the street and you said to me – you said 'How are you?' And I said, 'I think I will get divorced.' Don't you remember my doing this?" You see, it probably never happened, either. [laughter] "Oh, I told you all about that!" You know? "I've told my auditor about this whole thing in full." You'll get that kind of a response. And if you don't follow it through with, "Exactly what did you tell your auditor about this divorce?" you're going to be fooled again. "Well, what did you tell your auditor about this divorce?"

"Well, I said I was a little – little worried at the beginning of one session."

"Did you tell your auditor about what you were worried?"

"Oh, well, no."

"Yeah, I told the auditor all about it", he's saying, you see? "All about it." This is a qualified, broad, carelessly used, interpretation. "Yes, I said to the auditor I was a little bit worried."

"Did the auditor ask what you were worried about?"

"Well, yes, as a matter of fact. The auditor said, 'What are you worried about?'"

"What did you say you were worried about?"

"I said, 'life.'" [laughter] And you go back in the auditing reports and you will actually find it. And you'll find there was a needle registry, and when they said "life" it cleared, and that was it. The not-is went bang, see, and there it all went.

You'll find people straining to get Clear, something on the order of submariners try to get out of a submarine that is immovably fixed on the bottom and will never come to the surface anymore. For God's sakes, find out what submarine, you know? What's her name, rank and serial number, you know? On the bottom of what sea? "Oh, well, I've told everybody about that! Everybody knows all about this submarine I'm trying to escape from. Yes, I'm being evicted next month."
You say, "From where?"
"Well, from my sister's."
"Oh? Well, what about this? What about this eviction? How come?" and so forth.
"Well, it's because of what the police did last month." [laughter]
You say, "Whoa, boy! Where we goin' here?" see?

It's like taking a billiard ball and throwing it on a billiard table, you know, and it caroms off all sides and bounces and falls on the floor. Then – you don't even find a billiard ball there anymore, so you expect it's okay. Nevertheless, they become vaguely aware of a billiard ball during the auditing, you see, and you can track it back.

You get some goofy ones. Well, why are they goofy? Well, that's because life is totally identified with everything, so nothing makes any sense anyhow, so there's no sense in disagreeing with him. You're looking at some kind of a superapathy of one character or another. "This is life", you know, is kind of its motto. And you've got to do some smart checking back, that's all. And if you're smart enough, you can really start unveiling the statues, man. The place will look like an art gallery before you get through, you know?

"Well, have you ever consulted anything – during your last two weeks of auditing, have you ever consulted anything to find out whether or not you were improving?" And you get a fall. That's the first anybody ever heard of the hidden standard. See? "Have you ever asked anybody if you were getting better during the last two weeks of auditing?" See, that kind of a dissertation.

"Oh, well, yes, of course. I asked my wife!"
"Well, what did she say?"
"She said she didn't think I'd ever get better." [laughter]

And in that way, you can drift in sideways on something. The pc is actually not being willfully mean, the pc is not trying to obscure anything, the pc is not trying to withhold or anything else. The pc's opinions of life are just sufficiently abstruse that they don't add up to a disagreement, you see, because "that is life." They've gone up some gully someplace and it's way off the mainstream, and there they are, you know? And they worried a little bit; they kind of know they're up a gully. And they'll tell you, "Well, I don't feel emotional anymore about things, you see? I don't get a kick out of life anymore. Just things don't seem good to me. And I just seem to be a little anxious all the time and so on." They make these general statements of some kind or another.

Well, all they are telling you is "the mainstream of life went that-a-way, and somewhere along the line I considered it was just too much, so I went up this little gully. And I've been lying here in the midst of the dead leaves ever since. And if you dig me out of here, of course, you'll put me back in the mainstream of life again. And that's no good, because that's too horrible, you see, and that's impossible. And if I just lie here and not feel anything and not see anything and not hear anything, I'll be all right. So just go away quietly and let the robins cover me one leaf at a time!" [laughter] That is the supergeneralized solution that people take.
They find the back bayous of the muddy river, you know? And they go in there and after that they don't even catch any catfish.

But they are worried about the fact that they know they shouldn't be there and they know they shouldn't be doing that. And they know that that's no good to do that.

Now, pcs who apparently have never had anything happen to them, have led perfectly calm, orderly lives, and yet still don't improve in any fashion whatsoever… Oh-oh! No. Their tale of the calm, orderly life and that sort of thing, you could sing a little song about "It may be so. But I really don't know. Your story sounds so queer." The truth of the matter is that you've got a case on the back bayous. You see, the case is up this little gully lying there in the black mud, and they hope they have no past. Their quite usual reaction is to say they don't have any – they hope they have no past.

Now, how would you get a person's past? How would you get a person back into the mainstream of things? The cruelest thing you can do is just ask this burning question: "Have you ever left any place?"

And they say thoughtfully, "Well, yes, when I was a small boy, I uh – well, as a matter of fact, no. In uh – uh – well, I left school. I left school."

Now, that isn't all of the meanness you're going to indulge in here. You're going to ask one more worse question. You're going to say, "Why?"

Now, you're asking for the points of departure from the main highway. "Did you ever leave any place?" "Why?"

He says, "Yes, oh yes. Well, of course, I left a place. People always leave places. As a matter of fact in 19 – 1948 – 1948 – I left San Francisco in 1948. Anybody is liable to leave San Francisco." [laughter] "If you can find your way out. Fog, you know?"

And you say, "Good! You left San Francisco. Why?"

"Hm-hm-hm!" You shouldn't have asked that, see. Because what have you done to him? At that precise and exact moment you have said, "What didn't you confront that you should have confronted? What did" – not necessarily should have confronted – "you feel you should have confronted? What did you not confront that you feel you should have confronted?"

"Oh, well, that's a different story." And you've all of a sudden got an active meter. Now your meter gets active. Up to that time it was all okay, but this wasn't okay. Now, that particular – the not-is is what you run into as a more general mechanism. But if you want to connect somebody up with the mainstream of life, the exact mechanism I just gave you will just pick them up by the collar and throw them into the mad and raging torrent. It's very easy to do; don't think this requires very much cleverness.

It can be summed up this way: Did you ever have a little child want you to look at something? Put your attention on something? Did you ever have anybody –? All right, did you ever have anybody ever demand that you put your attention on something? [affirmative murmurs from the audience] Now, have you ever had anybody tell you you were wrong for not having had your attention on something? [Audience: Yes.] All right. That's the basic trick.
See, and you'll run into that on problems. One of your basic tricks of life – "making people confront" is the overt, and "having to confront" is the motivator.

All deaths and the whole mechanism of death derives from unwillingness to confront – that is the mechanism of death. So when people leave and yet feel they shouldn't have left, it is because there was something there which was too threatening. And it keyed in death. And that's why they went up the bud – the bayou and covered themselves with the dead leaves. Because it's just a straight Q and A on death. Departing from situations you feel you should have confronted is just the same as truck runs into body, pc goes out of head. If he was good enough at confronting probably the truck would have disappeared before it hit the body, but certainly he probably would not have been hurt. The fact that he knew he could be hurt caused him to bring about his hurtingness.

It's interesting. You will notice that people have repetitive accidents to the same part of the body. Now, there's a curious one, until you know that their motivator line must be that because their overt line is that. Well, similarly, they were running a no-confront on people. They were giving people things that couldn't be confronted. Now, if you ran a bunch of no-confronts on people, then you get to the idea that you can't confront. And after you get the idea that you can't confront, you can only leave. And when you cannot even leave anymore, you can still go nuts. I'm speaking very factually; that is the cycle of sanity. All right.

So, the person – you ask him this question. You say, "Well, have you ever left anyplace?"

And he'll say, "No, no." And "No", rudiments all in, everything is all fine, no disturbance here, everything is going… Now, you've got evidence that there must be something wrong, because you have two powerful processes, here, run one after the other without any change of profile. You know something is here. That tells you something is here. That's one of the most vivid tests that you can get is an unchanging profile, an unreality on the auditor. Case remains either very, very high or very, very low. No change. You got the idea? Just all floating along. Well, there are many ways to clear this up, and you can't clear it up with ordinary cleverness, you can go back and actually trip the trigger on it. "Have you ever left anyplace?"

"Oh, well, one time, I – yeah, yes, yes, yes." Of course, when you're part of the military services, you very often get answers like this, "Well, we were ordered out of Tobruk." That's not very fruitful ground. They say, "Well, yes, I left – I left London. Left London in 1948. Yes, I left London in 1948. Hm-hm, hm-hm." And if you were watching close, you got a disturbance right there. [knocks on the meter]

"Oh", you say. "You left London. Why?"

"Uuhp" Clang! Big withhold. It's liable to fall right out of that hamper. And maybe if it wasn't London, maybe you had to ask him for five places they left, and ask them why five times before the fifth one suddenly dropped it out in your lap. And all of a sudden you got a big withhold off the case.

Now, there's another way to follow this down. And you say, "Well, has that sort of thing ever been a problem to you at any other time?" Cow!
"Well, yes, of course, right now!" There's his present time problem. Got the idea? Get the withhold, work it to the present time problem, bring it down the line, you see?

Now, this works out this way: "Have you ever thought of blowing session?" is part of your technique. See? "Why?" You know he has no ARC break with the auditor. The pc has no ARC break. He has no – no nothing; everything is all fine, and so forth. "Well, have you ever thought of leaving session?" "What had you just done?" "Good. Well, what had you said about your auditor?"

"Uuhh!" Shouldn't have asked that one. Falls off the pin!

And you see, what you've done is walk around using cleverly the actual buttons which you know in Scientology. You have actually walked around all the defenses, "If I keep it all not-ised and unreal, everybody will go away quietly and leave my decaying body here in the leaves." You can just walk through this because you know the buttons to walk through it on, see?

Now, it's a funny thing that a lot of the parts of the original Prehav Scale can be discussed in exactly the same way. You almost do a Prehav Assessment, only it's in the line of rudiments. Do you see how that would be?

For instance, Prevent – just taking one off the bat. Prevent is to a large degree an anatomy of problems. So you say to him, "Well, during your sessions have you been trying to prevent anything?"

"Uuhh!" You're liable to get one fall off the pin there. "Well, no. I really haven't been trying to prevent anything. I just don't want to get any worse, you see? And the auditor is very unskilled, and…"

All of a sudden, "Well, have you told the auditor this?"

"Well, of course, no. But, uh – It'd hurt his feelings."

And you get a whole basket of stuff comes out, see? You can take almost any part of the Prehav Scale and go at it this way, see, and compare it to various parts of the rudiments. You don't need any system.

Now, the funny part of it is, is surprise has a certain amount of element in this. So therefore, if you take a pat system, you see, which is everything, everything, everything, and then you put in the eggs, and then you whip them all up, you see, and then you put the frying pan on, and you put exactly one sixteenth of an ounce of butter in there, you know? Well, the recipe becomes familiar, and this, too, can become a not-is. See, then the person can not-is that. No, it's got to be you – it's got to be you who does the questioning.

Now, there's another part of the element, completely aside from a system – a system defeats itself to this degree – is the person realizes he's being interrogated by an intelligence. And it's necessary for the person to realize that. And the person says, "Ooooh, well, last fifteen hundred years been very comfortable in these here dead leaves."

And part of his fall may actually be reaction against you – some misemotional reaction against you – for having actually disturbed the corpse. Dead bodies – any good, clean, honest
thinking auditor would know better than to disturb half-decayed bodies lying in piles of dead leaves.

But you can get to a pc from all corners and quarters. But to try to get to the pc before anything has happened to disturb the beautiful, smooth, not-ised complexion of the bank is quite a trick.

Therefore, things like Presession 37 run at the beginning of auditing turn up very little. The same technique run after ten hours of auditing turn up quite a bit. Now you take two tremendously powerful processes, like the CCHs or Problems, and look, if they're not going to move this case... It has never happened yet. All it will do, however, is just shove the case far enough that you can save the next five hundred hours of grind on "Give me that hand" by getting some withholds off and finding out what the present time problems is [are] and finding out why this case can't get easily into session. You see how you could do that?

So right there, you could save an awful lot of auditing with a little bit of cleverness. Interrogation of this character is very, very valuable on a case – very valuable – criss-crossed questioning of one kind or other. Well, you ask the straight question at first. "Well, have you had any – during your auditing have you had any present time problems?"

"No." No registry on the meter. "Except one. I told the auditor about that, and the auditor handled it."

He had no other present time problems. Now, what's calling this pc a fibber? Two profiles. Now, man, that's not possible, see? It's just not possible to get no change of profile and be free of present time problems. That's not possible.

So you say, well, all right, and go in on it on some other quarter – some level of the Prehav Scale. Something – anything you want to do. But try to find this present time problem. It's probably there. It's not there because your meter says so, it's there because your graph says so. It's there because graph and unworkable auditing says it's there.

Now, somebody tells you, after they've had quite a bit of auditing, that they haven't gotten any results from the auditing, this once more is as good as the graphs. So you just wind up your E-Meter with the handy attached made-in-Britain spring on it and let it fly. And you start interrogation of one kind or another. You don't just run rudiments. You just shake this thing to pieces. You just go at it from every quarter.

Now, one of the things that restrains you from doing this is you think the pc is going to get ARC broke if they're this knocked around. I'll tell you what ARC breaks the pc about something like this. The ARC break that comes about is because of some dumb repetitive question that has no cleverness in it. And the pc gets ARC broken because he feels he is not being confronted by an intelligence. And that'll cause more ARC breaks than you can easily count. You see? You can only cause ARC breaks by auditing stupidly or just going on knuckleheadedly. Just completely off beam.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says to you, "No."

And you say, "Well, all right, do you have a present time problem?"
And the pc says, "No."

And then you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and the pc picks up the chair and hits you over the head with it.

And I almost don't blame him. Because this line of questioning is going to lead no place. In the first place, he's fairly well aware of the fact that you're not even getting a reaction on the meter, don't you see? That's the wrong way to go about this sort of thing: "Do you have a present time problem?"

He says "No."

And you say, "Well, what would be a problem to you?"

"Oh, well, that's a different question. Let's see, what would be a problem to me? Well, like having my car parked outside like it is right now with the meter running – I – is – uh – na – heh-heh-heh! Yes, I have a present time problem." He'll say "Aha! You're a pretty clever auditor! You velly smart!" And he goes out and puts the nickel in the meter and goes into session like a rabbit disappearing in a burrow. Kabango! You got the difference?

Cleverness is very well associated with intelligence. Good reason, of course. It's also associated, for some reason or other, with control to such a degree that amongst working men who work all the time with their hands – you wonder what causes strikes and all this kind of thing, and upsets and so on.

By the way, I just read in the paper last night the first proof I have actually seen that psychiatrists do take their orders from Moscow. One of the great brain and nerve specialists of England, actually turns out to have been working under an assumed name as the head of an organization backed by the communists to knock out all management in England. He was the brains behind it all and he was working under an assumed name and he was known as something else, and so forth, and here he was.

This is the first one I've ever seen exposed. You know, they all go running down to Vienna every year to get their orders. You know? They all go down to get their orders, you know? And then they go spreading out and they say, "Well, the party line is 'Freud is no good' this year." You ought to hear them, man! And they get up there and they're always giving advice, that's superpolitical advice, that's going to bust somebody's back sooner or later. It's quite interesting. That was in the papers. That was headlines last night if you didn't see it. Did you see it last night? It was headlines. They got him! Rrrufff!

Anyway, labor-management situation is a suspicion of cleverness. And when people are very, very unclever, they are very easily overwhelmed by cleverness – very easily. So much so, as I say, somebody who is plodding around all the time just learning that somebody is very intelligent or something, or something of the sort, they have one of two reactions: either they admire this, or they don't quite like this, or they immediately decide to strike. That is the basis of labor-management relations.

Now you often wonder – I used to wonder, how in the name of common sense is a – is an engineer walking around men building sluiceways and digging with their hands – all of them with weapons in their hands, you might say, who would fight amongst each other. Every
morning, why, they're dragging themselves to work with black eyes and split lips, you know? Violent boys! And why is it that they never turned on you? It used to be a little bit of a problem to me. You know? They'd fight amongst themselves, but they just wouldn't fight in the direction of somebody who was more intelligent than they were. That was what I finally boiled it down to.

It's curious, you know? Real curious! And yet you put somebody more intelligent than they are at their level, or below them, and boy, they eat him up like a terrier will eat meat! Slurp. Gllumm! Yeah, they will! They just go out of their road to make life hell for him. But the second that he has even a quasi-position which is slightly in charge of something, he's really in charge. Bang! You know? It's quite fantastic. You've seen this kind of thing or samples of it. I tried to understand it over a number of years exactly what this mechanism was all about.

The basic yap of labor is against an intelligent function called management. And management is never bright enough, however, as bright as it is, to turn around and use the same weapon on labor. And the weapon on labor is, of course, just a display of intelligence, not conservatism. You get a display of conservatism and that's a sort of a defensive action, you see, of one character or another. And you just ask him to get overwhelmed by the FCTU Communist Dedicated Antipeople's Local Union Number 49. See, Kabango! It's not that I'm against unions; far from it. But they sure can be used! And you'll find that they have a revolt factor toward this other. And it's not management; it's intelligence. It's not so much control. The only way you can err in management is not control. And you can also err by being insufficiently intelligent.

But you get this intelligence factor. I'm only trying to say here that the intelligence factor is part of being looked up to. It's an altitude factor, let me put it more precisely that way. If you're clever, or if you show you're clever, or you are smart about something or other, you will have an immediate altitude with your pc. And going on and asking the pc stupid question after stupid question – preferably repetitively – all of which have been negated, is, of course, a prima facie demonstration of stupidity.

You ask this question: "Well, have you ever raped anyone?", it says on the Security Check. And the pc – you get a small fall, and instead of saying, "What was that?" or something like that, you say "Good! Have you ever raped anyone?" And the pc says "No." And you say "Good. Have you ever raped anyone?" Actually, anything is better than that line of procedure, just anything is better than that line of proceeding when you're trying to find out one datum from the pc, because he hasn't answered the auditing question. And yet by repeating the auditing question you appear to have agreed that he has in some peculiar way answered the auditing question, don't you see? Because you're obviously asking another one. Even though you say "I'll repeat it", or something, the fact is it's coming out again, you see?

And if you cease to demonstrate that you want that one question that you have asked, answered, and that you're going to find some answer to it regardless of what he does, and going in on it from all sides – you start doing that kind of thing, and he instantly feels sort of surrounded and he says, "There must be something here," and he tries to look and all of a
sudden he's got it. And the whole thing rolls along with considerable speed if you do something like this. But you sit there and say, "Well, have you ever raped anyone?"

"No," he says.
You say, "Well, have you ever raped anyone?"
"No."
"Have you ever raped anyone?"
"No."
"Well, have you ever raped anyone?"
"No."

I'll tell you, *anything* is better than that! Histrionics are better! [laughter] If you – if you even turned the E-Meter – this is extreme, but if you even turned the E-Meter around facing him, and said "Now look! I'm going to say those words again, and you look what happens here! Have you ever raped anyone?" *Bang!* "You see that? Well, that's what I want to know about! Now tell me." Honest, that's superior to a repetitive question. It sounds rough; it sounds rugged! But it'll get results! It shows that you're interested. It shows an active intelligence is confronting him, not a machine. See, he won't obey a machine.

And intelligence is very often variety or versatility, or other factors mean intelligence to people. So you say, "Have you ever raped anyone?" And you get a fall. And you say, "Who was that?" Well, it at least tells him there was an observer. You say, "Who was that?"

"Who?" He says, "Well, I've never raped anyone. It couldn't be any 'Who'!"
"Well, 'her' then!" [laughter]
"There couldn't be any 'her' because I've never raped anyone, I tell you!"
" 'Him' then!" [laughter]
"Well, there can't be a 'him' because..." and so on. "I've never raped anyone. I'm trying to tell you! I'm trying to tell you!"

"Well, I hear what you're saying. But so does the meter – look! All right. Animal, maybe? All right. Who could it be? Now, put your mind to it a little bit, this thing isn't falling on the window shade – now, come on! What is it? Rape, rape, rape, rape, rape."

"Oh!" he says, "You're talking about, uh, you're talking about my sister Bet..."

"No, no, you!"

"Oh, I was just trying to tell you, you're talking about my sister Bessie. She got raped and it was a great upset to the family, and that's undoubtedly what the..."

"No, look. We're talking about you. Have you – you – ever raped anyone? That was what the question was. And it's still registering and I want to know what it is. That's all. Let's get it up very plain. Let's get an understanding going here. I'm not trying to pick a fight with you or anything. I just want a piece of information that's very easy for you to tell me, it's very simple, and the second you tell me I will have heard it."
And he says, "All-right-it-was-a-sixteen-year-old-girl-and-I-was-there-at-the-side-of-road! Uhhh uhp! There!" [laughter]

You say, "That's better. I knew you could do it!" "I knew you could do it! Good! Now, let's just check here to make sure this thing is clean and clear. Have you ever raped anyone? Ah, that's calm now, all right, fine. Let's go to the next one."

Well, I tell you, that's Security Checking, see? Kabango-bango-bango! You're getting right on down the line. That's because the person feels he's being confronted by an active intelligence. Somebody is interested. Something is happening here. Something is going on. The whole situation is under control. There's something occurring. And that's the way to do it. And just never go at it on the basis of set yourself up as a nice ritual, a nice machine. Like I'm telling you, check the rudiments on this character that isn't advancing. You're not satisfied this case's advanced, check those rudiments.

But don't check them, "Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. Any ARC breaks? Yeah. Yeah. Any withholds? See? You getting along all right with the auditor. Yeah. Well, your rudiments are okay. The rudiments aren't out. Didn't fall on any of those questions."

If you add it all up to yourself this way, it'll make much more sense: Only a dead body would fail to respond to the processes. There must be something else wrong. You got it? And that something else is contained in the rudiments. And as soon as you pick up a high level of certainty on this, then you go at this with a lot more willingness and a lot more verve, see? And that a dead body doesn't talk well and doesn't respond well – so that if you're not getting instant and immediate responses, you've just got somebody who is lying up in that gully somewhere and it's way out of the mainstream of life. And you're going to have to get him back into it, that's all.

In the first place, he's never going to be happy up there. In the second place, he's going to go on complaining because he's living up there. Maybe if he'd just lay there quietly and never said anything anymore for the next two hundred trillion years, it would be all right. But he doesn't. He thinks he's lying there quietly, you know? And he's firing off guns and throwing leaves into the river and putting this dreadful stench up through the trees, and so forth.

And you just got to show him somebody is alive around here. That's all. And you do that by being clever. And you'll be surprised, you'll be surprised how much faster a Security Check goes, the second that the pc gets the idea that you might be smart. You know, that you just might have something on the ball; that you might be alive, and you might be smart. And all of a sudden he said to himself, "Oooh ooh, somebody has moved some leaves! Somebody has moved some leaves! And I never noticed it before! But there it is, there it is!"

Well, you can watch it, because you're liable to be put on test right at that moment. Next one that's hot, and you can say, "Well, did you ever spend any money that wasn't yours?"

He knows of one. And he says nothing, "No."

You say "All-l-l-I right. When was it?"
"When was it? But I told you no."

"But I want to know when!"

"Heh-heh! Well, yeah. I haven't even told you that I did!"

"Yeah, but I know – I want to know when!" "Why do you want to know when?"

"Well, I just think it might be a good thing if you told me. Peculiar idea of mine. When and how much?" [laughter] "From whom?" Now, it's getting tougher, see, and he gets the illusion, you see, that this is going to get horrible if he doesn't burst forth with it.

"All right", so he says, "Okay, it was seven dollars and nineteen cents, and I – hunh-hunh. Twenty-one years old, and so forth, and it was from Uncle Sabuchi."

"Very good. All right. Now, have you ever stolen any money from anyone? All right. That's clear. Good."

And you don't get these hang-ups – you just don't get these hang-ups that way. They sort of become a thing of the past. And you're over your primary hump of the guy wondering and hemming and hawing. Then you can go the other way, too. You can get so helpful that he depends on you utterly to find them, and he never bothers to remember any. [laughter] So that you can steer around that, too.

All right. Well, I didn't mean to keep you so long today, but I thought you might be interested in this whole subject of criss-cross checking rudiments, and hang-up cases, and so forth. Thought you might be very interested in that. Okay?

All right. Have a good weekend, and don't loaf because you probably have only got – oh, you've only got a fraction of what you should have gotten filled out on your checksheets.

Thank you.

Female voice: Thank you.
A lecture given on 18 July 1961

Well, you're very lucky to be here listening to this lecture today. That's all I got to say. What's the date?

Audience: 18th.

Thank you very much. Eighteenth, AD 11, July, probably. Saint Hill Briefing Course.

Understand something happened to you people today.

Audience: Yes.

Oh, I'm sorry. [laughter] I'm very sorry. It's a very, very difficult, trying world, isn't it.

Now, we're going to turn back the clock to 1952. Philadelphia Lecture Series and Scientology 8-8008 are the basic texts on havingness. That's basic and fundamental on havingness.

Havingness is a very dominant situation. It's a very dominant thing. I have worked from time to time down through the ages here and put together Be, Do and Have as the primary activities. Now, you are probably more acquainted with Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought and the discussions of games conditions.

Games conditions. A very, very important point. And all of a sudden it emerges as far, far more important than it ever has been, because now we're back to games conditions and its relationship to havingness. And in this book Scientology 8-8008, along with other things – theta-MEST theory, differentiation, association, and so forth – we get in here some general discussions of havingness. And this is the first written text on the subject of havingness.

And it says the goal of processing is to remedy scarcity and abundance in all things. Well, that's what's important about this. Remedy scarcity and abundance of all things.

And on the 17th of July – this book, remember, was written in the winter of 52-53 – and on the 17th of July in 1961, why, I suddenly undid... I've been thinking about this, by the way, for just weeks – I've been working with this for weeks, but I suddenly found out a simple modus operandi by which you put this into effect.

I call to your attention that all we had previously was Creative Processing. That was the key of how you remedied scarcity and abundance in all things, and a lot of people couldn't run it. And they got into bad trouble trying to create things, and so forth. Now, the next da-
tum, just a few weeks ago, that fell out of the hamper, was just this. And this is a very important datum because you will be using it in processing undoubtedly from here on out.

The status of affairs right now is that I could set somebody down, put them on an E-Meter, and probably in five or six hours, at the outside, have them Clear as beer. Now, that's about the step we have just got through taking. And that step derives immediately from having resolved how you remedy the scarcity and abundance in all things. And that's what I'm going to talk to you about today.

Now, let's look at this very, very important datum concerning havingness. I have finally gotten the interrelationship between havingness and creativeness. And when you've got the interrelationship between having and create, you pretty well got it sewed up because these things look a little bit separate. They look different, one to the other. Creating things – well, obviously, after you've created something, you may have it and you may not have it. That's the way we've looked at it. It may be taken away from you. It may as-is. A lot of things might happen. So that just the fact of creating something doesn't mean that we have something.

I'd like to make a discursion right at this point. I see we have some nice new students, some very fresh-looking students. The wife of one of our students was on the phone last night saying if her husband didn't come home instantly and at once that she was going to take a gun to him and meet him with divorce papers at the airport. I don't know whether anybody's communicated this to this student or not at the present moment. Well, I see they have. All right.

That's fine. [laughter]

But almost precisely at the moment she was calling, I was writing this same student a note telling him he had to be here another week. Now, my postulate goes on something like that.

Now, aside from welcoming you new students, you'll notice some notices on the board. I invite you to read the board. And they tell you that you have to learn the whole course in the first week. [laughter] That's right. Because we've got to have time to digest it after we learn it. So, I want you to pay good attention to those things and get those wheeling and dealing in a hurry because nobody has arrived at this course yet knowing how to do any of those things, which is quite interesting.

There are only seven things you have to know about auditing, and these seven can be just brrrrrrrrrrp off just like that. There's nothing to it. And we haven't had anybody arrive here yet that knew how to do one of them, much less seven. And how Scientology has been done through the world, I'm sure I don't know.

They're little things like the TRs and reading an E-Meter, and things like that. And we actually have never had anybody coming here yet that knew how to do one of them well. And the students who have been here for a while, I congratulate you because you now know how to do these things pretty good.

Now, that's just getting it out of the road, and anything I have to say about theory or what you audit depends first and foremost on the ability to audit. And the ability to audit is – consists of these seven things, not a theory. You see that? These stand totally independent of any theory. Now, these things are nailed in brass, and if you know how to do them, you can
audit. And if you don't know how to do them, I could give you the pearls of Ophir and you'd feed them to psychiatrists. [laughter] You understand?

All right. It's all very well to know the new theory and the new thing, to get all excited about that – because I was pretty excited about this myself – but those of you who are new or haven't been here very long just pay attention to that board in there, because none of this is going to work for you, not for five minutes, on anybody or on yourself unless you know these seven principles of auditing which have to do with E-Meters and TRs and that sort of thing. Okay?

All right. So, I give you that dire warning in the middle of this, not only to you but the fact that if you take this material, which I'm about to give you, and "psychiatrize" it and "squirrelicate" it, you're going to have somebody in the soup, man, because you have got both red hot pokers straight into where the thetan lives. And if you can't audit, you're not going to be able to handle this, boy. That's all. We already had one student today screaming. It's easy. It's easy. But to bring him all the way through it and make him feel better afterwards, that depends on your knowing the seven things. Okay?

So, a major breakthrough doesn't immediately change the seven fundamentals of how to do it. Okay? These fundamentals, these tools, Pre-havingness Scale, and the rest of these things, are all part and parcel to what we're doing here.

Now, havingness went into a revival – I'll get off of this cross professorial note here – and this revival of havingness came about at the Johannesburg Congress, practically the night before the Congress. I got some kind of a chart to draw, to show people so they'd understand some of these facts, and that was the birth of the Prehav Scale. But you'll notice it got called the Prehav Scale. And that's all of auditing. Pre-havingness. I don't care whether it's done by that particular scale or not. It is pre-havingness. Pre-havingness.

Now, the relationship between creativeness and havingness – I have just licked that. Now, that relationship is this, and this has to do with the fundamental formation of the reactive bank. And this is very important.

When a person can't have, he creates. That's the law on which man operates. Now, you'd just never dream it under the sun that that went together that way, but that's the way the crossword puzzle fits. That is the way this big French roll of bread crumbles.

When you can't have it, you create it. And that is the formation of the reactive bank. And that is the most fundamental law of the reactive bank now discovered. We have now gone down in diving suits well below the surface of the bottom of the ocean. That's the bank. That's the story of the bank: If you couldn't have it, you created it.

This tells us all sorts of things. All this last winter and summer, I have been collecting little odd data that looked like something strange and didn't look like it was quite part of the puzzle.

It began with an observation that Italy routinely goes into a renaissance every time it is licked. Obviously, the best thing possible for Italian civilization is to get whipped. That's quite an odd, random factor, isn't it? If they get licked, they have a renaissance. You'd think it would be quite the reverse. You'd think they'd go into a decline. But they don't. They have a
All you have to do is lick the Italian, and, boy, does he produce.

It goes into such things as the roses which you see out here on the terrace. I have long known, as most gardeners have known, that all you had to do was cut a rose routinely and it bloomed. Only they put it down to this. That the roses have to be appreciated. And if you don't cut them, they aren't appreciated, so they don't produce roses. Now, that's the *modus operandi* that most gardeners think occurs or halfway think occurs with regard to roses. And that isn't true at all. The abuse of a rose causes it to produce roses.

All right. Now, let's look a little bit further here. All these observations, one after the other, plus a long story which I myself went through ... It does you a lot of good for me to get out into the real universe every once in a while and get out that rope ladder and get off the Ivory Tower, you know, and go out and rub elbows with the sweating humanity, you know.

And I have been fooling around with ships for a long time, and this was another correlative factor. I found out I couldn't get a ship from South Africa, so right away I started to buy ships. And I've been trying to buy ships ever since. And then I found out I was now creating ships, and I was beginning to build ships, and this wasn't totally a waste of time because I've done a rather fantastic thing – design a ship hull – Earth apparently hasn't had one because they have very calm seas here on Earth compared to most planets. And resulted in designing a motor. And apparently they don't have a motor on this planet. I heard people say this an awful lot of times. But all this directly derives from the fact that I couldn't have a ship. So I had a bit of subjective on the thing.

That wasn't where we got the main part of it, but that all kinds of little observations of this character have gone on and on and try – these are funny bits of the crossword puzzle. What are all these things?

And all these things add up to this fact: that if a rose bush can't have a rose, it creates roses. It also adds up to this interesting fact. That if a shipyard is building ships, it is because they can't have ships, and that's why they build ships that only last for seventeen or twenty years. That's why the great *Empress of Canada*, which was just launched up here, has an aluminium – boy, is that British – superstructure. Its whole superstructure is aluminium.

Isn't that interesting, because in something on the order of about thirty-five years it's going to be a mound of gray powder. I know now aluminium doesn't work in shipbuilding because I have been in receipt of tremendous catalogues which are very beautifully put together and pamphlets beyond count, released by Kaiser and the Aluminium Company of Canada, and all of them are so insistent that aluminium can be used, and they are so hysterical on the whole subject that I began to look up the data. And looking up their own data, you find out that, at the most, a few decades and the aluminium is a pile of gray powder.

Also, you can't weld it. You have to solder it, and if you use zinc, why, that won't hold under the sea water conditions. And there's all these reasons. But you must use aluminium to build ships.

I think they just put out about two million pounds in money to build the whole superstructure of the *Empress of Canada* out of aluminium, and it'd seem to me like that many tens
of millions of pounds invested in a ship should last longer than about thirty years. It'd just seem to me because you start adding it and dividing it and subtracting it, and you find out that it just – the ship just sitting there is going to cost a half a million quid a year before you do anything to it at all because it's all going to disappear in about thirty-five years. And you ask yourself odd questions like this, and you come up with this odd observation. If somebody is creating ships, it's because he can't have ships.

Ah, but let's take one further look at this. He's going to make sure that you don't have a ship. If he's reactively building ships, it must be because he can't have ships. So, he's for sure going to Q-and-A with you, and you're going to wind up with no ship. Oh-ho. So, of course the ships on this planet, with all the materials available out of which you could make ships that would last – well, teak and cypress last practically forever.

There is an old ship I was trying to get my hands on down in Las Palmas; she was built in 1885. She is much sounder than the dollar. She is in beautiful condition. 1885! And she's built out of teak, and the teak lasts forever. But has man enthusiastically been building teak forests all over the place so he could have lots of teak to build ships with? Oh, no, nothing like that. Do you see cypress growing everyplace in the swamps so that you could have wood to build ships? Oh, no, you see Oregon pine. [laughter]

Well, you say, well, it grows fast and there are lots of reasons for it, but even Lloyd's tells you that Oregon pine lasts. And I've never seen an Oregon pine hull after it's been in the water twenty years but what you can't see daylight through the dry rot. Now, a lot of surveyors will argue with me, and so forth. But they argue, and I can still find examples whereby the ships which they build have no endurance, and they go to pieces, and it costs a lot of money. Well, now there's an interesting field, one that I happen to know something about. And out of this we get this interesting series of observations, and suddenly a total explanation of what this is all about.

If they – they really don't want to build ships and they certainly don't want you to have ships. Shipyard worker goes in and he works for something on the order of five pounds a day, but when you get the bill his wages were fifteen pounds a day. Why, that's fascinating. That's just a method of not getting ships for anybody. It's very interesting.

I think the reason the US government punishes all the producers of the United States is simply to get them to produce on some reactive basis. But the government is a no-production body, so it's going to make sure that nobody else produces, but the immediate result of not permitting anybody to have anything is to make everybody create something. So the stupider the government gets with regard to handling production, the more is going to get created. And the more passive a government is and the less interested a government is on the subject, the less is going to be created in the country. Isn't that an interesting fact?

There's all sorts of cross observations under all of this that make life much more comprehensible. That isn't what's important to us. I'm just giving you background music – the various things I've looked at that were close to me, and so on.

I've been rubbing elbows on the subject of ships and I've monkeyed with a lot of other things in the last few months. And looking at life in general it has seemed very interesting to
me that there's evidently some cross relationship that goes further than the overt-withhold mechanism. There is something more than the overt-withhold mechanism.

Well, actually, it was described, in theory – it's a marvelous thing to eventually understand your own work. But I find myself in that interesting position every once in a while, and I'm of two minds with regard to my own past work. And one mind says, "Boy, that was sure stupid", and the other mind is "Boy, that was sure smart", you see. I mean it's two minds definitely.

But this havingness situation compounded with the games conditions of Scientology: *Fundamental of Thought* actually give us the answer to any case. Games condition. What do we mean by a games condition? Says in *Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought*, it's preventing people from having things. But how far can we go on this basis, and what is this all about, and what do we mean by things?

Well, anything you can name is a thing. You name it – it's havingness. You can name it – if you can name it, it's havingness. And if you can guess at it, it's havingness. And a thetan is only unhappy when he can't have. And his idea of quality ... Well, amongst us, I think personally it could be reformed.

But if you deny him any given thing, his instant and immediate reaction is to try to obtain it – so that prohibition in America makes drunkards out of the whole country.

Now, I know how to make a successful civilization now that would just go like a hot bomb just using this principle. I would find everything I wanted the civilization to have in it, and then hire nothing but police and agents in all directions with bureaus and departments to prevent each one of these things from existing. And then I'd make sure that I had real knuckleheads in charge of these bureaus [laughter] so that they would not be in the least effective or efficient. Well, just name the number of things you want in the society or the civilization and then form bureaus to prevent each one of them, and you'll immediately get a demand. That's the way you create demand. You don't create demand by supply, and that's what's wrong with economics. You create demand by prohibition.

Now, how do you create creation? By just running a broad can't-have. That's all. That's all you have to do. And everybody will create it. Now, if you were to run a million-pound advertising campaign in England stating categorically, giving fines – particularly in England; England works on this like a gorgeous thing. I mean it's marvelous. You get instant reaction on a games condition. And if you made it absolutely against the law, completely and utterly to have a cat, *cawow!* You know you wouldn't be able to see the pavement anyplace? Well, think about it for a minute, you see.

Everybody'd kind of get even with you. They'd immediately start breeding cats, man. Well, I can see it now. The Secret Cloak and Dagger Society for the Breeding of Angora Cats, or whatever. Having clandestine meetings, you know, and everybody wrapped in cloaks and meeting behind back doors, and so forth. A whole secret fishing industry springs up so they can smuggle fish in. The government passing regulations "No fish for cat consumption will be imported into England." I can see it now, man. That's the way it'd go, too. That's the way it'd go.
Now, oddly enough, the games conditions situation can get so bad that if you insist on people having something, they also don't want it. So if you insisted on England having nothing but slums, you would immediately improve the standard of living. But unfortunately, by insisting that they have nothing but council houses with very, very nice appointed apartments for one and all, you're going to get slums. They're going to uphold the standard of living. If you're going to uphold this standard of living with great violence, you see, people are going to listen to everything else. I think the total birth of rock and roll in England is the attitude of BBC toward culture. I think so.

After all, old BBC sits up there, and they – they just figure day and night how they're going to make everybody cultured. And the net result is, the only thing they – they haven't got Bach and Brahms being played on the streets. Man, all they've got is rock and roll and the Whiffy Tiffy Five, you know. [laughter]

Unless you knew these rules, man's activities would look totally incomprehensible, and as – once you know these rules, his activities look very comprehensible.

All right. Let's say that we want three-sixteenths-inch size bolts produced in enormous quantity in Manchester. Well, the first thing we do is put a heavy tax on such bolts. And we prohibit their being sold in any of the stores. Everybody's going to produce three-sixteenths-inch bolts. That's for sure. They're going to make them, left and right. I can see it now. They take quarter-inch bolts and swell them up and half-inch bolts and shrink them down, see. [laughter] Everything's got to be three-sixteenths, man. It's right there. Bang! Nothing else will do. So this all looks totally irrational.

You'll go into a community, you'll arrive here on Earth, it's a new area to you, and you start looking around, and you see this happening and that happening, and the other happening, and it doesn't make any sense to you at all. Well, you don't know what the law has been. So therefore, you can't read the opposites because your games condition is going to bring into existence the reverse. If you run a can't-have on people, they're going to create it. It's very interesting.

You take a district, and you utterly prohibit, one hundred percent, crime, and everybody goes just a little bit bugs or crime starts to occur around and about the place, or something like that. It is totally police action that creates crime. Everybody knows this sort of instinctively, but they never quite look it over. I've operated down in parts of Los Angeles, South Alvarado and Main and that sort of thing. It's as much as your life's worth to go down there on a weekend. Hang around those bars and gin mills and marijuana joints. They just stack up the bodies like cord wood.

It's nothing. You pick up some guy on the corner, and he's cut from ear to ear and bleeding gore all over the pavement. Nobody's paying a bit of attention to him. That is too usual.

Well, it was very odd in operating in that particular area to look what man was actually doing or what he would accept or what he was trying to do. And it was very peculiar that the police were trying in some measure throughout that area to squash all of this kind of activity. And they were particularly hot in those particular activities. There is more police per square inch on Main and South Alvarado, and so forth, in Los Angeles than any other place
on earth. It's totally populated by police. And it is the seamiest, lousiest, scummiest skid row in the world. Well, isn't this fascinating?

Look. Well, you see, reasonability throws you astray. You say the place is rough, therefore they have to have police there. No. You have police there to forbid roughness, so you get roughness. Now, I have actually seen police create roughness. It goes this far.

Here's a guy minding his own business. A cop walks up to him, turns him around and tells him to get out. Well, what is the fellow doing? He's doing nothing. Well, that was why he was told to get out. It's all too calm here for the cops, man. And the next thing you know – I have actually seen a man beaten till every tooth was knocked out of his head and stamped on and everything else. And there wasn't going to be a single thing going on. I mean, the fellow didn't do anything or otherwise. The cops just had to have some trouble.

It was very interesting. One of the cops, after that foray was all done, was all beat up. He was just black and blue, and he was in terrible condition and all this. And this other fellow got away, by the way. And I was standing there explaining to this police officer how I had helped him all I could. I did, too. And he was trying to create trouble; I helped him create trouble – for himself. I was helping him beat the guy up, you see. I was operating as a special police officer myself, you know. Just somehow or other, every time he'd raise his hand to strike, you see, his wrist would hit my arm or something like this. He kept getting in my road. That's what I kept telling him. It was a very confusing brawl.

He explained to me afterwards over a glass of whiskey, and so forth, he'd never been in quite as confusing a brawl. He'd never ... [laughter]

But that it was possible to keep law and order in these places was very, very easy to observe. Because in those areas where I was, they didn't have any trouble. Now, that wasn't some special monkey business I was pulling off. In fact, I wasn't looking for any trouble either way. I wasn't either trying to make people be good or be bad or try to start fights or otherwise.

Actually there was law and order in that immediate area because nobody was running a 'can't-have' on anybody. There were no 'can't-haves' being run.

I'd talk to all the guys that came in, and so on.

People kept trying to hire me, by the way, because it was bad for business to have these brawls, and so forth, occur. And I've been offered some very fancy sums to keep on with this job. It was very, very amusing and entertaining to me. They took me as the real McCoy, you know. I must have been the real thing. I thought, that – boy, that's the biggest fraudulence I ever pulled in my life.

Anyway, there where you didn't run a super 'can't-have' and a super no-have enforcement of some kind or another, nothing would happen. I'm talking about a rough area of the world.

I've had ships, I've had places of this character, and as long as you yourselves weren't in a games condition with the people present and you had some control in the area, nothing happened. Things just went on and everybody was happy and cheerful, and so on.
And so we get this oddity. We get a Captain Bligh, who was an awfully good officer, but he did have a mutiny. Bligh did have a mutiny. Good officer. I wonder why he had a mutiny?

Well, he had a fellow by the name of Mr. Christian. And Mr. Christian was running a can't-have on the captain. The captain ran can't-have on the crew. And I'll tell you, running a can't-have on a bunch of sailors where a bunch of beautiful Polynesian women are concerned is a mighty hard thing – an adventurous thing to do, if I may say so. I myself never tried it personally. I never tried it personally.

Myself not wearing any halos in this particular department, I've followed quite an opposite course. I remember running the Golden Gate Bridge one time with radar only, with a Golden Gate pilot – San Francisco Bay pilot – standing there getting grayer by the instant, with nothing but cotton-packed fog. You couldn't even see the bow. Running down a fairway full of ships at frank speed. He'd never heard of radar before, and it was brand-new in the war, you see.

And of course, I could see Alcatraz at the other end of the entrance, and I could see every ship in the fairway. And down the line we went, crash, bang; turned on our tails, snap, boom, underneath the Oakland Bridge, bang onto our mooring spot. Down went the anchor, shook the pilot by the hand. He didn't have to apply any motion to his hand, it was already shaking. [laughter] And boats away! And if he had examined the situation very carefully, he would have seen this was perfectly reasonable, sensible activity.

I myself had innumerable dates on the "Top of the Mark" which I would be late for. And all of my petty officers undoubtedly had numerous dates along the waterfront that they would be late for, and all of the crew undoubtedly had numerous dates ... elsewhere. [laughter] Well, it's very fantastic, but nobody was running a can't-have on these characters. You get the idea? Quite the reverse, but not any enforcement on it either.

The reasonable, sensible thing to do from this crew's point of view, of course, was to get ashore as fast as possible after a long cruise and get their liberty boats away by four-thirty on the button. That was the reasonable thing to do because, man, that beach was just crammed with dames, man. Crammed. See, that's a reasonable thing to do. Bligh didn't do that.

He says, "You see all those beautiful women?" He said, "Nope. Hgh! No." Games condition. Now, we read in the annals how he didn't create the mutiny. Isn't that an interesting thing to read? He didn't create the mutiny. Well, he – you see, there is nothing against running a can't-have. It's supposed to be a good thing on this planet. So when you sailed in here from wherever you came from and took a look at this scrambled hamburger, you were probably amazed because the one thing that is bound and determined to produce a complete upset throughout the whole civilization is allowed on this planet, condoned a hundred percent.

You are only a sterling, upright, pat-him-on-the-back citizen if you run a good, solid can't-have in all directions on everybody. Now you're a good man. Let's put him in charge of the National Provincial Bank or something. See, let's put him in charge – he's a good, safe man, you see. That's a good, safe admiral. Um-hmm. Um-hmm. Runs can't-have on all the sailors, all the officers, the Navy Department, everybody. Okay. Good. Let's appoint him, see.
Well, this must be an excellent army because the sergeants and captains and generals in it won't let anybody have anything. Must be a fine army. Look it over. Must be. That's the test. Are they strict? What do you mean by strict? You see?

You have governments that don't govern. Well now, how can you possibly add this up in any other fashion than the government is running a can't-have on the people with government. But they don't take these odd, decisive steps. They don't take odd, peculiar, sensible decisions. They don't act when they're supposed to act, you see, so they're good fellows. Got the idea?

The best thing you can do, of course, create as many problems as possible. And the way you create problems is – and we're right back to the common fundamental – is run a can't-have. And as soon as you run enough can't-haves, you're going to create problems.

We had one here in the last two weeks. We had somebody in Accounts turn me in an accounts record on which some four or five thousand pounds were not shown. Well, that's interesting. When you're very interested in getting the show on the road and keeping everything together, and so forth, you all of a sudden read your bank statements, and there are four or five thousand pounds less. But I had told this person not to reconcile these bank statements anymore, but it looked like the bank statements had all been reconciled. This accountant was running a can't-have. The immediate result of this has been caroms in all directions. A can't-have suddenly appeared in the organization, and there's all sorts of discussion and offbeat activities, and everything you could possibly think of just as a result of this.

Rumor lines going around left and right, and so forth. This is all tempests in teapots or in tea saucers. But it all came from one little can't-have. Got the idea? And this thing went zoom zoom zoom zoom!

So "can't-have", in addition to being the fundamental of the reactive bank, is also the fundamental of all problems. If you want to create a problem, run a can't-have. That's the best way to create a problem. Your problems normally look as though they're don't-haves. You can look at your problems as mainly don't-haves. You have a problem of what to do with the weekend because you don't have a – you see, a car or something or other. You get the idea?

So they look like don't-haves. Well, how did you get into a don't-have? That's the fascinating question. How did you get into a don't-have? How come you haven't got this thing that you need? That's the question to ask. And all of a sudden you can materialize it. Here's exactly what you do. You say, "Well, got a weekend coming up, and I don't have a car, so there I have problems of what to do with the weekend." That's a very mild version of a problem, see.

Look out in front of your face. What have you done at that moment? You're liable to spend the rest of the weekend trying to build a car or something. In some various via, you will have something to do with the scarcity of cars because you ran into the fact that you don't have one. You may have one where you normally live, but right at this particular area you just don't have one.

Well, how did you get into a position where you can't say presto digitanto pretlosis or something and have this car materialize. How are you in a position in life where you can have
a don't-have run on you? Because that's sort of the last ditch of "can't-have", isn't it? The don't-haves. That's way downstairs. Well, how did you get in that position? Well, it's the overt-motivator sequence.

You see, you run enough can't-haves until you create a situation of don't-have. And then all of a sudden you can look around and not-have yourself. See, you've opened the gates on the motivator. By running a can't-have, you've opened the gates of the motivator, and you will eventually wind up, not with just can't-have, but you'll run up with a don't-have. It's very, very simple. It's one of the idiotic, Simple Simon mechanisms, but that's the O/W sequence as applied to the games condition. And that's where we arrive at now with the practicalities of auditing. I'll stop reminiscing to you about this and that and get down to some "practicalitis."

And it just adds up to simply this: that if your pc doesn't have anything, it must be because he has denied it. As elementary as this. He must have denied it. If he has a low quality of something as his favored quality, it must be that he is operating on this kind of an activity mentally. He can't have a good one, but nobody wants a bad one, so he's got a bad one.

Now, you've seen that guy around. You'll find them in the electronics world. They've got the whole backyard full of impossibly decayed machinery, electronics, junk, and so forth. There's always a spool of wire, you know. The wire itself is broken in fifty places and nothing you can do with it or about it, and yet that's it. And nobody wants this wire. And you run into this and you puzzle yourselves with this problem. You say, "Well, why does he have the wire if nobody wants the wire?" And of course, you've answered your own question. He has it because nobody wants it. And if nobody wants it, then he can have it. And that is his first test of havingness with regard to wire. He can only have it if nobody wants it.

Have you ever realized that there might – I know it sounds incredible to you – but there might be, there just might be an explanation for the old ladies' hats you see in London. [laughter] They're too incredible to be believed. Well, that's the only hat they can have. And they can only have it because nobody wants it, obviously. You get it? You get that kind of an answer.

Now, the total absence of something does not mean the thetan is without it. This is the other interesting fact. The total absence of something doesn't mean the thetan is without it. You're going to find it in his reactive bank being obsessively created. Haw-haw-haw. And the further it is out of sight and the further it is out of his sight or anybody else's sight, of course, the more covertly he thinks he has to create it. So the covert creativeness which goes on, called a reactive bank, is a remedy of havingness. And that's all a reactive bank is.

Now, you run a can't-have on somebody on sex. And then one fine day you find people are running a can't-have on you on the subject of sex. And you're very puzzled because these two facts don't necessarily or easily associate. Well, now if you go on that far, you will find out that second dynamic activities are impossible, see. You can't have these second dynamic activities. So therefore, they're liable to take some kind of a flip. They'll go off in some different direction, and you start building up various types of second dynamic activities that you could have. You got the idea? And when these, too, fail, of course, you wind up with these even hidden from yourself but still being created in the bank. You get how this is? So they don't only pass out of somebody else's sight, they pass out of your sight, too.
So we get the degrade of quality. We get the downgrading quality, you see. A fellow can't have a Cadillac. So, he thinks he might have a Buick. But he actually can't have a Buick, so he settles for a Ford. But he can't quite have the Ford, so he settles for a 1928 Austin, Baby Austin. Now, he's all set to buy this, and then he finds out that he can't have that because it can't be licensed anymore or something of the sort, don't you see?

So, we're auditing him – we find a car wreck. Hey! What's this? You know? This guy is stuck in a car wreck. No, he's not stuck in a car wreck. He's stuck in having a wrecked car. [laughter] You get the reinterpretation of the thing? That's something nobody wants. Life sort of ran a can't-have on him in cars, so his cars downgraded, downgraded, downgraded, and then disappeared. There wasn't anything lower, I don't think, than a 1928 Austin. Unless it's a vintage Stutz Bearcat 1912. Vintage model. Mint condition. I'm familiar with the car. It was never in mint condition.

All right. So you get the degrades, you see. And the degrade is only what a person can have.

Now, what emotion or feeling can a pc have? Now, let's just depart from the nature of things of just solid havingnesses, and let's move over into what feeling can the pc have? And do you know the common denominator complaint of most people who are around the bend is that they can't feel anything anymore or they can't emote, and they have no more sensation. That is a common denominator way downstairs, and then you get a little bit upstairs and you find everybody has something that they wish they could feel more about. They can't feel about certain things anymore, and they – this upsets them.

That is what? That is nothing more nor less than a can't-have on a feeling. So the feelings degrade. The beautiful, exhilarated, superserenity of Tone 40, you see. Well, that's impossible, you know. You have to gaze at your navel for forty years on the tops of Everest, and every time you climb Everest, you know, you get wiped out and all kinds of things. That's impossible to obtain. So we will settle for a little enthusiasm, but of course, that's really an overt-act to be enthusiastic to people, so it's best to be conservative. Except bank managers set us such a terrible example in that that nobody wants us to be conservative, so the best thing to be is sort of bored, the best thing to do is angry but you can't – nobody'll let you be bored. You won't let anybody else be bored either. And so the best thing to do, well, let's start crying. But you don't want people to cry and people don't want you to cry, so you can't have that one either. So you at least could be good and degradedly apathetic. Oh, but nobody wants you to be apathetic, and you don't want anybody else to be apathetic, so you wind up with no feelings. But you can mock 'em up way at the back of the bank.

Now, at the first Saint Hill ACC, I talked about two routes. Experience, and another route that we were using at that particular time, you see. These two things we've now combined, because the experiential factor is havingness. All of a sudden it all can be lumped under one heading. Experience is havingness. If you regard all experience as havingness, then all experience can be restored.

In other words, take these doingness and beingness factors and add them all under havingness. In other words, make beingness and doingness junior to havingness.
All right, we get a beingness. Now, we can't obviously be some of these scarce and rare beingnesses which are way up to the top of the list of social stratas, and so forth. So we settle for lesser beingnesses and lesser beingnesses and lesser beingnesses. And we get into this sort of state where we're not being anything right where we are particularly, or we maybe are being a bit of something which is not too acceptable to us, and we mock up some kind of a beingness – reactive mock-up of a beingness. And of course, the first grade of beingness that we're liable to mock up is something terrifically desirable and then pretend to be it. But we're not it. You got the idea?

Now, little kids do this all the time. I want to call to your attention that children are not allowed to fly airplanes in this society. This is an omission. Undoubtedly, it is done to deny people airplane crashes. But the truth of the matter is that a little kid is not permitted to fly airplanes. He is not permitted to be an aircraft pilot – nor train as one. They say, "Go to kindergarten and learn your ABCs", and he's only interested in learning how to read bank-and-turn indicators, and engine temperature gauges, and so forth. This is all he's interested in. But they say, "Go to kindergarten and play with those blocks." And we find this little kid buzzing around, buzzing around, buzzing around, buzzing around, buzzing around. He's creating being an aviator all the time. Why is he creating being an aviator? Well, nobody's let him be an aviator. See, there's the explanation. You got the idea?

This is reactivity we're talking about. By running the can't-have, we get the creation. This is reactive. What confuses everybody is all of this can take place on an analytical level, a totally analytical level. And we say to somebody, analytically, "Well, you really shouldn't drink so much alcohol because it makes you drunk, and you've got a class in the morning or something." And they say, "Yes, that's right." And they don't drink. See, that throws all of our computations out that the way you get people to do something ...

But oddly enough, if we did this to them very often and if we did this to them in some unacceptable way so it's a can't-have, so the communication is a can't-have, they can't have the communication. And they can't have the liquor. They'll all of a sudden start feeling a little dizzy all the time. What they're doing is rekindling their past drunkennesses. You've run a can't-have on drink, and they've started rekindling their drunkennesses, and they start going "Thuuh-thuth, now, see what you've done to me", you see. And they use it for some new purpose. But the truth of the matter is that by running a can't-have, not by as a friend of theirs helping them out or something like this – you see, that level can exist – but we run a can't-have, a good games condition – our motives are as impure as a politician's, see. They're really impure.

Now, we say, "Well, you really shouldn't drink anything this evening, you know." We've sort of privately, reactively got our eye on the bottle, and we see there's only three drinks left. [laughter] All of these mechanisms take place below the level of ARC, of course. So that absence of ARC is almost a direct requisite for a reactive creation by reason of can't-have. It must be a can't-have run without ARC or some portion of ARC or mis-ARC. You got the idea? The can't-have really has to be run, man. It really has to be run.

Now, people all over the place are working day and night on this. Saw Sergeant Bilco on television last night and I never saw quite so much can't-have on the army in my life. But
that was a gorgeous program whereby these recruits come in under a military school graduate who is some military prep school graduate, and they've all been drilled up already. And they want Bilco to take them out on the rifle range and teach them how to shoot. And Bilco's trying to beg off. And all he's doing is run a can't-have on them on training, you see. And he thinks of fifty dozen different ways to insist that they not be trained. Real gorgeous.

But do you know the condition of peace which avails every place is simply a can't-have on army activities. They just run a can't-have on all these soldiers. Soldiers like to come back and tell you how beat up they are after a war. As a matter of fact, they don't, you know. It's only lying around shore bases and things like this and waiting forever and not doing anything that really upsets them. They're denied the experience of war.

Generals, of course, are the people who will run can't-haves hardest. You get more peace and more war along with the peace and more explosive peaces which develop instantly into war under generals than any other single class of person. Man, you can have yourself some nasty international situations if you get somebody who is totally insistent on peace. Why? He's reactively running a can't-have on war.

See, it isn't that war is good or bad. He's just running a can't-have on war. That's what he's totally devoted and dedicated to. And he runs one hard enough, he'll get one. Somebody'll create one. why will they create one? Let's look back at the first rule. He's run a can't-have on the subject. Well, man, don't run a can't-have on the Germans on the subject of war because they react on it too easily. They mock it up at once. The best way to handle the Germans is, you can see immediately, is to get into good ARC with them and explain to them how they must get ready to fight. We don't care what, but just ready them up to fight in all directions. Explain that there's alien races on Arcturus or something, you know.

No, keeping the peace does not consist of running a can't-have about war and getting out with a bunch of propaganda about, "I hate war, and Eleanor hates war. And James hates war. We all hate war. And that is why we are going instantly and immediately into one that we should have entered five years ago." See? That was a real mess. But it's all on, "you mustn't have war, you mustn't have war."

Now, if you don't think that wasn't reactive, it went this far. There were no bulletins about the war. There was a can't-have on war run by the US Information Services on the American public. And it was the wildest can't-have on the war I ever heard of. You could read newspaper accounts about what was going on in the part of the world which you were in, and they bore no slightest relationship to reality. Now, I don't know that it was doing the enemy any harm or any good. But I know now that it had nothing to do with the enemy. It was just a big can't-have on war. Everybody was involved in fighting a war, but simultaneously everybody was running a can't-have on the subject of war.

Man, the trouble you got into in World War II for going and attacking the enemy. That was something that just wasn't done. You think I'm kidding, but it's true. That's the most trouble you could get into. You couldn't get in any trouble sitting still. You couldn't get in the slightest trouble saying, "Well, the engines are broken down, and I haven't got a full crew. And nobody's serviced with provisions and the refrigerators won't cool the meat."
Everybody'd say, "Oh, well, good boy, good boy", you know, and pass on down the line. They'd just leave you alone. But if you ever said, "Say, you know, there's a whole bunch of Japs or something just landed on that island over there, and I'd like permission to go over and run a harassing patrol." Man, they're liable to put you in the booby hatch or something, you know. You were non persona grata at that moment. You had broken the prevailing mores which is "there mustn't be a war." But somebody should have called it to their attention: there was one in progress.

After a whole United States fleet had sacrificed itself holding the Japs back and buying three or four month's worth of time, they then said some old, obsolete ships have disappeared in the Pacific. It's the most fantastic story I've ever read. I read it the day I stepped off of a boat from that exact area, how these old, obsolete ships which didn't mean anything anyway had kind of sunk at their moorings or something. Well, you get somebody who can't walk, he'll run no-motion on everybody. Right?

All right. Now, there is the interlocking complications of existence. People are running can't-haves on things that exist. Let's move it up now to that state. Let's run a can't-have on something that exists. Let's say it doesn't exist. We get a total delusory state.

There's a whole religion devoted to this called Christian Science. I'm not mad at Christian Science. We are indebted to Christian Science. But unfortunately for the Christian Scientist, their can't-have runs to the degree that the physical universe isn't here. You try running 8-C sometime on a Christian Scientist. Cawow! Cawow! Cawow! You're going directly against their most basic can't-have, which is they mustn't have a physical universe. What does it amount to but you mustn't have a physical universe when you tell somebody there is none here; there is no physical universe. Nobody asks the intelligent question: "Then where the hell are we?" [laughter] No, everybody says, "Oh, I see. I got that. Yeah. Ooohh." Let's look over and see where these things come.

What do you suppose this Christian Scientist is then going to do? What's his bank going to look like after a while. Cawow! What would be the basic mass of a bank of a person in Christian Science? To have a can't-have on the whole physical universe, now, what's their bank going to look like?

Audience: Solid. Solid.

Well, they're going to have a whole solid bank, aren't they? That's real good, huh?

And just for kicks sometime, you ought to get somebody that's been in Christian Science and ask them to swing around Arcturus and other places because it's all in their minds. It's all present. Everything is all present. It's all inside. All being obsessively created internally because it can't exist externally. The insistence on a thetan on the somethingness of existence and on the first Axioms is utterly fantastic.

Now, how are you going to use this?

Do you realize there's a – let's get into some very practical practicalities here in ending this thing up. You've got a bunch of people, for instance, in England who can't think. Try to run a think process on them. A bunch of people down in South Africa – they can't think. You say, think of a time.
Kabow wow! "No. Can't, can't think of a time." Oh, this is "fascinating." Have you ever run into anybody and you try to run a think process on them, and you had to change it over to "Get the idea?" Did you ever do that? You had to change it over, actually. You could – well, we had ways and means for a while of not-is-ing – of running the not-is off of thinking. It was back about the 4th London ACC. Ah, but there is something very much worse than this, as a process, that is absolutely deadly. Utterly deadly.

Look, if they can't think, they must have O/W games condition on thought. Ha-ha! There must be something there whereby they have preventing people from thinking. So if they can't have a thought, then they have added it up to a can't-have on a thought. Oh, this is very fascinating. A can't-have on a thought. Therefore, people are going to run can't-have on them on a thought, aren't they? And that is going to be very interesting, and with that one observation we can antiquate every Security Check we have. Aren't these people withholding all of these various things so as to deny other people from thinking things about them? [laughter]

So there is one two-command process which knocks out a Security Check necessity. Now, we're still going to do Security Checks, we're still going to have them, but recognize what they are. If the individual is withholding a thought, he is doing what? He is running a games condition on you on the subject of "you can't have it." And this is going to render him in a condition where he's going to have less of it. And if you can make him get off his withholds, which is to say give you the thought, you have then stopped him from playing this particular games condition, and he feels much better.

But why does he have all these discreditable things anyway? Well, they don't exist. They haven't existed. For instance, why is this fellow nursing to his bosom having robbed a candy store of a bar of candy at the age of five? Why? Why has he got this thing pulled into his bosom. Why won't he tell you? Completely in addition to the fact that he doesn't want you to have that thought, that thought is scarce. If a person is withholding, the thought is scarce. And if the thought is scarce, we must assume then that there's damn little robbery and theft in candy stores. He's got it cut down, see. It is not in abundance. It's in scarcity. And so the individual is taking these immoral actions, criminal actions, actions of – against the mores of the society – well, the reason he withholds them is because they're against the mores of the society and therefore scarce.

They are scarce because they are against the mores of the society. So if he can get hold of one of them, he has a little jewel there in that little plush box tucked away, you see, under the left oblongata. It's a scarcity.

But then he holds on to it for this other mechanism. He doesn't want you to have bad thoughts about him. And of course that's totally recognizable, but it's in the same category as games condition. He's running a can't-have of bad thoughts on you. You're not supposed to have bad thoughts, so therefore you mustn't think these bad thoughts in any direction, much less against him. Got the idea?

So this is a basic process, this "What thought –" well any – I don't care how you phrase it – you don't have to write it down as a command because it's just a theoretical process – it's "What thought haven't you permitted another to have?" and "What thought hasn't another permitted you to have?"
Well, that immediately starts doing all kinds of weird things with the Security Checks we've got. Because it's the – one of the basic modus operandi of why the Security Check exists. The person is running can't-have on thoughts. He doesn't want you to have bad thoughts. So if you ran any such auditing command, you – well, if you said, "When haven't you wanted another person to have a thought?" or "What thought haven't you wanted another person to have?" Accompanied – to get your flow in properly – "What thought haven't people wanted you to have?" You've immediately jumped over the top of all Security Checks. Get the idea?

Now, another mechanism about this is, you tell somebody, you say, "Think of a woman. Thank you. Think of a woman. Thank you. Think of a woman. Thank you." And then just keep tags on what kind of women he thinks of. It's quite therapeutic, by the way, but you're making him create women. All right.

"Think of a woman. Thank you. Think of a woman. Thank you. What kind of women?" First, he gets nothing, perhaps. It's probably quite invisible. He probably gets some generality. He probably thinks of the general idea of women. He probably doesn't have any broad concept of it at all except just "women", you know. And then he starts thinking of specific, departed women. You know, they're specific, but they're departed. Therefore, he hasn't got any picture of them. And then as you run this process, you eventually come back up to a basis where he can get dead women. So he gets dead women and dead women and dead women. And then he gets sick women. By the way, if this is running perfectly, it runs through all the sequence of the funerals.

You have certain strata of funerals, you see. So you have women's graves, and then you have women being buried, and then you eventually get women dead in state or something of this sort. And then you get women dying, you see. And then you get women sick and about to die. You got the idea? And it goes back up this line.

What exactly is happening here? You're making him examine the scarcity of women, that is all. And it runs backwards, and eventually the process would be flat if at length he was able to think of a present time woman with the greatest of ease and actually get a perfect 3D picture of her. You see that? Well, actually, just "Think of a woman" would do this. You're getting him to exercise the automaticity of the downgrade of women. You see that? Not a recommended process. That's not a recommended process. That's a test process. And a very simple test process and a very valuable one. Australia of autumn 1959 – spring Australian time.

Now, what is this? What's the next process? What is a valuable process? How would you work these theories around into a process now?

All right. We find this fellow's deficient on the subject of women. One of the things he's probably deficient – we detect that he's deficient on women – is because perhaps he has peculiar ideas about sex with men. You don't condemn this. You just – it's just indicative that he obviously can't think about women. If he's a man and he can't think about women, he can only think about men, well, there's something weird going on here. So therefore, he must have a hell of a scarcity on women. Well, here's the gag and here's the formula by which you put together the games-condition process.

Whatever it is that you find him inverted or nonexistent on, you develop a process by which you can discharge his using that item in a games condition on others, and others using
that as a games condition on him. And because you're running out stable data all the way on this, you add a confusion, a problem or emotion along with it.

In other words, you take whatever the item is that you find him inverted on or nonexistent on, and you run a games-condition process.

Here's an example. Your confusion and stable datum is what accounts for the last command. The guy – if he doesn't as-is some of the confusions and problems and motions in connection with this, he will be content to just sit there and run the stable data of the games condition out from the middle of it and wind up in a confusion. So you've got to throw something else in there to make him as-is the conf – the motion. Got the idea? Whatever it is. Or the problems with regard to it. You've got to bring up his confront on the problem of it. Otherwise, you're just taking apart a game for him.

So the last part of the command, or the third part of the command, is to rehabilitate the games condition. And when that is missing, the games condition doesn't necessarily rehabilitate easily and the process takes a lot longer to run, and he's going to feel like you're taking a game away from him. So you run this last one.

He's short of games, too, merely because he can't ... The way you deny people of games really, is to give them things they can't confront. And, of course, that's a marvelous way to deny everybody havingness.

So the fellow can no longer confront problems, so he can't have new games. You got the idea? Because new games require havingness. So the confront of problems is necessary to the rehabilitation of all new games. Right? All right.

Now, here's a sample of this. Here's women. "When have you denied another a woman?" "When has another denied you a woman?" "What problem about women is not present now?" Now, those three commands would take any of these oddball sexual difficulties and just knock 'em out brrrrrrr.

Now, let's take a woman, and she has a lot of trouble with men – having lots of trouble with men of one kind or another. Of course, you give them the same command, only it is addressed to men. "When have you denied a man to another?" "When has another denied a man to you?" And "What problem about a man is not present now?" Now, why that form "not present now"? Well, you remember my lecture on not-ises. Well, that's the not-is version of problem confront. And that's a murderous process, man, because it un-not-ises everything involved. Got it?

Well now, that basically is the road out as far as games conditions are concerned. And it started back there with Scientology 8-8008, and went through the vicissitudes of problems and Creative Processes earlier than that, and then problems, and came up more recently into the Prehav Scale, and has moved out into a highly workable, functional activity. All you have to do is establish the nonexistence or the downgraded form of something in the pc, run a games type process on the pc, and the pc's going to snap out of it.

Now, how does the Prehav Scale fit in with this? Well, you could actually assess on the Prehav Scale and find out the person was very short on something or other. Well, it's – he's got something; he reacts badly on something so you simply consider he's short on it. And
let us say it was leaving. It's as indefinite as this, don't you see. This would be your Routine 2 application of this sort of thing. You assess it on the Prehav Scale just as you normally would. And you find that he is short on leaving. When I say you find he's short on leaving, it simply means you've assessed and found out that the hot button was leaving. So you run a games-condition type of process on this and you would find that the person would recover in maybe a tenth of the time or something like that than he would on a general run. And the games-condition process would be something made up out of leaving. But make sure that it makes sense. Just make sure it makes sense. That's the main thing.

You have to work it over. And then make sure that the commands react on the meter before you start running them, because they might be totally unreal to the pc. In other words, it would be, "When have you prevented another's leaving." "When has another prevented your leaving?" and "What problem about leaving isn't present now?" And that would be the way you'd put a games-condition process together on a basis of Routine 2.

Now, you'll get some of these levels, and they don't make sense, so you wouldn't say to somebody, "What fail leave isn't" and "What fail leave is" or something of the sort. And it's all up in the air, and he can't quite wrap his wits around it. Well, you have to work around it until you get an answerable command and one that reacts on the E-Meter.

Now, the basic thing that this has resolved and the basic target at which all this work has been leveled, is the problem run into by Peter Williams and the problem run into by us on endless assessment for goals, since a proper assessment for goals obviously is taking much too much time. Well, now why? Because it is not everybody who takes this amount of time in an assessment for goals. What is this all about? It is simply a games condition on the subject of goals. And you're sitting there asking somebody for goals who is in a games condition about goals, and goals are very scarce, and they're not going to let you have one, man. So of course, they're never going to give you their goal. And you can easily get a thousand goals out of them – none of which are their goal.

So, you can use a games condition process on goals which is preparatory to a Goals Assessment which shortens the Goals Assessment right on down, boom! Which is what? Is "What goal haven't you let another have?" or "What goal don't you want another to have?" or any way you want that thing, and "What goal doesn't another want you to have?" or " – hasn't wanted you to have?" or any way you want to phrase it, you see. And "What goal would be a problem?" or some such a command. All of a sudden they come off of games condition with you, the auditor, on the subject of goals, they begin to level, and reactively, they are incapable up to this time of digging up a goal and giving you one.

Now, all of a sudden, they actually stretch their goals out. You can find their goal. You can find their terminal rather easily. That defeated that game.

But anyway, a games condition is an unnatural situation since in a games condition a person becomes convinced that only this game exists. And that game always consists of a singleness in that field and a can't-have. And all games consist of a can't-have. And the person gets into the opinion that there is only that game, so they can only run this can't-have. And the more they continue to run the can't-have, of course, the less they have of it. So the thing dis-
appears from view after a while and they've gotten worse, if anything, not better. So there is the long and short of games.

You understand, of course, that originally when you started to clear people, way back, they wouldn't clear because they thought they were losing their games. And when you did get them, by some hook or crook, Clear, then they were left with only one game and became impatient with the idea of being Clear, and so promptly got themselves aberrated up again so that they could have a game, and they expressed it this way: "Well, I wanted to be like other people or have some fun in life, and I felt like I was totally detached from existence, and I didn't want to be this detached."

Well, what was pinning it all down was games. Scarcity of games. And their scarcity of games was so terrific that they felt if they left this game of being aberrated they would never find any new game. And SOP goals, of course, walked them out of this but was walking them out of it, for some people, much too slowly. We were being successful, but at what slowness in many cases.

All right. So a remedy of havingness of games consists basically of broadening their view on the subject of games. And if you can broaden their view on the subject of games, you can of course clear people rather easily. So therefore, all you would have to do is find out all of the basically aberrated games that the fellow was playing, knock them out one right after the other. And getting his fixation off of these things, he'd be able to look around and find out there was more games, and would practically blow Clear almost at once, because he would now be willing to.

But every person going for Clear has become totally convinced that if he audited just one more auditing command, if he said just one more answer, he would no longer have his game. And he will tell you occasionally that he really doesn't want to be Clear and yip yap yip yap. And he's just talking about one thing: He said "Well, if you run out this game, there are no other games, and I've had it."

So my attention has been very much on that thing, and I am very happy to tell you that I have gotten that wrapped up.

Thank you very much.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: AUDITOR EFFECT ON METER

A lecture given on 19 July 1961

Thank you. This is the what?

*Audience voices: July 18th. 19th.*

Eighteenth?

*Audience: 19th.*

I thought you were wrong! I just got one of my motorcycles back out in the garage out there and so I didn't know the date. That's sufficiently non sequitur. Nineteen July 1961, AD 11. All right.

Now, I've been giving you a lot of information but I haven't given you any opportunity to ask any questions. We always assume at times like these, that you've gotten up to a point where you've found out you don't know something. This is, of course, a rare and strange occasion when this occurs. But is there anything that I could help you out with? Any questions? Yes?

*Female voice: Why does a stage four needle do what ...*

What is a stage four needle?

*Female voice: No, not what is it. Why does it do that particular thing instead of just sitting at Clear, or doing something else?*

Instead of just sitting at Clear?

*Female voice: Yes, or doing just so long. Why is it, that in every case with a person in that condition has exactly the same sort of movement?*

Why does he always have this stage four needle? Is that right?

*Female voice: No. Why is the – why is the movement constant?*

Yeah. Why is that movement constant? That's what I meant, yeah.

Well, now, of course, you're asking me for a surmise. Now, I can only give you a surmise. A stage four needle, of course, is one which is unmistakable. The tone arm setting has nothing to do with it. Usually, however, a stage four needle will sit around Clear read and therefore you should beware, beware, beware, beware, beware because the person is below Clear. It's something like, if he got a long ladder and climbed for a long time, he'd reach bot-
The stage four needle is something that when you encounter it, sometime or other, will plague the living daylights out of you. You don't see them too often, but when you do run into them they are marvelous.

Now, the standard stage four needle that I have observed has about a two-and-a-half inch swing and it goes from – well, if you've got the tone arm set right, it'll sweep up from, as you're looking at it, the right side of the dial on the needle and it'll sweep up here, and it will stick. There is a stick. That's what makes this quite different than a free needle. It sweeps up here and it sticks and then it drops back, falling again to your right as you look at the thing. And it just keeps doing that. At just about this speed. And that's all it ever does. It just goes through that repetitive swing. U-u-up, stick, fall. U-u-up, stick, fall.

And that is the darndest thing you ever want to see. Because no matter what you ask this pc, no matter if you hit him over the head with a brickbat, he'll still have a stage four needle. In old times, he comes under the heading of an unsolvable case. You have so many things now that will resolve his case that it's not particularly a worrisome thing. It's just something that you shouldn't ever be in any illusion about.

You put somebody on an E-Meter – here's where you'll get into trouble: you put him on an E-Meter and start to security check him. Ha-ha! "Have you ever raped your mother?" You know? Bang! No action. "Have you ever put slugs in a parking meter?" No action. "Have you ever breathed?" No action. It's just that stage four needle. Just that stage four needle. It just seems like it will go on forever.

It's an electronic transfer – what it is – of energy in the mind and it is a repetitive cycle and what you might call a machine reaction. And – it is – this person is not himself, but is being a machine – always, always. They are not themselves at all. That is to say, they're totally backed out of being human. They distrust themselves to such a degree that it is much safer to be a machine.

Now, the oddity is, is they're so far down on this that the machine has an individual read, not a 2.5 tone arm read; it's liable to have any kind of a read. But as a result machines are run by energy and what you're looking at is some kind of a fancy doodad like an AC motor and it's feeding its current on a surge and then it's reversing its flow; and it's feeding its current on a surge, and it's reversing its flow, and there's nothing going to disturb that except auditing. Anything in life could happen to this person and this machine will still go on, on this charge line.

Now, that is a surmise as – that its current is running that way and reversing. I myself have not observed this closely, but I would say it's a very safe surmise because you can also get an alternating current read on a pc. If you ran Black and White Processing fast enough on a pc, you'd get sixty-cycle AC. And – you would. Over here in England – fifty cycle. [laugh-

But this is – is just a machine read, a machine facing. It's just – the person isn't there. He has no responsibility for being there. No responsibility for his case. Doesn't have any re-
sponsibility for answering the auditing questions and whatever he thinks produces no reaction at all upon his bank. That he thinks a thought has nothing to do with his bank. He knows he can have no effect on anything.

Well, there are too many ways to take this apart, nowadays. But the CCHs if – will always undercut it to some degree or another. You can run one of these stage four cases on the CCHs and get further than any other activity if in doubt.

But remember the common denominator of all cases as they worsen is less and less effect upon the bank and the bank has more and more effect upon them. So, getting them to think a thought, you see, by an auditing command – you say, "Do this" or "Do that" – well, they think a thought. This then produces no reaction upon the bank and they drive you sparky, you know. It doesn't matter how many auditing commands you think up. You are not going to get any action, even if the pc complies with them because, of course, the pc has no effect upon his bank. His thinkingness does not effect his bank.

The common denominator of all cases is the amount of effect the thetan has on his bank; and that is a gradient scale which runs from "no slightest effect" all the way up to "total, easy effect" on the bank. And what you see at the bottom of the scale – the reason you have a Clear read, of course, is the thetan has no effect of any kind on the bank. Nothing disturbs anything. There it sits. Of course, you're just reading a dead body. And as you go up the scale by gradient, he has more and more effect on the bank. Well now, sooner or later he's going – as you audit him, he's going to start changing around the bank by the reason of what he's thinking.

And about this time you'll see energy lines, you will see ridges. Those generally show up before pictures and then they kind of pass out, and he has lots of pictures. And then you run into more energy masses and energy lines and the tone arm starts acting up like mad. Well, what you're watching there is he has more effect on his bank now, don't you see. And eventually he's got enough effect on his bank that he can as-is it. And it gets up to a point of no bank and no disturbing bank – which is what you mean by Clear.

All right. Now, the stage four needle is a retreat from bottom and when encountered, your safest bet is always the CCHs run exactly the way you're supposed to run them and so forth – not a thinkingness thing, but an action thing.

However, there are many other ways to take this apart. And you will find that there are some buttons which are still open and the modern processes which you are doing in these three routines – you always find some hole in the fence. It's problems. It's confusions. It's motion. It's leaving. It's something other, you know. There's something going to be open there someplace and you could keep tickling this spot in the fence and all of a sudden you've got an entrance. And that's about all it is.

You know, on a low case, all you have to do is trigger an automaticity and then, of course, the case is undone because the automaticity is being run off by the auditor; and the automaticity is what prevents the pc from having an effect on his own bank. You as the auditor, through triggering the automaticity, are not ever actually asking the pc to do anything, you see. Except not retreat; that's the only thing you want him to do. You want him to come to sessions and so forth.
And stage four is no exception to these particular lines. But if you were to open up on a case and do a case assessment on somebody and notice there was nothing on the meter whatsoever but this odd phenomenon of it rises, the needle... Down here from where you'd see on this old meter dial about 3.5, it goes back on up toward set, sticks somewhere in there vicinity, falls on down to 3.5, comes up, sticks around set, just about at the speed I'm talking.

Now, there is another spook stage four needle that I probably have never made any remarks about at all. But that is turned on by the auditor's statement, and sometimes it's very small and sometimes it's large, but it only occurs when the auditor says something. Actually, you're turning it on and turning it off, see, by saying something or not saying something and it just doesn't matter what you say. And you see this all the time. This is very common. This is a third of the pcs that sits down in front of you have this ghost of a stage four needle.

You say to him butter and you get a little rise or a little fall and a rise and a stick and a fall, or some combination of this sort. You've got – every time you speak, you vivify the needle. Well, that's you energizing the bank. Remember you're an electric eel. And you can actually have on pcs more effect on the bank than the pc can. Something you have never learned, something I have never been able to teach anybody. They are always so sold on the idea the pc's totally responsible for it all that they don't realize that the auditor can just sit there and just actually push that bank around anywhere, you know.

Say, "Be in the Roman arena. Thank you. Now, don't be in the Roman arena, be in the twentieth century. Thank you very much." And the bank will just move.

Because they can't see it, they don't believe it. See, they're not there then sitting, looking at the picture of the Roman arena which results. And then maybe the pc is so occluded he doesn't see the picture of the Roman arena that results. But you – an auditor can say something like that. "A spear is now entering your right side", and the pc gets a somatic – because it's a cinch someplace on the track a spear has entered his right side and you say, "The somatic strip will now move to that part of the track where a spear entered your right side", and you get a somatic. You're very much in control of the situation.

And this other phenomenon will baffle you sometimes when you're doing a Security Check. And you open up the paper and do your Security Check and everything is fine, and you start right in and you say to the person, "Now, are you on the moon?" something like that, and you get a boomp, boomp, tink And just for fun throw a total non sequitur into the situation, you see. "Are bananas hot?" you see. You get pzoomp, tink – get the same kind of a reaction. You say, "Is the sky blue?" Hmm, tink. "Is your name George?" Hmm, tink.

It's you, you see, you are actually turning the reaction on. It is the impact of your thinkingness and speakingness against the pc. The pc isn't doing anything, it's just the fact that you are energizing the bank and then the E-Meter will read that energizing.

Now, I better clear up something here that hasn't been cleared up for quite a while, and that is: What about these null questions to find out if there's a needle reaction? Do you use these null questions today and do you pay any attention to them at all? And the answer is no. You don't even have to ask them. It's always nice to know that the pc actually does respond and have a lie reaction because it's a good case index.
You set some pcs down, and when they say – you say, "Are you sitting in that chair?"
And they say no, you get a lie reaction. Well, you know this pc's in pretty good shape. Well,
you say, "You're on the moon – are you on the moon?" He says, "No", and you get a lie reac-
tion. Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh. It's a way of indexing a case, don't you see. It's whether the case
has any reaction or has a reverse reaction or has a proper lie reaction.

Now, of these the lowest reaction is when the pc is energized every time the auditor
speaks and if you're seeing a needle that every time you say something goes whirr-plunk, you
know, or does something, don't get an idea the pc's getting a fall on it. You just say, "Are ba-
nanas hot?" and the needle does whirr, clunk. And you say, "Are you on the moon?" and the
pc says, "No", and so on. But that has nothing to do with what the pc's saying has nothing
whatsoever to do with it. You just say, "Well now, you shut up for a moment, and I'm just
going to ask you a few questions just to read it out on the meter." And then you say, "Well,
are bananas hot? Are you on the moon? Do automobiles have motors? Cheesecake." Each
time you've said something, you get the whirr, clink, clink. It's nothing he's thinking. In other
words, you're not reading the pc's reaction.

Now, if the pc is in a Security Check, the moment that you start to security check a pc,
his level of interest rises and creates an emergency level and thereafter, your needle rides
straight. So don't avoid a reaction on an E-Meter needle just because the pc has one of these
automatic response things on the needle at first because the second you're asking him meaty
questions that he feels he might be caught out on, he no longer has that reaction. He's right
there pitching, I don't care how low toned he is, you see?

"Te-thu-ooh, ooh."

"Have you ever stolen any money?"

"Wah, well, let's see, I – mm-mm!"

And you've got him in session and so that any reaction on a security question that
might be meaningful is always taken by the auditor as factual. And you will never go wrong,
providing it's an instant read.

So your null questions are just some kind of a goofball case index and that's all they
serve as anymore. But any time you start asking a whole series of questions that are non se-
quitur, and have nothing to do with the case, of course, you're liable to get some kind of a –
well, you're liable to get an impulse reaction. Because, you see, the pc knows it has nothing to
do with the case. It seems silly to him and he's not taking any responsibility for the answer.
And if he's at a level where the moment he just thinks of irresponsibility or it has nothing to
do with me – the moment this is triggered – why then, after that you are moving the E-Meter
around. You got the idea? But the second you're on something that's meaningful, that might
have something to do with him, why, it will behave just like any other E-Meter.

Now, I'm not sure that a stage four needle, at this time, will behave that way or not.
But I tell you that it's a high probability that it will behave any time you hit the button because
they've got withholds by the avalanche. Got it?

So any reaction on an E-Meter – Mary Sue has had a little bit of a hard time pushing
this across occasionally, so I'll help her out here – any reaction on an E-Meter when a mean-
A meaningful question is asked and that's any question on a Security Check that might have (might have) something to do with the pc, not just null nonsense questions – is taken by the auditor as factual, providing it is an instant read. And an instant read is immediately, factually, instantly followed up by the auditor; and a latent read or a latent reaction is totally ignored.

The only thing you're interested in is "Did the meter react instantly when I asked the question?" In spite of this other oddball phenomena, you'll find out that you won't go wrong if you'll always investigate that instant read.

An instant read must occur within one-tenth of a second of asking the question. Anything that occurs later than that is neglected by the auditor.

Now, is there any judgment involved there? Well, yes, there is. Yes, there is. Because I cannot guarantee the meter on which you are working, unless it's a British Mark IV or an American. I can't guarantee the meter. And a lot of these meters – squirrel meters and so forth – have a lag. I'm not trying to sell meters or run down meters or anything. I'm just warning you that they do have a lag.

Some of the early organization meters, circa 1954-55, had a lag built into them which made me think that battery meters were no good and then I found out everybody had been working day and night to build this lag into the meter. And the meter did not respond for from one-half to one second after the question was asked. And if you're foolish enough to audit on some old decrepit affair that was made by the buggy-whip companies or something, you had better establish whether or not it has a lag in its read. And of course, that would throw out this instant-read law at once because the lag is in the meter, not in the pc. All right.

Now, what about three quarters of a second? Well, let's not get picky about this, shall we? Three quarters of a second. Well, that's an instant read, see. Because the lag is introduced by the length of the question. You got the idea? The length of the question and the difficulty in digesting the sense of the question. And the sense of the question sometimes doesn't come home for a half a second after you've stopped talking. Got the idea? That's got to come home before it can be even acted on in the bank. But it's just about as close to instant as you can get, don't you see?

Now, definitely, from a second on and up, let it drop, man! Skip it! Get away from that horse because it has nothing to do with the question, and so forth.

You can do a great deal for the pc. You can clear up enormous sections of his life. You can clear up all of his relatives. You can give a Security Check to all the teachers he's ever had. You can do all sorts of oddball things, but you're not giving this pc a Security Check. That's what the main criteria is. Do you understand?

So by latent read we mean anything – we don't mean anything after a tenth of a second. By latent read we mean from one second, plus. That's one second plus and that would even apply to an old buggy-whip meter. If there's – takes a second or more for that needle to react in response to your question, ho-hum, brother, ho-hum.

And I think you've been using that rather consistently, most of you here and you've been getting along just dandy with it, haven't you?
Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

And before, when you were using latent reads, you were just having one awful time. Right?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

It took 139 hours to clear question 18, you know. Every time you ask, "Have you stolen anything?", you would get a long silence on the part of the pc and then a little motion with the needle and you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, let me see. What could that have been? Well, I thought actually of my Aunt Grace. My Aunt Grace once kept rats and I think once she stole a rat. I am not sure."

So you say, "Well, all right. That's fine. All right. Have you ever stolen anything?" Three, four seconds go by and then – fall. "What was that?"

"Well, it actually wasn't stealing, I guess. But I was on a bus one time and the conductor gave me too much change and there were a lot of people and so I gave him the change back and corrected the change and gave him the right change, even though he'd given me..." oh, what the hell are we doing? See. [laughs] What is all this about, man? Well, it's not situate in the reactive mind and the basic characteristic of the reactive mind is instantaneousness.

The reactive mind has no time in it. And as a result, if you ask a question that is going to be real to the pc – that is to say, if he can see that deep into his reactive mind and so that response can be energized – you will get it instantly; and that's the difference between an instant and a latent read and not knowing this difference can louse you up on doing a Security Check just from here on out. You'll have a hundred-hour Security Check every time you turn around. You just don't ever get any security checking done. It's got to be an instant read.

Well, I've told you an awful lot about meters there, extraneous to a stage four needle, but there it is. Okay.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, what has the velocity of fall got to do with it? In other words, the needle just rides ...

Nothing

Male voice: ... slowly?

Nothing.

Male voice: Oh, okay.

Velocity of fall has nothing to do with nothing. Don't worry about velocities of falls or recoveries or the square root of the God – of the God Ohm. I'm not making fun of your question, Bob.

Male voice: No. No.

It has nothing to do with it. I'm glad you brought it up, because this rumor is always brooding about. And we're always hearing this – that something about velocities of fall, or repetitiveness of fall or "thises" of falls or that of reaction, and so on and they don't have any-
thing to do with it. A pc who is situated and has been living in glue for the last hundred tril-
lennia is for sure going to get a slow fall. But velocity of fall can't be watched – I'll tell you
more precisely why it can't have anything to do with it – is because it can be altered by
the setting of the meter. So the second you can alter something by the setting of the meter, then
you can't calibrate anything against it, so the devil with it. Okay?

Male voice: Right. Thank you.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: What's the purpose of the "What represents" and "How could you help"
questions in the Joburg, and do you have to null them? You know, "What represents your-
self?" "How could you help your family?" Questions like that.

Is that still in Form 3?
Female voice: That's still in Form 3.

Well, now, what's the question?

Male voice: Well, what's the purpose of them in a Security Check?

What's the purpose of them in the Security Check? Nothing.

Male voice: Do you have to null them?

It's something like – there are a lot of people have nerves that go back underneath their
lungs. I'll tell you where this comes from. And this nerve channel passes actually underneath
the lung and according to Darwin, this is all a hangover. Got it? I'm not making fun of your
question. I'm telling you – this is fact, this is fact.

And you'll find a lot of bric-a-brac of structure ... Well, like boats. I was quite inter-
ested to recognize the other day on the subject of boats that the first boat was a log and I'll be
a son of a gun if the Queen Mary isn't still dragging a log. It's now the keelson. They have
never moved off of this log. The first boat was a log, of course, with this caveman straddling
the thing and paddling it. And so help me, Pete, it's still in the Queen Mary. Another thing is a
raft is three logs at least and so help me, Pete, they've still got three logs in them. They're chi-
nes and the keelson. There are eight-thousand million ways of hanging a boat together that
have nothing to do with these logs, but they're still there. I was – I was quite interested in it.
That's Darwin, too; he talks about these things.

And this check originally was an employm ent check. And it was one of these things
that was going to do everything and all in one package. One of the things it was going to do
was select out executives.

Male voice: Well, I know how it got ther e, I put it in there but I was wondering ... [laughter]

I wondered how long it would take him to realize that! Well now, why did you build
the Queen Mary out of a log? Thank you, Jack. You can strike them, you don't have to null
them. They have nothing to do with the price of fish or apples. But that is basically, remember
now, Jack, a Security Check. That is still a Security Check, even though it is used for process-
ing. It still serves organizations for various purposes and until there's a proper organizational
check and until purely processing checks are written, that one will have to do. But it's just a stopgap. Okay?

_Male voice: Yes, thank you._

All right. That's a good Security Check, by the way. Yes?

_Male voice: Yesterday, you said that – you told us that a person can't have, he creates. Then now, is that a prerequisite of creation?_

No. That's the reactivity of creation.

_Male voice: I understand._

Now, we're only talking about unknowing creation and most of our discussions here concern the reactive mind and the unknowingness of it all. This is some of the laws which have gotten submerged and which are out of ken. And those are the only laws we're interested in digging up.

Nearly everybody who has studied the mind has studied analytical reactions only and I sometimes err in not telling you, "Well, this is not an analytical reaction", or something of the sort. That's not an analytical reaction. It is totally a reactive action and the statement here that a can't-have is a prerequisite to creativeness is only a reactive response. Of course, at one time it was an analytical response and all reactive responses were at one time analytical, but this is now no longer analytical and so is a hidden law.

Right now, let's get an idea out here. We've got some very, very terrific workmen here at Saint Hill. I mean they're marvelous people. There's Mr. Weller and Mr. Jenner. These guys are really marvelous. And those birds aren't under any such delusion. They can really build in concrete, and wood, and do various things. They're quite good, you know. But they just go on the simple postulate of "Well, I think I will build up this stone wall out here and we'll make a curb around the thing and that's all there is to it." And it doesn't fit with Weller because everybody was giving him a workshop. He could have all the workshops he wanted, but when he got around to moving his workshop, well, he built himself one. Well, there he could have a workshop and he did build a workshop. All right, that's a totally analytical response. A fellow decides he's going to fix up a wall, he decides to build a wall.

You – you're walking down the beach one day and you say, "Well, I would certainly – dearly love to have a house on the beach." You very likely would simply call up a couple of your friends and tell them to build a house on the beach. See, nobody has even inferred that you couldn't have one. And you up and built one. But then you're doing it knowingly. See, you know what you're doing. You know you want a house on the beach.

Now, this other law comes up along this wise: One day you have a picture of a rhinoceros in front of you. Where the hell did that come from? Well if – you know that somebody somewhere along the line has forbidden you to have rhinoceroses. I mean it's as stupid as that and of course, that's getting real stupid to have a picture of a rhinoceros because you don't even want a rhinoceros! You got the idea? You're not aware of ever having wanted one – at no time.
The truth of the matter is it could get keyed in very well and very easily because of an interest in wildlife back along the track somewhere and regulating life on planets – something of this sort – and you've read in the paper how there are only 250 rhinoceroses left in the world or something like this and a couple of days later – you've forgotten that, see – couple of days later, why, you got a picture of a rhinoceros. Now, where the devil did this picture of a rhinoceros come from? And you trace it back. You see now, this is the reaction of the unexplained appearance of a mental image picture.

Now, we go back in the history of Dianetics and Scientology, we didn't even know we were making them at first, see. This is how far we've progressed. All right. If you sort it back carefully, knowing this law, somewhere fairly recently, some part of rhinocerodom has been run as a can't-have on you. Just like that. And you get this automatic response. But it's totally an unknowing response which is what makes it utterly incredible. But just creating, oh well, pooey.

You can always trace back a desire to create something. You can always find and link up some period when somebody told you not to have one. You can always cross these things up, but then actually you're the one that's crossing them up. They're not crossed up already, see.

The Freudians moved all sorts of rationale on the backtrack to explain what was happening in the present time. You see, they'd even invent backtrack rationale to explain what was happening in present time. But the mysterious appearance of a creation somewhere in your vicinity or a wild and incredible impulse of something you don't even really want – and for some reason or other, you've just got to make up this tune. You've got to make up this tune. Just got to, you know. "I got to write this piece. But I don't know how to write music. But I got to write this – no, I don't know how to ..." and so on. That kind of a bling-blong - well, somebody's run a can't-have on you on music. And you've gotten the immediate back response from it, see.

I know Mary Sue used to get the ideas all the time that she had to write a book. All right. In spite of past track, which she could have added up very easily into something like that, it was true that a member of her family used to run a can't-have on her on books. But it wasn't a can't-have that was that easily explained. It was another type of can't-have entirely, because people didn't want her to read. See? So somebody didn't want her to read wound her up in the necessity to create a book which had nothing to do with the price of fish. Got the idea? So this is how you can track one back.

It's a reactive law, not a knowing law. All creativeness, fortunately, was not a necessity-driven affair. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the creativeness that goes on is totally spontaneous. It has no connective action. But a spontaneous creativeness, of course, is usually an able creativeness and a reactive creativeness is usually for the birds. It is terrible. Have you seen any cubist paintings lately, man? That answered?

_Male voice: Thank you, Ron._

Good enough. Okay?

_Male voice: What's the purpose, and when do you run a negative Sec Check ?_
What's the purpose and when do you run a negative Sec Check? Ah, I'm glad you brought up that point. I've been meaning to tell you about them. I neglected to issue a bulletin. Nobody's run can't-haves on me lately on bulletins, so I'm not writing them anymore. Last time...

Negative Sec Check – may I just cover the whole subject?

*Male voice:* Yes.

What is the reason why your pc advances in auditing and gets new answers on the Sec Check? He's gone over them before, he hasn't remembered that he did anything on these Sec Checks. You see, he hasn't remembered stealing anything and now he gets some advance in his responsibility in auditing and you can tell whether or not he's had any advance because now you ask him if he's stolen anything, he suddenly remembers something and it's rough to clear the question. Don't think that you missed the question before. You have raised his responsibility level so that he does remember.

Well, by raising his responsibility level, you have also made him braver and he doesn't hold everything as not-ised as before. Now, on negative Sec Checking, I refer you to the lecture of a few days ago on the subject of not-isness. You should know how to do this trick. It's a brand-new trick. I just whipped it up to speed up the withhold situation. It's just speedup. If you'll notice, that's about all we're working on right now. We're working on speedup. We're working on more cases reached and reached faster.

All right. Now, this is part of it. Why sit around and wait for this withhold to come up? Why not just knock it into existence? Well, how would you knock it into existence? Well, you'd as-is the not-is. You ask him the not – a couple of not-is questions.

See, this is processing check. This isn't a Security Check, but I suppose you could use it as a Security Check for employment or something of the sort and it would be much more reliable. But this is plain murder. You say to the fellow "When haven't you stolen something?" Well, he has to spot something on the time track, you see, and he has to spot another one on the time track and if you've got any needle response, I certainly wouldn't bother to clear it with that question. But I might run the question longer. Got the idea?

If I were getting needle response, that would only tell me to ask the question a couple of more times. It's a little auditing process that you run in there with the question, don't you see. "When haven't you stolen something? Very good."

Now, you pop the question to him, "Have you ever stolen anything?" "Uh-hiuckieogkiyeougluh." You've practically got it all answered. In other words, you scraped the not-is off the top of the question and of course you got to the meat under it almost at once. And although it is – there are more questions and more processes and more statements involved, you will find this will speed a Security Check.

Now, your question of "When should you use this?" is quite important. You should use this on any Security Check which promises to have a long duration. Do you know we've had some forty-three hour and thirty-six hour Security Checks around here? One time through Joburg HCO WW Security Form 3. Thirty-six, forty-three. *Ka-wow,* man, I mean that's a long time through a Security Check.
Well now, why? Why did it take this long? Well, actually the poor pc was just being tortured to death, because they didn't remember and yet the needle was falling. Now, everything was trembling right on the verge of memory. But not sufficiently on the verge of memory that the pc could find out about any part of it.

All right. If you're going to get a fall, it must be a terribly thin crust you see, that you have to penetrate. So, if you're going to get a fall, you say, "Well, have you stolen anything" you get a read. And you say, "What was that?"

And the pc says, "I haven't got the faintest notion. Let me see. Could it be this? Could it be something or other?"

And you say, "Well, have you ever stolen ... Good. Have you ever stolen anything?"

"Let's see, it might be this, it might be that."

And, "Have you ever stolen anything?"

"Oh, could – oh, I can't ..." Just comm lag. They don't remember.

When you run into that kind of a phenomenon, just treat every question with a negative check. Just take the crust off of it and let it explode.

What you're doing is "Not-is stealing. Not-is stealing. Not-is stealing. Okay. Thank you very much. Now, have you ever stolen anything?" Bowwww! If the answer is there, he's going to know about it. Got it? And that's why you would use it, and that's on what you would use it and actually that is how to use it.

Now, there's one little question there I haven't answered completely and that is how many times do you ask this question? Well, this would be a gradient scale of how rough is it to get a withhold off this pc. If your pc is running easily on a Security Check, you don't use it at all. If the pc is having a little trouble, use it once or twice. If the pc is having a lot of trouble, use it five or six times. And that's why you would establish it and it is unfortunately a matter of judgment. That answer your question?

Male voice: Yes, very much so. Thank you.

Okay. You bet.

Female voice: So one point on that – it's make a point of "When." They ask "When haven't you stolen anything? When haven't you looked at pornography?"

Yeah. You mustn't ask this question: "Have you never?" That's for the birds, man.

Male voice: Thank you.

Kawow, kawow, kawow, because the guy's telling a lie, of course, if he's got a reaction on it, isn't he? You must always ask an auditing question that can be answered. That's one of the laws of commands. It must be answered.

Another law of command is: that you mustn't ask a question which if answered would be a lie. And "Have you never" is a lie. You see. Because right away you've invalidated the pc, so you've disobeyed the Auditor's Code. You say, "Have you never stolen anything" and the pc says – well, he doesn't know whether to answer yes or no or right or wrong, and he
finally in desperation says no. And then you say, "Well, have you ever stolen anything?" If you said that right afterwards, and so forth and he said yes, this would make him look like a liar.

It's one of these legal questions, something on the basis of "Now, answer the following question yes or no", the prosecuting attorney says, "Do you still beat your wife?" Of course, you can't answer that yes or no and you're hung, you see! And that's another. So it must be "When haven't you?" and then make them recall an actual time. And it'll seem to the fellow like ... on some of these cases where the question is real live, it looks real funny, by the way. It just looks like they must have been doing it day and night all of their lives, because they can't find a moment on the track when they weren't doing it! [laughter]

It has several side effects too. It knocks into reality the fact that the guy does have charge on it. We're, of course, adapting the negative processes of old SOP 8-C in its fullest sense, in some of these respects. The moment we move into games condition, we're right back to SOP 8-C, 1953-54.

Okay. Any other question? Yes?

Female voice: Since Routine 1A has come out, does this mean that now 1 is not good for half the Scientologists in the world?

Oh, that doesn't mean so. It does mean this: that it's a speedup.

Female voice: Mm-hm.

1A is a speedup, and I – you want to know if Routine 1A, since Routine 1A comes out – does that say that Routine – cancels the statement that Routine 1 is necessary on about half the Scientologists in the world. Yes, I'd say it modified this statement, because it's showing itself up as being a very beefy process.

Running – you see now it's further refined. We're getting it into real dynamite now. You have – you've got any Problems Process, you've got any Games Condition Process addressed to problems, confusions or motions – that all comes under the same routine. You've got a negative Security Check plus your positive Security Check and this is something on the order of this poor little suffering pc was doing all right and we were making good headway with him and then we started bringing up shotguns and rifles, decided that wasn't good enough and brought up a little bit of antitank armor [laughter] and you know, here it went. So that actually, the processes are so beefed up along this line that a tremendous number of these cases now that would have been included in that one-half are reachable, without running Routine 1. Okay?

Female voice: Okay.

Thank you for asking. Any other questions?...

Well, I'm glad you all know it! I'm glad you all know it.

Now, the new students are, of course ... Let's see, what day is this? This is Wednesday, isn't it?
This is Wednesday and a couple of students got here Tuesday. They've been here now twenty-four hours or forty-eight hours. They've been here really forty-eight hours and they've passed all of their examinations.

Female voice: Yeah.

Ah, that's pretty slow! [laughter] We're dead serious about that though, dead serious.

Actually, the beginning of learning is a discovery that there is zones of not-knowingness. Up to that time you're liable to go along like the old-time pilot that was – he was never taught to fly, he just got into an "airplane" and he just flew it, you know and the wings kept brushing the trees and he always flew with the left wing low and a few things like that, but he never paid much attention to that because he was still alive and it was still flying, wasn't it? Well, that's enough answer to him, you see.

Now, you take a hold of this guy and you try to correct any of his errors or retrain him on any of his mistakes and he doesn't pay a cotton-picking bit of attention to you because he doesn't think there's anything that he doesn't know. And of course, right now you're in a position where you can catch the tips of your wings in more bushes and trees; you're flying lower and slower and – higher and faster than you've ever flown before. Actually, it's marvelous how few upsets occur.

Now, of course, this is invalidative of training and one's past training and all of that sort of thing to insist so suddenly on it. But let me point out this horrible thing: If your past training was real good, why worry about taking an examination? E-Meter for instance – E-Meter has just been codified for the first time. That's why that becomes very important – with E-Meter Essentials. And I swear, I don't think there was anybody in the whole world could run an E-Meter. It is completely fantastic, but I don't think anybody was. E-Meters were telling lies to people and so forth.

I'm certain that none of these poor people in the States that were getting all swamped up in PDHs and that sort of thing – I am sure that there wasn't a single one of them knew the top of a meter from the bottom of a meter, you know. And you didn't even have to know the refinements of compartmenting questions. I don't know, I think they thought the tone arm wobbled when you asked a question, you know? Tone arm never wobbled, the E-Meter didn't work. Say "Do fish swim?" No motion on the tone arm. One time, no motion. You point out to them, "Look, you have to reach over and take hold of the tone arm and move it before the tone arm moves." And they say, "Oh, is that right?" [laughter] I'm sure being snide today.

Okay. All right. Are there any other questions?

Female voice: Would you just say a word about these obsessive people who talk about how they must, you know, react on the E-Meter and how, when they think about something, well, then it doesn't react, but other times they think about something, and it does, and you know, they're in real competition with the E-Meter.

Well, that's a dodge of withholds, when you see that worry. Now, you don't mistake me. I will not tell you a lie. You're talking about people who say they can push around E-Meters and so forth. Well, I will not kid you. An E-Meter can be pushed around.
But I'll tell you frankly, I can't counterfeit a reaction when I push around an E-Meter. It does not look like any reaction I ever saw come off of a pc. I'm just not smooth enough. My touch isn't sufficiently delicate. But I can move a needle back and forth by just putting a beam on it and moving it back and forth. You know, I hit it, knock it on the side and it looks like body motion. I know I can't make one read. I can make a Beep Meter play "Yankee Doodle", or push that thing around, but I can't make one read in any kind of a read that is sensible. It's jerky. It'd look like a body motion. If you did see it read, you wouldn't even mistake it for a reading because it would be zz-zz, you know? And you'd say well, the pc shifted his head or something, you know, moved his hands on the cans.

And the first thing you'd say about a pc who was worried about pushing around the meter is that he was not in-session. That would be the first thing you'd say, if he was worried about the meter. The second thing you'd say is that he's got withholds and he's afraid of the meter or the meter disturbs him or the meter is showing him up in some fashion or he's afraid it might show him up. Or you would say, well, he's trying to put up some sort of a pretense of some kind or another that is making – he's trying to impress the auditor, and the effort to impress the auditor gets into the road of the session because he's not there to impress the auditor; he is there to get audited. So that tells you he's not in-session. So I'd say the common denominator of all this is the pc had never been put in-session.

And I could say a lot about this, but I don't mean to condemn anybody because I've heard an awful lot of people talk about this meter and how they could do this and that. But the point I'm making is it doesn't look like anything an auditor would ever mistake for a read. You'd say, well the battery has hit a rut or something of the sort. It would come over and it would go clank, one way or the other, and it would just be too jerky to pay any attention to. Yo?

Male voice: Well, Ron, I may have contributed to a little bit of that confusion. A couple of weeks ago while I was being audited, I was getting great big twangs on the body that weren't showing on the meter and then all of a sudden something would happen on the meter that I had absolutely no idea about it. It's gone now apparently.

All right. But that would be ordinary that you wouldn't know what was happening on the meter. I know I find a great deal of trouble predicting whether the thing fell or not. Because what it's falling on is the unknown. It's what the pc doesn't know about that causes the meter to react. No, I wouldn't worry about that, Wing, whether you did or didn't contribute to it. I'd just like to put the facts straight.

I'm certainly not going to tell anybody that they cannot move an E-Meter needle. I'm not going to tell anybody that. I'm not going to say that a person who is Clear couldn't mock up a mass and read the tone arm high, make the tone arm go high. I couldn't say that either because I could undoubtedly myself sit and think about some juicy organizational problems and then be very careful not to look at any of them. You know, think of a problem and then very carefully not confront it. Think of a problem, not confront it. Think of a problem, not confront it. Think of a problem, not confront it and start to get this tone arm going up. You see, there are various dodges that you could resort to, but this wouldn't have anything to do
with auditing. That's the point I'm making. It doesn't have a thing to do with auditing and it rather tells a person that the person is not in-session or is upset in some fashion.

Now, all of the things that keep a pc out of session are being handled pretty well these days. Those are present time problems, withholds and ARC breaks. Talking to the auditor and interested in their own case: That is being in-session. Now, obviously, part of that is violated when the pc is more interested in the E-Meter reaction than his own case. Or interested in what the E-Meter is saying about his case rather than what his case is all about. His attention is already too extended to fit this thing of "in-session." And I would say offhand – for the benefit of pcs, not their condemnation in any way – that if a pc starts talking about moving the meter or starts worrying about the meter, that the pc has gone out of session and one of the rudiments is out.

And my first action, as a practical action, would simply be to close off the process I was running, smoothly, with my Model Session and do end rudiments and just knock the spots off of those end rudiments; and I would every time find something was wrong. Well, this is not, then, the pc's fault if the rudiments are out. It's the auditor's fault.

All right. So therefore – that's enough about this particular phenomena.

I've got an O-Meter we're busy developing these days. Reg loaned me a couple of great big, powerful scopes. One was streamlined. It was powered with Cadillac engine, I think, and it was extremely easy to push a beam around. It registered mass more easily than it registered thinking. And it was so easy to push a beam around that it was utterly fantastic. I was sitting there with Mary Sue and Dick Halpern, and so forth; I don't think they were even noticing this thing. But I gave up on the thing at once. I found all you had to do was put a beam on the electrodes and it instantly got a different read. It jumped. Well, that is too darned critical. It's almost as if all you do is look at the electrode and the E-Meter reads. So you see, I can't say that it doesn't happen. I can only say that when a pc's doing it, he's not in-session. And the rudiments are out. Okay? All right.

I've spoken about this O-Meter. There is one. It does exist. It could be put into production now. But the top zones of this thing have not been exhausted by most people and we needn't worry about that. We would right now only have a couple of dozen people on Earth that could be audited on it, so skip it. Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: I'm so vague about this, I don't know really how to say it. Perhaps you'll help me. I read someplace or heard someplace that at sometime Havingness plus Confront Processes were used in rudiments. Is there anything ...

You say you heard someplace that Havingness plus Confront Processes were used in rudiments. No, this would not be true.

Female voice: At the beginning of the session.

Ah, yes. This is where the confusion has arisen. After you've done the rudiments and when you begin to audit the pc ...

Female voice: Mm-mh.
When you begin to audit the pc, this is not, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" You've actually started a session. You can run the Havingness and Confront Process to get the pc even more thoroughly in-session, but it's not a rudiment. It's not a rudiment because its purposes are different. The rudiments' purposes have totally to do with the outer environment. You're trying to reorient a pc in his bank when you're running Havingness and Confront Processes and it's totally attached to processing. And just before you finish, it is a very kind thing to straighten out the pc's bank. It's like, you leave an auditing room, it's a very nice thing to put the chairs back in the proper place and empty the ashtray or something like that, you know. Well, similarly, a pc will get along and actually go right on through to Clear, but you can actually leave him parked in the middle of what you were just running and Havingness and Confront Processes move him into PT.

Another thing. You can be running a terminal which it doesn't exist in this life. It just doesn't exist. There hasn't been any. And, all right.

So therefore, all of your Prehav processes on an SOP Goals Routine 3 run would be addressed to past lives – every single command! How is the pc ever going to get up through and scan up to this present life? How's he ever going to get back up to this life, unless you run some Confront? This has strictly to do with a subjective phenomena. Rudiments are basically objective, having to do with the environment, to break it down in an effort to get the pc's main things that keep him out of session off, so that he will get into session.

Now, you set up the bank for auditing and you can set up the bank for auditing with the Havingness and Confront Processes. It's a very nice point and one can be much too picky about the thing. But they couldn't possibly be part of rudiments because if they were part of rudiments, then you would only run them at beginning and end of a session and this is not what you do with them. You can run them at the end of every process.

Let's say you are going to shift processes in the middle of the session without going through a whole bunch of rudiments or something of the sort. Well, a beautiful way to shift processes is to end this process, run some Havingness and Confront and reassess. That's a preliminary to a reassessment. The pc isn't answering the auditing commands too well, seems to be struggling and bungling and flobbling along. You don't seem to be getting anywhere and the tone arm action sort of died out. Well, there's two things you can do. One is go back and cover the rudiments and end the session; which is a rather time-consuming activity if, usually, a very beneficial one. Or you can simply give him a kick with Havingness and Confront and continue on with the process and the thing now gets active. You understand their purpose and use a little better?

*Female voice*: Yes.

All right. Okay.

*Female voice*: I think where I heard it, it was not stated that it was in the rudiments. I think in my confusion I put it there. It was in the beginning of the process, so instead of in the process I put it in the rudiments, in my thoughts. That's why I asked you about it.

*Second female voice*: Mm-mm. She just was explaining why she was confused. Mentally she made a mistake, is all I'm saying.
All right. Okay. Good enough. Good enough. All right. Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: I would like to ask what vitamins or what composition of vitamins would be taken in an intensive and if they were allowed vitamin B1 and C and iron and nicotinic acid.

Oh, well, you're talking about an interesting subject. You want to know what vitamins could be taken to what? What is your exact question?

Female voice: It is usually advice to take in a longer intensive or how do you ...

Good advice to take these things in a longer intensive and so on. All this is perfectly true. You're talking about GuK is its oldest phrase. More politely, latterly, Dianazene and other such mixtures. All of them, however, directed at different targets.

The target of the atomic bomb is what gave us Dianazene and that is the one which has the iron and everything else in it. Now, let's see, what is the formula for a Dianazene? I think it's 100 milligrams of B1 – something on the order of this; this would be a workable formula anyhow – 15 grains of dicalcium phosphate (or calcium), 250 milligrams of ascorbic acid (vitamin C). Now, that all by itself is GuK. That isn't the original GuK, but that's the component parts of the original GuK that worked. Folic acid and several other items – iron and so on – had nothing to do with the original GuK and its performance. So those three items were the original GuK. And that is vitamin B1, 100 milligrams, 15 grains of dicalcium phosphate and 250 milligrams of vitamin C (ascorbic acid). Now, that was GuK.

And to this, if you add iron and 100 milligrams of nicotinic acid – not niacinamide (that has no reaction at all). It's nicotinic acid; it's that vitamin which goes under that heading. And if you add a 100 milligrams of that and a few grains of iron – it doesn't much matter how many grains of iron – you'll start running off all of the sunburns, all atomic blast flushes. You'll have a ball, man. You'll be on fire one moment and getting cold the next and it's hotter than a pistol. It feels like bathing in mustard.

And in addition to that, its basics have something to do with skin cancer because once in a while some brave soul taking this stuff has turned on – or this has happened now and then – has turned on skin cancer per se – itself – in person. And it has run right straight on through and turned off again, providing he persisted. So we can assume that radiation and so forth has something to do with cancer. We can probably expect more cancer in the world now with atomic bombs around or something of the sort.

All right. The reason why this rationale came about is very simple; is nicotinic acid is listed in the "pharmacopoeia" – I'll bet you can't say that [laughter] – anyway, is listed as a – a drug which produces a drug rash and this doesn't happen to be correct.

But I have also – I've been informed – informed by the powers that be; who of course know all – that if it isn't in the "pharmacopoeia," it isn't true. And that it's the "pharmacopoeia" that sets up the standards of chemistry throughout the world and if they made a misprint in Mendel's chart or something like that, why, Mendel's chart would have had it, you see. And iron would no longer weld or something, so they had to be awfully careful with their typographical errors. So it is listed as a dangerous drug because it turns on a flush.
Well, the observation was originally – I was trying to find some drug mechanism when they were having such a time exploding atomic bombs. Oh, they were enjoying themselves. Boy, were they enjoying themselves. And every time it rained, you could take a Geiger counter and you could point it down at a gutter and it'd go brrrrrrrrrrr. Fallout was falling all over the world, and so forth.

I was walking down the street in Washington one day and said there must be something here and then I suddenly remembered that – the tremendous amount of research we did on this earlier, that sunburn was turned on and run out by nicotinic acid. Sunburn. Very interesting. Now, the odd factor which totally disagrees with the pharmacopeia is simply this: It produces a body flush, but why always in the shape of a bathing suit? [laughter]

You know, that's an interesting one. That's – I suppose the medicos would explain that by the fact that the various nerve centers as they go through the body end at those points. But it's very remarkable. You can take some of this stuff and if you've been out this summer sun-bathing in a swimming suit, the flush occurs exactly where the swimming suit wasn't. It's remarkable. Leads to better clinical research. Very interesting.

Anyway, this point is coupled with the fact that there was something which turned on a radiation burn. There was something that did, because sunlight is radiation. I know in – just a few short years ago they were teaching in all the public schools that the sun was a burning ball of hydrogen, which was regulated by the Thames Water Board or something [laughter] and it doesn't happen to be true. The sun is a ball of incandescent atomic fire. And that's what the sun is and sunburn is nothing more nor less but radiation burn. That's all.

Okay. Let's take a look at this, and sure enough, those people who'd been unlucky enough to be around the sites where they were testing – and we had some of these available – boy, they would turn on a nicotinic acid flush the likes of which you never heard of and it was no longer relegated to the shape of a bathing suit, but was relegated to the shape of work clothes. Interesting. Guy working down in the desert with a low necked shirt, you know and it would just be exactly these areas on the backs of his hands and it would be the very places he would get it.

And we did quite a few tricks with this, but we were experimenting around. It was simply a stopgap proposition. There's a serum – I think they've developed a serum and if you shoot somebody with a horse needle with this serum; I think if you shoot him every ten minutes – you shoot a quart of serum into him every ten minutes, in event of atomic fission, he will get sick. I think that's the limits and workabilities of the existing atomic energy serum. It's just grim. In other words, they've done nothing.

Now, as far as the problems of civil defense are concerned, the amount of equipment necessary to handle one atomic burn victim is something to the value of three to five thousand pounds and requires something of the order of a large hospital room to house. I think this is very interesting because there's enough to treat several hundred people, for instance, in the British isles. You could treat several hundred, but the last time I looked at the population count it wasn't several hundred.

So I thought that it might be a good thing to know in event of atomic war that we would get – we might have some chemical assist so that maybe the people who were only
slightly frazzled and so forth, could – could come out of it. And it would have to be very simple. It would have to be some common drug, some common pill.

Well, there are societies in England that are having an awfully good time fighting the cigarette. They can't do anything else, so they fight cigarettes. And they say that the cigarette causes lung cancer. And they've – you've been hearing something of this, I'm sure. Yeah. Not smoking enough will cause lung cancer. Not smoking enough will cause lung cancer! If anybody is getting a cancerous activity in the lung, the probabilities are that it's radiation dosage coupled with the fact that he smokes. And what it does is start to run out the radiation dosage, don't you see. But I'd say that would be better than not running out any of the radiation dosage at all and the number of lung cancer cases which exist, of course, that don't smoke are just forgotten about by these societies, but they are very numerous.

Anyway, there's nicotinic acid in that cigarette. Inevitably, on inhalation of tobacco, you will get some of this phenomena of face flush, but in view of the fact that a cigarette isn't pushing its smoke over the outside of the body but on the inside, of course, you run it out internally.

But if you will notice – if you've had many sunburns, that a – that cigarette smoke stings. You can hold cigarette smoke up close to your face for quite a little while and you'll get it stinging. Or all of a sudden you get some kind of a lip upset or it'll start burning or something of that sort. Well, it's the same phenomenon. The same phenomena. It's the same stuff.

Anyway, we gratuitously were going to help out the tobacco companies and then found out that they had appointed a Committee for the Defense of tobacco Companies, and this committee is in the research business. And some guy goes around, and he's got a lot of letters after his name and he gets everybody to contribute a lot of money so that he's then permitted to sit at a desk and shuffle papers. And then he takes all the papers that are issued him and he writes new reports, you see; and then they go to some other society, and they take all those papers, and then they write new reports on his papers, you see. And then, they have another society, and they write new reports on these two societies' reports, you see; and then the first guy has still got a job because he can still rewrite the papers of the third society, you see. And they get this circle going and that is what is called research. Never – never be bumbled as to why they don't get anyplace much with research in this society because that is – I'm not even being sarcastic – that is the way they do it. They grab all of the funds for appropriation and then run a can't-have of knowledge on everybody, see, by circulating these papers. You've seen them do it.

The US government has gone insane on this subject. My God, you could walk into the US Government and you could set a spaceship down in the middle of the Pentagon, fully equipped with crews, oxygen supplies, and call all the generals out and say, "All right now, boys. We're going to go up to the moon and bring you back a sample of the stuff – whatever's up there." Take off, go to the moon, bring them back a sample, present them with a sample, give them all the photographs; they've had you on radar all the way and so forth and they would turn around to their research department to find out whether or not it was possible to build such a spaceship! And of course, the research department has only been reading their
own papers, so of course, they say, "No, it is not possible to build a spaceship" and you would have had it.

They're really going to lay one terrific egg on research one of these days because it's getting more and more the old school tie and it's all tied in and it's all this and it's all that; and they are just rewriting papers. And this Committee for the Defense of Tobacco Manufacturers is one of these outfits. See, we've had enough correspondence with them to know what the old school tie is all about, you see and we've just been trying to tell them that probably it is because people don't smoke enough cigarettes. And we can prove that you can actually get rid of the effects of atomic fission using the ingredients of a cigarette. Which of course, what would this do to this anti-tobacco campaign which is now upsetting the income of tobacco companies. But that is a solution, and they're only in the business of problems, so they don't want anything to do with it at all.

I've detoured, but I thought I might tell you something about that because I found it rather amusing when it was happening. I knew definitely what was happening.

That's why we get research done, is because we research. We look. We observe and then we don't spend the rest of our lives getting into arguments with people about what we wrote about it. You see, it's the basis of whether or not it works, not the basis of whether or not we are qualified to judge. Does it work or doesn't it work and that's the whole criterion and that makes us kind of new and strange. All right.

Dianazene is the whole mixture of the ancient Guk plus nicotinic acid and is used only for the purpose of the discharge of radiation and is an experimental drug but does do some remarkable things. So much for that.

Guk, on the other hand, for fifty-seven minutes after a dose of Guk is taken, a pc runs at a much accelerated rate because of the chemical boost, by actual test – by E-Meter, and so on. It does speed auditing for the first fifty-seven minutes after the dose is taken, for that exact period of time. This was very carefully researched.

Female voice: That would be Guk only?

That's the old Guk. That's the first three-item formula which I gave you. If you have nightmares, you should take some Guk. [laughter] That's right. If you're having nightmares during auditing or something, you've simply drifted out on B1 and you want it to drop off [snaps fingers] and take some Guk. It's a chemical assist. That's what it is.

Furthermore, it will run engrams through all by itself, too, which is quite interesting When you start taking this stuff periodically day after day – you take a dose of it every day regularly as a clock, and a somatic will progressively go on through and move – you'll move through an engram. Nutrilite, and some of these other substances, have this same basis, but not in these proportions.

And these proportions are so alarming to a chemist that they just don't know what they're looking at. And yet with great aplomb they will give 100 milligrams of B1 to people, without the calcium and without the ascorbic acid and it sets them up to lose all their bones and teeth, because B1 will find ascorbic acid from the teeth and gums and will find calcium from the bones and teeth if you start feeding somebody with it. It'll find it in the body. And so
you better put it there in the stomach for it to discover real fast. Otherwise it softens up all of the bone structure of the body, which is quite interesting

Shows you the irresponsibility of some of the drug companies like Abbot, Parke, Lilly, Menninger and some of these other drug companies. [laughter] These characters are uniformly having a happy time pushing out into the hands of doctors and psychiatrists, heavy enormous doses of B1 which are given by the needle and given by oral, and so on. They just give enormous doses of this stuff, and it's just knocking people to pieces. They never even bothered to find out if there was any supplementary vitamin had to be given with it.

I think we're the only ones that ever did any research on it, probably because we didn't have any profit motive. Of course, that's a snide remark. I know that Abbott, Lilly and Parke and Davis and all the rest of them – I know they have no profit motive at all. No, they never invest any money in fighting Scientology or drugless healing either. They – never, never, never a penny. They invest it strictly in the American Medical Association and tell them to do it! [laughter]

By the way, there's no Pure Food and Drug Act in England, for which you can be very devoutly thankful. [laughter] But you can buy a bottle of medicine in England and it doesn't have any of its ingredients on it and in America all the ingredients have to be on the thing. But then to make sure, they get the Food and Drug administration which is totally supported and subsidized by the drug people – and if one of the big companies comes in with a new drug – doesn't matter what it does, you know – why, if they're a big company, they get an automatic okay. It's automatic. "Well", they say, "that's Parke-Davis; must be all right."

So they have a sterility pill now in America which was okayed by the Food and Drug Administration, despite the fact that it has about one hundred percent side effects and practically no action on virility. It's almost a hundred percent side effects. It just tears a person to pieces. But because Parke and Menninger or somebody put it out, see, why it was automatically okayed, and they have started actually now, reversing the flow – a good example of flow reverse – and they've actually started okaying only things that are harmful.

They okay the electric shock machines of the psychiatrists even if they are going to short out and kill patients. That's okay. But they won't okay an E-Meter. That's a harmless device so it can't be okayed. They wouldn't okay somebody selling bread pills which are totally harmless, but they would okay somebody selling a sterility pill. I think these sterility pills are the biggest racket anybody ever heard. They are about fifty cents anapiece, and you have to take one a day, and that's fifteen dollars a month, and the net security of them involves with upsetting the entire menstrual cycle, blood upsets; I think it makes people dizzy, huh?

*Female Voice: Sick at their stomach.*

Makes people violently sick at their stomachs and consistently dizzy and – and fixes them so they can't eat, and so forth and so that's the very thing we ought to do.

Every time you get a government bureau set up to guarantee purity, you see, they run a can't-have on impurities on everybody [laughter] until they finally become totally impure. A wonderful example of a games condition. Just gorgeous.
Well, I've talked to you quite a while here, and you're way overdue and probably anxious to get home so that you can get back in time!

I'm very happy with the case results which you have been resulting. Doing a good job of auditing. All except those, of course, who have just come lately and we can't expect anything more than that and we're not going to worry about it particularly. We won't worry about it till Friday!

Saint Hill, by the way, doesn't have any dungeons. There are no dungeons at Saint Hill. There's only the remains of some. And down here there's an – the old wine cellar looks like a dungeon and the electric door on it has nothing to do with the fact that atomic fission has been used in there or anything. And the actual entrance to the dungeons has been sealed. And there was an entrance in there. If you go in and inspect the bricks very carefully you will find out where the dungeons are. They were right back under the terrace back there. It was an old Norman castle sat on this site before 1733 and its dungeons are still there. The boys discovered them the other day and we're not going to use them ... before Friday. [laughter, applause]
GAMES CONDITIONS

A lecture given on 20 July 1961

How are you!

Gee! Green light out there. Look at that! Storm coming. Yeah, green light. I remember being in the middle of a Kansas – what do they call them out in Kansas? Tornadoes. They call them tornadoes. That's it. It sounds utterly incredible. The wind went up to about a hundred and some miles an hour and you couldn't see fifty feet and everything was as bright green as pea soup. I never heard of it happening that way and then twenty-five pound blocks of ice started raining out of the sky. And I said, "This is Kansas." And then I said, "And they took it away from the Indians." [laughter] It's quite startling.

Well, I think this is the 20th of July, AD 11. I asked you for questions yesterday and answered quite a few of your questions and today I probably ought to tell you about something, if I can think of anything to tell you about. There's very little doing.

I have an announcement. In addition to the three other course Clears that were made on the HGA Course in Johannesburg, another Clear has been made by the HGC in Johannesburg in the last twenty-four hours. Little girl recently off the HPA Course by the name of Spinder, using Routines 2 and 3. I'm bringing you up to date on the thing.

You see, now, the oddity why some people get Clear and some people don't get Clear has a lot to do with the ability to confront problems. This was apparently the random factor involved in this sort of thing. In other words, the rudiments factors. They were so oppressive with some cases that they went nowhere. And you just ground and ground and ground and picked off a grain of wheat and chaff and picked off another grain off the pile and it was going slow because the rudiments were out, but the person's responsibility was not up to knowing that they were out and so they didn't register. You get what I mean? I mean the guy is so disturbed by his present time environment he never gets down to the basics of clearing.

Okay. Let me see. There was something to talk to you about. What was it? What was it? It had something to do with the aspects of um – oh, I think it was problems.

There are a number of ways of running problems and I'd better bring this to your attention. When you say Games Condition Process, you mean that it is an interchangeable, negative bracket. In other words, it's interchanged between person A and person B or person B and person C and person C and person B. I don't care how many legs the bracket has got on it, but it is basically a denial of interchange. Whatever it is, it's a denial.

Now, a Games Condition Process – a model process – would be worked out on an E-Meter for the pc. All commands should actually be worked out on an E-Meter. I can give you certain blanket commands that will work on everybody – on some very well and on some mildly well, just because of the variation of the auditing command from pc to pc. Certain things are not meaningful to some pcs and certain things are.
So any auditing command should be cleared on a meter before you run it, any auditing command.

When I tell you to run such-and-so and so-and-so, I will generally give you one that has a high general workability on all pcs. But at the same time, I'm liable to give you one and tell you to "assess the command."

Now, this means that there's probably a much more workable workability to be found for this command in the particular pc you are running.

Now, there are certain vagaries associated with commands which you should know and I, however, am not going to at this time try to sputter off all the rules that govern commands. As far as I know, they've never been written up. I've never written them down in column form – one, two, three, four – and said this is the laws of the origin of command, mostly because I know them but haven't particularly articulated them. I can sort out commands and know whether they work and know whether they don't work. It's quite complex. There are certain things that are workable and certain things that aren't and you see all these things represented in the bulk of the work. That is a whole subject all by itself and you should identify it as such. It is a whole subject of its own.

Now when I say a games condition, I mean an agreement on can't-have amongst various relationships of people or beings. It is an agreement of can't-have and you are likely to find this as the first thing your pc tells you.

"Did you ever deny anybody else a thought?" should be then followed: "Somebody else giving you a thought?" Got the idea? I mean, at once your pc is liable to come up with the fact that it ought to be "have" for self and "can't-have" on others.

Now, that is a true games-condition condition as far as that is concerned, but you're looking for the game. And the game was an agreement, so it is can't-have on the other fellow and the other fellow "can't-have" on you and he "can't-haves" on other people and other people "can't-have" on him. You get the idea? And it – it is just a total agreement about this and only then do you get it nailed in brass.

Now, the disagreements which come up off of this line are immediately and directly on the surface of it and actually could be run. You say, "All right, get the idea of refusing problems to another and get the idea of another giving you problems." You're going to get meter reaction and it will run. There is no doubt about this and there's actually nothing wrong with running it this way, except that it's not very fundamental. You see?

You're looking for the time when everybody was in agreement because it is agreement which nails it in concrete, you see. When you have a widespread can't-have agreement, then you get mass and all kinds of electronic phenomena, see. Everybody agrees this should exist, therefore it is the thing to do!

You want to know what happened to man under the Christian civilization – you had a widespread agreement on can't-have of sex. See? It was very broad and I know that I probably get my share of criticism for chopping up other people's religions and so forth. I'm not chopping up other people's religion. I'm sure you were part of a space-opera party that planted christianity on this planet. [laughter]
This situation of Christianity and a can't-have on the subject of the second dynamic: now that is about the most fundamental can't-have that you can run. That is "can't create", see. Denying other people creations and other people denying you creations and one and all are in total agreement that we deny creations and what does this do? Man, this not-ises a reactive bank into action and limbo faster than you can spit. If people aren't crazy, they'll make it in very short order.

Now, if you see how idiotic this is, let's put it on the subject of pottery. Let's get some kind of a religious wingding going of some kind or another in which it is an offense against some mythical god, who is all-powerful and who will choke down your throat at the least thing and take your thetan out of your head while you sleep and do all the other things this mythical all powerful might do – any kind of a god you want to invent – and then let's have this god have as the finest, highest crime that he can imagine, somebody making some pottery.

All right. Now, therefore, nobody in the society is going to be permitted to make pottery. Now we rig it at the same time that the society is totally dependent on pottery for all of its economic stresses and strains and carry on.

Let's say England – let's set up England you see, so England has only one thing it can do. It has enormous supplies of clay. It has lots of fuel to bake pottery and it ships pottery to all parts of the world and it depends for all of its food and other things on pottery. And now let's get a game going by which, immediately, it is against the law and a criminal offense to create any pottery.

Well now, can't you just see people going around the bend trying to measure up to this thing. You can see it when I put it out there in the clean air, see. They go round the bend. Are they supposed to make pottery or aren't they supposed to make pottery? Don't you see? And they agree that nobody else should make pottery, but they compulsively have to make pottery in order to eat or get paid or have anything to export or use any of their vital, natural resources. And one and all is ready to punish them on the one hand for making pottery, but they're going to be punished like mad for not making pottery.

Now, wouldn't that be an interesting thing. You can see this case in court, case number 362, followed by case number 363. And case 362 has something or other to do with whether or not we have fed the family. And the fellow goes to prison or something of this sort for not having fed or taken care of his family. And he tries to explain to "Your Honor." He says, "But, Your Honor", he said, "I have to uh – uh – you see – the only thing I can do is potter and uh – actually, I was fined last month, you see, for pottering, and uh – so therefore ..."

And the Honor says, "Nothing to do with it, nothing to do with it, nothing to do with it. Ninety years", you see. And case 363 comes up and this fellow is accused – primary crime against the land, of having actually made some pots. They were found in his possession. He was actually – actually did make these pots, and so forth and Your Honor says, "Well, that's ninety years", see and case 364 would have to do ...

Well, of course, this is pure nonsense and idiocy, but what could the society do? It was forbidding its own survival. Eventually, all you'd have to do to anybody in this country is just show them a piece of pottery and they would just start screaming, you see.
Now, let's look at the second dynamic. You've got to have bodies. That's the primary vehicle of locomotion used on this planet is a body. You're not supposed to make them, but if you make them, why, then you're supposed to take care of them, but you're not supposed to make them. And you go to jail for having made them and not taken care of them. You see? Or you go to jail for all sorts of neglect charges and that sort of thing but if you really go flat out and start making bodies like mad in all directions, why, of course, you find yourself in court at once. [laughter] And it's one of these, sort of a cul-de-sac in the Culture, you see. Everybody's dependent when he kicks the bucket, on picking up a new body, but it's sort of against the law to make them.

Now it's against the law also economically. There's a penalty on having children. If you don't believe it, have some and start paying all of the various odds and ends and you can no longer live in a one-room house. You've got to have a three-room house and then you can no longer afford to just sort of sit around in the evening. You've got to work hard in order to pay for the three rooms, which you've just gotten. Only how about the fact you have to work, therefore, you've got to have a nanny or something like that to take care of the child and here we go, you see. We're outward bound.

Now, this is a sort of a penalty mechanism. You see, it's actually a sort of a punishment mechanism and yet, one and all are totally dependent on getting bodies made if bodies are their favorite vehicles. If you're going to have a body and an identity, a beingness, importance, problems or anything else in life, you'd better not show up without a body. People won't pay a bit of attention to you! [laughter]

Now there's more basic law written around the creation, the noncreation, the care of and the noncare of bodies on the subject of the second dynamic than you could easily tabulate up here in the law library in a lot of long English winters. They are innumerable! But running right along with it, worked into the society, is the series of economic penalties of one kind or another.

So it's rather fantastic. Don't you see? You must create bodies. That's obvious, but you must not create bodies. That's also obvious. So when you get a "must" and a "must not", which run right close in together, it isn't enough to run off the contradictory must-must-not situation. You can pull this thing apart because it is in the field of disagreement. These facts do not agree with facts and you can actually start taking them apart with any process you care to take them apart with.

Now a games condition, however, underlies the fact that: how did you get suckered in on this? How did you get so that you could actually accumulate a motivator of this character? And that's the question you'd better ask.

It's like the question I long since should have asked my poor father. He used to complain about money and how it was so expensive, you see, to raise a family. He used to complain about this all the time and of course, the number one question was simply, "Well, why don't you make more money?" Well, obviously he didn't make more money because he knew he was not supposed to. He was already doing something which was just a little bit beyond the pale, you see, in raising a family. Because there is so many penalties connected with having – with doing so, obviously it must not quite be right.
Now, this of course, gave him no resurgent willingness to go on and make the money to raise the family, don't you see? He didn't have any willingness to do it because he was kind of being punished for doing so, and it's very complicated and it's sort of spun in on the thing. Well, you can take all these disagreements apart, and you can cause a considerable resurge in the pc.

But how did you get so you could have a motivator? You must have been party to the can't-have. You must have been party to the can't-have somewhere along the line – an originating part of the can't-have. It would be necessary for you to suffer the consequences. You can't suffer any consequences you didn't have any hand in creating, you know. It's just not possible. So you must have done something that agreed to all this and you must have done it with people, not because they disagreed but because they agreed, too.

So underlying all games conditions, you can very easily suspect that there is a total agreement by one and all that we must all "can't-have." And now what we're doing with the disagreement is disagreeing with the game that we made sure came into being so therefore, you can take the disagreements off the game which we brought into being and you can cause a resurge. Or you can undercut this by getting all of the agreements to have this game, because the game won't persist without the agreements. ARC is always stronger than no ARC.

So that's what a Games Condition Process is all about. It reaches for and seeks to isolate the basic agreements on some kind of a wild game of some character or another and the word "games condition" is a derogatory actually – the words. They mean a very specific, technical fact. There's a technical thing goes along. When you say games condition, you mean a package and the package has to do with this: it means a fixated attention, an inability to escape, coupled with an inability to attack, to the exclusion of other games.

There's nothing wrong with having games. There's a lot wrong with being in a games condition because it is unknown. It is an aberrated activity. It is reactive and one is performing it way outside of his power of choice and without his consent of will. He doesn't want to be there. He doesn't want to be playing this game. He's got to play this game. He has to play this game. He thinks he'd better like this game because he has to play it anyway, you see. And actually, it is an overthrow of the power of choice of an individual. When you say games condition, you mean that somebody's power of choice has been subjugated against his will into a fixated activity from which he must not take his attention. That's a games condition. In other words, it's a sort of a mental trap. It's a sort of a doingness trap. It's a sort of a cotillion in a barred ballroom.

The pc will be the first to tell you that the doors are all shut and locked. There isn't anything you can do but to play this game. There is no dance you can dance but this dance. It's different than jail. In jail you can sit there quietly and meditate upon the sins of your jailers. But not in a games condition. A games condition is a cotillion. You're not even permitted to sit still. You've got to do. You've got to do that. You've got to do something else. These things are all mandatory, and they must be all done in a certain area and always according to some wild ritual of some character or another.
And although the sun may be shining in the village square and the clouds may be caressing the mountaintops round about, that must not be observed. One must never go out there. One must never walk up and down that village square or look at those mountains. That's for sure. There are other people around, but if they are not part of the game, one must have no communication with them. The world in essence becomes massless, spaceless, timeless and peopleless very rapidly. Most marriages that go on the rocks are totally cast in the mold of a games condition. If a marriage is going to go on the rocks, it's just some kind of a games condition.

Here's a typical one. This fellow and this girl. She was a man, and he was a woman. [laughter] Back along the shores of the lower Zambezi when it was a civilization, they happened to be partners to the same execution. Whether they were executed or whether they executed somebody has very little to do with the thing. But they were both involved with this and there was a lot of shame, blame, regret, involvement and can't-have. And they got really snarled up, man. They really got snarled up. If there was anybody's guts they really hated, it was this other person's guts. And that was something we evidently must really do in some future existence, is get even with this person.

So the millennia roll along and one day while calmly picking lotus leaves, [laughter] one looks up and sees passing by in a boat this person. Recognizes him on a sort of a wavelength, God-knows-what principle, you know. Wow, see. Enters into a series of intrigues and eventually gets executed by or executes the person or goes through the whole dramatization again of shame, blame and regret, see.

Now, life is totally narrowed to this point, you see. And time goes on and one is sitting calmly enjoying his martini in a bar in Manhattan and this person sits down at the other end of the bar. Well now, we know by past experience, it does no good to get them executed swiftly. Murder is out. So let's wear them down slowly and the other person, of course, simultaneously gets the same idea and there ensues some kind of a love-hate cycle, resulting in matrimony and we don't know what the devil we're looking at. Of all the misemotionalisms you ever cared to see, you are certainly going to find it in that relationship. Because it's basically based on a total agreement that neither one must have anything: life, liberty, happiness, money, houses, nothing.

Now there have been disagreements with this and one is actually living in the world of disagreement. Of course, the other person must have a house, don't you see. Of course, the other person must have life, of course. And of course, the other person has rights, of course. And every one of these "of courses" are in violent disagreement to the basic games condition, which is a total can't-have on life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness – total denial of any one of those factors. Their tenderest moments are, of course, their moments of wildest disagreement. I mean – not disagreement from the standpoint of fighting, but when they sit down and they say, "Well, we're very fond of each other and everything is going along well", this is the wildest disagreement of it all.

It's pretty goofy to watch one of these things go. Pretty goofy. You can't make head nor tail out of it. All of a sudden one of them gets a chance and it's an oblique chance and they
whip out a bayonet and plunge it – deep, man. But it's usually a legal bayonet of some kind or another.

And out of this, we get all sorts of interesting maxims, none of which are true. Like there is "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned." We read this off, you know and all we see is the later-day disagreement and we see this later-day disagreement and we say well, "Good heavens, what produced all the fury involved with that situation, because they were getting along so well for four or five years, you see. They were getting along so very well and for this to suddenly blow up like that, well, he must have scorned her and she must have gotten even with it, so this thing of jealousy and so on, these are very, very powerful emotions. Oh, they're very powerful." And we assign it all to jealousy and hate and get a whole bunch of cockeyed rules here that have nothing to do with it. No, this thing is not based on some nebulous thing called "jealousy". This thing is based on a desire for sudden death. You see? It's the agreement and disagreement on the motives involved.

When two people get in this condition with each other, they will fixate on each other and the rest of the world ceases to exist. They stop going places. They stop doing anything. They stop going anywhere. They stop living, actually. They sort of sit and stare at each other. It's a fact. You've seen it, I'm sure. That is the end result of a games condition.

Now, there are your conditions of fixation and there is your "cotillion in the locked ballroom". Well, it's like two fighters being strapped together and made to fight and they can see no part of the horizon except the fight. Don't you see? Now that's basically what you're looking at. Games conditions can exist on any dynamic – any dynamic.

I got in a games condition one time – I'm sure you have, too – I got in a silly cycle. I don't know, a trillion, trillennia, trillennia ago. And every time they had a war, why, I went out. I would either be a pilot in, or commander of, or somebody connected with an interceptor squadron on the outside of the capital. Societies used to last longer than they do now. And it wasn't anything for a society to go a billion years without much change.

But, every time the society would get into trouble, usually with the same adversaries, why, that was the drop of the hat. That was the signal. The whistle had gone and you would go down and snappily report to the Seventeenth Interceptor Squadron, which had in charge of it the protection of the capital, don't you see? And the enemy would come over and you would take off in an interceptor and you would go up to the center of the airport and you would either shoot down the attacking plane or be shot down and always at the center of the same airport – for a billion years.

When I ran into that mass on the track, I said, "What is this?" you see. I could see the airport okay. That was fine. I look around and what is this? What is this nonsense that is going on here? Because it is a total stop exactly above the middle of the airport. Of course, there's your overt-motivator sequence always takes place exactly above the middle of the airport. You know, if an enemy attacking the city can just keep the interceptors on the ground, he's got it, you see, and if the interceptors can just get up, why of course, they've got it. They've got protection accomplished. So one of these two things would get accomplished every time there was a war, but nearly always in the same place. I don't think the perimeter varied as much as a square – as a cubic mile.
And you talk about a games condition! Once I collided with the middle of that airport in the bank. I could practically spot the middle of the airport in the physical universe. The area still exists, somewhat decayed, but it still exists. And you talk about a fixated area, you know. You get your attention on it, you just can't get your attention off of it. Your attention goes clang! What it is, it's a games condition. It's totally aberrated, has nothing to do with reality, has nothing to do with anything. If I'd had any slightest idea during this whole period of protecting the capital, I certainly wouldn't have operated in this other sphere, because that wasn't my normal sphere of operation in that society. That's what's goofy, you see.

I simply would have gone on and done a better job diplomatically or politically, don't you see, or moved into diplomatic or political spheres which I wasn't in. See, I would have done something effective or I would have developed some weapons or developed some defense mechanisms or something like that. They didn't do any of those things. War is declared, you know exactly what you're supposed to do. You go out to the Seventeenth Interceptor Squadron. You take down your cap off the wall and they run out the plane. You get in. Up you go. Clang! You have either protected them or not protected them as the case may be. You know, a billion years is a long time to go on the same treadmill.

Frankly, wars being space opera type wars, they rarely lasted more than about thirty days at the outside. So you never had a chance to do anything else but just clang, you know. You're shot down or you shoot somebody else down. Fabulous. Fabulous.

You get what I mean now? That's just a total cycle. I didn't do anything effective for the society at all, ever. Did nothing effective for the society. Because let me assure you the last effective thing you would do with a society is permit enemy planes to approach to the interceptor field on the outskirts of the capital. Well, for heaven's sakes, an enemy ought to be halted somewhere out around the borders of the empire, if you read it in any of the textbooks, you see. But no, that was the thing to do. You got the idea?

That was the thing to do. No reason could interpose in any way, shape or form against that action. I'm sure that people could have stood around by the hour and tried to talk me into the idea that, "Look, if you're so interested in the idea of the capital being protected, then why don't you get interested in training up better pilots for the interceptor squadrons? And put interceptor squadrons out around the borders of the empire. Why don't you do this?" I would have said, "Nope!" You see? "That doesn't sound sensible to me." And it wouldn't have. It wouldn't have sounded sensible either. It would have sounded stupid.

Any good excuse served to go straight back [snaps his fingers] into that same dramatization, don't you see. Bang! Bang! There it was – over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over – and in the course of a billion years, how many times do you think the capital might have been menaced in a very dangerous society, at the rate that if every lifetime we have had a major war here on this planet? Well, they happen even faster in space opera societies. So it must have been about three times a lifetime, for a billion years. Same motion, same movements, they defied all reason and here's what's crashing about it: It wasn't fun! There was no amusement connected with it. There was nothing connected with it. It was just the machine, "Now I am supposed to." You got it?
If you were to train an armed force with implantation – the way they normally do in space opera societies and the way this society is going right now – you would get nothing but that kind of reaction. Nobody would ever do anything effective. Nobody would ever do anything really sensible. The only thing they would ever do is just play the exact game they were implanted to play or were implanting others to play. You got it? That's what they would do: Bang! Bang!

All right. Let's take the case of a Clear I know of right now, who has another person who is not Clear. And this other person cannot understand that there is any slightest advantage in being effective on the standpoint of a continent, you know – effective. Let's do something. Let's clear the people on this continent or something of that sort. No. This other person has two or three games which must be played, you see and none of them have anything whatsoever to do with getting a show on the road in this planet, you see – I mean on that particular continent.

You see, these are all so reasonable! This other person has got to do these games. One, two, three, you see. He's got to do these games and he's very impatient with this other person who is Clear because this other person who is Clear now says, "Well, there's a much broader game. Can't – can't you see?"

"No, no, no. Well, you wouldn't be able to do anything like that and we've got to play these games", you see. And they don't have anything to do with anything. You get the idea? It's a "fixated into this weird cotillion, got to do these things, got to do these things" and "would you like doing those things?"

"No."

"Well, why do you have to do these things?"

"Well, you have to. You see?"

And you say, "Well", let's see, "what are you trying to accomplish in doing those things?"

"Well, that's beside the point."

You would get some very, very interesting reasoning going perhaps, but it wouldn't have anything to do with anything except there's two or three games here, you see, that are – just have to be played and maybe the game is so silly – as silly as this: One has to go down to a particular restaurant and order a cup of coffee and insult the management once a week. And if one can't do that – if one can't do that, why, just one isn't living, that's all, that's it. The game can be as idiotic as that, don't you see.

You get what I mean when I say a games condition? It's a person who is doing – now here's the clue to it – a compulsive confront. In order to do the compulsive confront, he must compulsively assume a certain beingness. And in order to play this game, he must deny a certain havingness. Part of a games condition is really not having, you see. It's denying a certain having. The United States right now in the last two wars has demonstrated itself to be in a war games condition because it cannot have any of the fruits of its victories. They look on it –
they got all kinds of explanations, you know. All they do is take this poor conquered nation and throw it to the wolves. You know, just throw it in the soup – splash.

It is an irresponsibility of such magnitude that you go to these countries and you find that they're kind of mad at the United States. "Well, they conquered us. Well, why don't they do something about it, you know? We're not supposed to have a government now. Where is the government?" Don't you see. The United States is not doing it. The United States is not actually fighting a war. The United States is just getting a kind of a compulsive games condition internationally.

And this compulsive games condition summates into the fact that if certain conditions occur, war will occur. If certain conditions occur, war will occur. And when war occurs, then one goes through certain evolutions and then one makes very sure one only loses havingness – make sure one doesn't gain any havingness. So we isolate another characteristic here of a games condition is: no matter what the person says, he always winds up with no havingness.

You'll see some "writer" (quote) (unquote) in Hollywood, who is being a (quote) (unquote) "writer". You'll see this character. He will be dead broke. He'll be assaulting the studios all the time. He'll be knocking down the doors. (He doesn't, by the way, ever write any stories.) And he is just caroming around and banging around and he is being a writer. He is doing all the actions of a writer, except writing. And if he did suddenly, miraculously move in sideways on actually selling a play or a scenario to TV or something of the sort, he would be the first one to lose the lot. See, somehow or another he would lose every penny of it or something wild and incredible would happen. He would make sure he didn't have a "have".

So you get a plus beingness or you get a beingness which is an obsessive beingness, a doingness which is an obsessive doingness and you get a "can't-havingness", and that's how you identify a games condition. It's a "can't-havingness." A "can't-havingness" is the other end of the thing.

Now, you'll sometimes get a maintenance man around an organization or a janitor in a building or something like that. And this bird is doing everything but the job of janitoring. He can't have this job. He's got to be this, see. He's got to do this. But he winds up running a can't-have on you on the building. He'll run a can't-have on the heat, he'll run a can't-have on the electricity and so on. And then he will work it out so that he eventually doesn't draw his pay. And then he'll work it out so that he's backed totally off of the thing while still fighting into it.

It's a very interesting thing. He's in a games condition on the subject of buildings. His games condition is the attack and destruction of buildings. So he gets a job as a janitor and he goes through some of the weird motions. The motions are weird, but they look almost like the job of a janitor, don't you see. But you don't get any janitoring out of this and you don't have any building and he doesn't have any building. He's totally individuated from this building and he'll eventually back himself totally off the roster. This is quite interesting to watch.

I'll repeat this because it's quite an important factor in a games condition. You get a beingness: compulsive, not wanted; a doingness: compulsive, not wanted and you get a no-havingness. And that's the easiest way to spot a games condition. Now everybody's got a few games conditions, but very few are playing a games condition to the total limit. Those that are
playing a games condition to the total limit are up here in the spinbin. And you'll see those boys playing a total game. All you have to do is identify what game they're playing. It's pretty interesting. You always can, too. Except nobody ever looked at it like that.

All right. You get generals this way and they just become generals because they're supposed to become generals. And they don't want to be generals. And they hate to be generals. And they hate the doingness of generals. And they mustn't do. And they're always saying they hate war. What's he doing as a general if he hates war? That would be the first thing a Roman would ask him: "You mean you don't like fighting wars? Well, what are you doing as a general?" And of course, that's a very sensible question, isn't it?

All right. Now he'll wind up with no havingness. One way or the other, he'll wind up with no havingness. He's trying to run can't-have on the troops. He's trying to run can't-have on the country and he himself will wind up with a can't-have. One of the ways he winds up with a can't-have, you'll see his old age get accelerated madly. He's running himself out of a body, you see. He's running himself out of all the beingness that has anything to do with it and so on. It's all quite interesting.

When you see one of these games conditions, if you've got your eyes open, you inspect one of these things going on and they just defy all logic, of course, because they're obsessive. And they haven't anything to do with the real universe. And that is true of all aberration. Aberration is aberration simply because it has nothing to do with anything that's going on anyplace. It may have a lot to do with what has gone on. But it's got nothing to do with what is going on. The guy is way out of PT.

I imagine there's somebody up in Manchester right now making buggy whips. I'll just bet you. I'm sure. And he'll give you a thousand reasons for it, you know, and they all sound so logical. But this rationale that reasons out a games condition has holes in it. And if you sit and try to argue with it, you're a fool. That's all. You're just a fool to sit and argue with a games condition once you know what it is. Audit it, don't argue with it. You cannot educate a person out of his aberration and that is the end of it. You can audit him out, but you can't educate him out. You can show him, cleanly and clearly.

Well, little Arthur was upstairs just this afternoon, swinging two swinging doors, madly. And he was grabbing hold of the doors. You know how you grab two swinging doors? If you get a coincidence whereby the two doors come together where the hand is also between the two doors, there's no room. Well, he was having a good time swinging doors – now we know how that door got broken. And I showed him the mechanical characteristics of a pair of swinging doors just a little while ago and showed him when his hand was in there when the two doors shut. I showed him there was no space, you know, if they came together at the same instant. And he looked that over and he inspected that very, very carefully and he sort of says, you know, "Well, what do you know", you know and knocked it off. He hadn't realized there would be no space between those two swinging doors. He was not in a games-condition with regard to swinging doors.

Now, if he was in a real games condition with regard to doors, you would have found him up there ten minutes later doing the same thing, don't you see, even though he'd found out he could get his hands squashed. Got the idea?
So you stand around and you try to tell this fellow that if he keeps riding this motorcycle at ninety-five miles an hour on wet roads – which motorcycles aren't supposed to be run on anyhow – flat out, particularly with no attention to his brakes or anything else and you just keep telling him that when you're on a wet highway you should take it easy, you see, on a motorcycle. You give him safety rules, in other words. Hasn't anything to do with it and nothing to do with him. He's in a games condition on this subject and a games condition is going to wind up with what? Can't-have! No motorcycle, no body.

Now, it's very much better if somebody else also winds up with no vehicle and no body. That's much better. Get the idea? And here sit all these road safety committees. And by the way, I resigned the other day from the Road Safety Committee. I didn't tell them why. I didn't tell them why because they won't adopt a program. That's why. You could lick all these traffic problems in ten minutes. You'd have to screen the drivers and that's the one thing they're unwilling to do.

You'd have to find out what drivers present are in a games condition on the subject of driving. You'd have to screen that out. It'd take 10 percent of the drivers off the road, bang! Just like that. Your accident rate would go down. Somebody could drive on the roads.

They're not about to do anything like that. That's an invasion of privacy. Oh, I don't know. The last time somebody shoved a radiator through my bonnet, I thought it was an invasion of privacy, too. [laughter]

Well, now you understand a little more about this?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, let's take up another subject which is quite comparable to this. I'll take up both of these subjects one after the other here, mostly because I'm going to have a week holiday on you. So I won't be talking to you next week. I'll be talking to you promptly when I get back. You haven't digested all of this yet, so why ... [laughs, laughter]

I haven't had a holiday for some years. Anyhow, the – and I'm not taking one now, actually.

The situation with regard to the person who cannot influence his bank with thinkingness is of great interest to a Scientologist. The gradient scale of inability to recover from aberration is the gradient scale of lessening ability to influence one's own thinkingness or mind. In other words, less effect, less effectiveness.

The gradient scale of less effectiveness eventually winds up in no ability to affect – no ability to affect. And now you give this fellow an auditing command and of course, he really doesn't do the auditing command, but anyway, if he did the auditing command, he still wouldn't have any effect on his thinkingness. Got the idea?

Now in view of the fact that this person is the one who breaks auditors' hearts and gives people loses, an understanding of the anatomy of that phenomena – this is not, by the way, a peculiar case. This is all cases I'm talking about. All cases sit at some level of inability to influence the reactive bank. When you clear them, you have simply raised their ability to influence the reactive bank, that is all. You got it? I mean that is all you've done, if you say
this. Now they are effective and can be effective and what they think is effective, don't you see, and so on.

Now therefore, it is of great interest to you how they get into a condition where they cannot affect the bank. How do they get into the condition where they cannot affect the bank? I've been talking about this phenomenon now since 1954 and I've said it many times. I never had a clear-cut way of stating the exact anatomy or its immediate cure. We have the total recovery on this now.

Now, how does he get into this condition so that he cannot influence his bank or his aberration or anything else and so you have difficulty auditing him?

Well, it's the story of withhold. This fellow is backing right on out from life, see, withhold, withhold, withhold, withhold. He's denying this, that and the other thing. He's in games conditions of various characters, but basically with – part of his games condition is withhold. And you can recognize at once that a withhold is a denial of something to somebody else, so all withholds have something to do with a games condition.

All right. So he develops a withhold. Well, now that immediately gives him a "can't reach." If he's withholding, he can't reach. So you get a "no reach out" and a "pullback". All right. Now we multiply this. We get another "no reach out" and a "pullback" and we get a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and a "no reach out" and a "pullback" and we keep doing this. And eventually this fellow practically exits from the dynamics one after the other. And the gradient scale of how he leaves various dynamics has already been discussed as early as 1950, in the autumn. Departure from the dynamics.

Now he can't leave the dynamics, so he inverts in them. You see, he's doing something he can't do and nevertheless, as far as he's concerned, his effort is to leave the various dynamics or livingnesses or universes or whatever.

So his effort to leave, of course is compounded with a withhold and a "not reach." So you get the withhold combined with a "not reach." And, of course, you get an apparent departure while he's still there but you certainly get an ineffectiveness, because you cannot drive cars that you are in maybe, but you are not reaching in any way and from which you are totally withholding yourself. You can't sit in the back seat of a car and drive one. That's not possible. Not unless it's specially built like an old Ford I fixed one time and used to stand everybody's hair on end. Sit in the back seat smoking a stogie with a derby hat down over my eyes and drive around town. It was very upsetting to people. [laughter]

The "mustn't reach" is a "mustn't be reached", of course and you get how punishment downgrades because punishing other people and people punishing him, this just compounds the withhold, don't you see. So the person is less and less reaching, less and less reaching, less and less contacting.

We see this in many ways. Eventually where the contacts will be so sporadic and so ineffective in certain directions that they amount to practically destruction. Everything they touch, you know, like machinery – you've seen somebody with machinery and every time they just look at machinery, it all stops or the gears go clang or something like this.
Well now, that is a games condition with machinery. And one withholds himself from machinery and doesn’t reach the machinery and withholds himself and doesn’t reach the machinery, you see, because his can’t-have on the machinery prevents him from reaching it and then he withholds and he withholds and eventually, he can't communicate sufficiently with machinery to do anything but wreck it. Even though he intended to fix it, he'd wind up wrecking it.

A little kid who was just trying to rehabilitate himself in the next lifetime, you see, and you give him an alarm clock. And he might have been a watchmaker at some time, but that doesn't prevent him from wrecking the alarm clock. His ability to reach the alarm clock is so unaccompanied with any ability to understand the alarm clock, because he can't communicate with it, that it winds up with the destruction of the alarm clock. You got the idea?

Well, below destruction of the alarm clock is no influence of any kind on the alarm clock. He cannot do anything to the alarm clock, not even destroy it and you've got a total withhold from the alarm clock.

All right. Add up all these withholds and all these can't-reaches, "can't-haves" actually, on the – all dynamics and you eventually get a person who's totally withdrawn. He's individuated. And he individuates further and further and less and less effectiveness and of course, eventually he can't affect his own mind. Now that's the exact mechanic of it. I don't care how complicated anybody makes it. That is what it is.

Now of course, when he runs can't-have on people, he is running the – a tendency toward unfamiliarity. He's making people less familiar with something, so people are more withdrawn from it and then, because of the overt-motivator effect, naturally this reacts on him and that explains the exact mechanism of how it comes about that he stops reaching and starts withholding.

A can't-have results in a "stop reach" and then this results in a further withdraw. And when you get this withdraw up there to a total a hundred percent – crash, bang, exclamation point – of course he can't influence anything and you say, "All right. Now, get the idea of disliking cats." He does.

You notice that every time a cat walks in the room he gets a black eye. I mean he sees a cat and his eye goes black, you know and you say, "Well, I'm going to fix this up for this man." And you say, "All right, get the idea of not liking cats. Thank you." And, "Get the idea of not liking cats. Thank you", and so forth and you do this for three hours and nothing happens. Cat walks in the room: he gets a black eye in the other eye. [laughter]

Well, what exactly has happened? His ability to influence his own mind is so low that no matter how many auditing commands you run on the guy, of course it doesn't wind up with any result. It's his ineffectiveness is what you're dealing with and when you're going in straight on a games condition, you'll get this ineffectiveness considerably magnified. And of course, it must be a games condition with cats, if all a cat has to do is walk in the room and he gets a black eye, man, you're way down the scale. I knew such a fellow once. His name was L. Sprague de Camp, one of the great science-fiction writers.
Anyway, this person, when he registers on the E-Meter needle, when the E-Meter needle registers and when you can get tone arm reaction, your command is affecting his mind and then therefore changing his electrical potential, so this tells you if you're in a zone or area where he is being effective. That's what it tells you most intimately and directly.

All right. Now over here on the needle, if it dips, this tells you that you have a chance of affecting it. See, he can affect that area, because it dips. So therefore, you can run it. Now, if you saw that the cat walked in the room and he got a black eye and you just made it up out of your own mind that this was what you should attack on this case and cure up this black eye situation, don't be amazed if he has never noticed it.

He just somehow or another has never noticed the fact that he got a black eye every time a cat walked in the room. Everybody else knows it, but he doesn't. Yeah, he's even been told a lot of times and he'll occasionally say, "Yes, when a cat walks in the room I get a black eye", see. Daaaaaa! He'll say it, but it's not real to him. He really thinks it's the chandelier.

And if you doubt that, take somebody who has a wild allergy to some known object that has been isolated for him by the medicos and ask him, "Is it really Persian rugs? Is it really? Have you ever thought it wasn't Persian rugs?" And you'll get the first reality that you got on the situation.

He'll say, "Well, I – no, I know it isn't Persian rugs."

"Well, what – what do you suppose it is?"

"Well, I don't suppose it's anything, as a matter of fact."

"Well, do you think it's Persian rugs?"

"No, it is not Persian rugs." Then you get an action.

"Well, what is it?" No action. Got the idea?

So you might ask this fellow, "Do you get a black eye when a cat walks in the room because of Persian rugs?"

He'd say, "It's likely". Seems reasonable to him. He'll buy any wild explanation you ever heard of on the subject because he can't think, can't reach or can't rationalize on this particular subject.

Most Dale Carnegie salesmanship is directed toward these individuals. You see? That's if you can just give them a bunch of specious reasons why they should buy and you're sufficiently 1.1 about the situation and so forth and they're in a games condition, of course, they can't do anything but do what you tell them to do or something like that, with regard to an object.

All right. That's being tough on poor, old, late departed Dale Carnegie. Anyway, what you read here is: Can the individual influence his mind? That's what you read and that's what this thing adds up to. And therefore, when you run a command that you have not assessed on an E-Meter, you're doing something very adventurous.

See, you run a command that possibly, quite possibly, he has no influence on. You can be very sure what the command should be, but when you test it out, does it produce any nee-
dle action? Let's say these words to the pc in the command and let's say these commands. And do they produce needle action?

Well, it they don't produce any needle action, you'd better not bother running it, because you've got an area where the pc either doesn't have to be audited or where he is totally ineffective. And if he's working in an area that's totally ineffective, of course, you get no needle reaction.

Hence, you should assess something like a games condition process on such things as problems, confusions, thoughts, facts, motion, almost anything that you could assess. And then you finally got one of these that produces a reaction – not that this is real to the pc, don't you see. That phrase is what we've been using previously and it is not very explanatory.

The mechanism is, can the pc be even faintly effective in this particular sphere or area? Well yes, he can be, because you see a needle reaction. So you assessed it out so that the word he goes clong on is "motion". Ah, voilà! Very good.

But now all we know is that he has an effectiveness where motion is concerned. This we have, that we have. We don't have the gen on the rest of the command. Does the pc have any reality of, whatsoever, on the "wheness" of things? And we test out "wheness". We test out "whatness" and "howness." And we all of a sudden find out that "when", if we ask him "When did you?" or something like that, we're not going to get any reaction on the E-Meter. That's not real to him, he's not effective in the field of time. We say "How could you?" Ha-ha, and we get a reaction, see. "How?" That "howness" is real to him.

All right. So we'd add together and we'd say, "How could you?" and all right, we got that and we've got motion, but we haven't got "deny", "prevent", "not let", you see and a whole bunch of intermediate verbs and we check those out on the E-Meter and we get "not let." Ah-ha-ha. This is nice, now, we've got: "How could you not let another have motion?" Doesn't make much sense to you, but it seems to make good sense to the pc. He falls all over the place on this auditing command, don't you see.

So we put that in its various brackets and we run it and it produces a result. We don't assess it. In the first place, we haven't found the areas where the pc can be effective. In the old law of taking something the person could do and make him do it better is not then present in auditing. You see, the basic thing you're doing in auditing is find out something he can do and then make him improve the ability.

All right. So that is the way you sort out a command. Those are the basic laws. That's why you should check a command out on an E-Meter. That's quite a good thing, to check a command out first on an E-Meter. Because if you get no reaction on this command, you had better start banging the brain cells together and sparking long and blue and getting smart enough to take the same thing you want run on him, just take the same thing, only let's get it into some gradient and some phraseology that does produce reaction on the E-Meter. And you'll find out that the command is answerable, the pc has good reaction on it and so forth.

Now, most pcs will react on one of the three: "problems", "confusions", "motions". They usually react on one of the three. They'll react on one of these three: "thought", "fact", "idea". Those are three that go together, and they're gradients to most people. You've got to
sort out what you're doing so that it's real and what we mean by real is: can the pc be effective in that particular sphere?

Now if you can get the idea of some pc having just backed out of life and then started backing out of his head – you know, "withhold" and "can't reach" and "withhold" and "can't reach" – you'll finally find somebody with a body over there and he's compulsively exterior in some fashion. And this is simply a graphic and a factual example of what occurs. And this is the "detached case" of Mr. Sigmund Freud that he found out he could never help. He could never help this person. The person was detached. This is what he called the case. (The end of the twenty-eighth lecture, if you want to look it up, of Freud's.)

That applies to most homos and so forth. They're detached or it applies to an awful lot of people, not to use any dirty words. They have gotten detached and sometimes somebody will tell you they feel detached in life. Oh yeah, I'm sure they do. In any area where they're in a games condition, they feel detached.

I think the unrealest activity that a soldier – in a games condition about soldiering – the unrealest activity he could possibly engage in would be fighting. Everything would get very unreal to him the second he approached this particular field, don't you see? And he's got to do it, he must do it, he's not going to get anything out of it. He's not going to be effective either. If you let him near a gun, he'll land one on his own command post. It's this kind of thing, you see, but he'll get very unreal. Everything goes very unreal and very foggy and very drifty when he starts moving in toward that area because it's the area where he is the least effective. Life can effect him the most and he can effect life the least and yet he'll always volunteer. See, these are the odd explanations.

So apparently, we feel this man can do soldiering as an effective in the field of soldiering, simply because he does volunteer in the field of soldiering, don't you see. Well, he is not effective in the field of soldiering. But he has to volunteer, that's – that's the way that is.

Now, how do you do as a Scientologist? How do you reverse this condition? Just find it on the E-Meter. What's real to this person means what will react to this person, which also means what will this person be able to affect? And having found it on the E-Meter, then you can, on a gradient scale, bring him up, get his withholds off, get his can't-haves and game conditions out of the road and of course, he will walk up to a total effectiveness. Get how you're doing that now?

You take off the withhold – well, that permits him to reach – and you take off the games condition and of course that permits him to reach. And he just reaches further and further and further and of course the further he can reach and the less he's withholding, the more effective he is and that is all there is to it. It's as simple as that. It's actually idiotically simple. You can get terribly complicated about it, but that is precisely what you were doing. Now, when you violate that doingness, you don't get any results in auditing.

Now, let's take the cure of psychosomatics. If you want to go in for the cure of psychosomatics – nobody says you ought to or should, but this is kind of a nonsensical thing to do, but that's all right. I want to give you this as a graphic example. Psychosomatic illness.
Now, if you can actually enter a certain field and find patients who are so much the ef-
fect of some psychosomatic difficulty that you can alter it but they can't and so you tell them
to get well in some fashion or another and they do. Only they don't find out about it and so
they never thank you and more auditors have run into this one. Now that's a queer one you
know. That's a goofy one, but that's the explanation of it. You found an area where they were
totally ineffective and actually you simply mauled the bank around and straightened them out
and told them that was the way it was and that they had it. Got the idea?

So of course, you effected a cure. And it advisedly could be called a cure because you
certainly did it. You didn't effect an eradication of the difficulty.

All right. Here would be the right way to go about it so you wouldn't run into this sort
of thing. You would assess all the things the person thought were difficult with him until you
got a fall. And you got your major fall of the thing he has the greatest communication with as
a difficulty and then you work on that by getting the withholds off of it and getting the games
condition cured about it and it will right itself just like that. Bang! But you've got to do it by
an E-Meter assessment.

Now doing it that way, you actually could eradicate an enormous amount of illness or
upsets with people, but you would have to assess them.

Now that a pc keeps complaining all the time about some difficulty means nothing,
because the complaint might simply be a piece of machinery firing off or the mechanism that
the pc is complaining about is a mechanism that has to do with another games condition
which has nothing whatsoever to do with the difficulty they're talking about. This is

But of course, you're not going to get rid of that difficulty. The difficulty would be to-
tally unreal to the pc on the meter. But the pc may be saying all the time, "Oh, I'd just give
anything, anything at all if you could cure my migraine headaches. That's what really disturbs
me. Oh yes, it's my migraine headaches."

Why, you – you poor auditor you – you fall for this every once in a while and you say,
"Well, it means so much for Scientology – I cure this guy's migraine headaches." Well, it sure
would. It sure would. There would be no doubt about that, providing you did eradicate the
difficulty and the games condition that was associated with it and everything else connected
with it, so that the person found out about it. Because you're liable to go ahead and cure his
migraine headache and he never finds out about it and goes around and tells everybody what a
bum you are. You get how this is?

Well, the way to avoid that situation – the way to handle this situation, not to avoid it
– is to just take lists of difficulties the person has until you get one that continues to fall good
and hard. Yeah, continues to fall good and hard. All right, audit it. Get the withholds off of it.
Make up some little pat series of questions that has to do with this particular item and then get
the can't-haves off of it, in a bracket of some kind or another.

Well, let's say you actually did find out you could do something for this fellow's arm
and the arm did fall. Well, that's dandy. All right. Now, we actually could do something for
this arm and we would do it on the basis of: "When have you denied somebody an arm?"
"When has somebody denied you an arm?" "When has another denied somebody else an arm?" You get the idea? "What problem or confusion about arms isn't present now?" In addition to that, you would say, "What haven't you ever told anybody about an arm?" You got the idea? You would get the withholds off – just a little Security Check about arms, you see, and you work those two against each other. Get rid of the games condition with the brackets and get the withholds off with a Security Check and you'll just about have it made. And all of a sudden their arm will do a miraculous recovery.

But the condition is – that it has to obtain before you start all this is: does the pc have any effectiveness in the zone called an arm? Or are you being the only one effective? You see, you can hypnotize people and tell them to get well and they do. Only they don't. Their body or bank obeys you, not them.

All right, so much for that. This is the gradient scale of "state of case". You also have a "state of difficulty", the gradient difficulties. The pc has ten thousand difficulties. All right. There may be only one of them would ever find him effective in the zone of, see? In that zone, only one of these things would be. He'd be effective on just one difficulty. He can list ten thousand, but he's only effective on one.

That's an interesting viewpoint. That is actually the barriered line on healing and the barriered line on all therapy of all kinds and is actually the barriered line on "help." Of course you can run any level of the Prehav Scale, any level of the Prehav Scale, in a games condition form.

But I wouldn't advise you to use "no motion" in a games condition form unless you use it with this type of a version: Stillnesses should be used so that they are meaningful of motion. You don't ever run a stillness, you only appear to run a stillness. You say, "What stillness have you denied somebody else?" You get the idea? That's a good command. "What stillness has another denied you?" This was what you assessed on the Primary and Secondary Scale. You got "stillness".

Now, you could also run this on the pc's terminals. After they've been assessed on SOP Goals, you can run a Games Condition Process with assessment and so forth. You can apply all this to Routine 3.

You got their terminal? You got their terminal? All right. Use their terminal, fit it in as a games condition-type process. Work it out one way or the other on the E-Meter. Assess him on the Prehav level. Work it out so that you get a fall and you'll get something on the idea of – let's say it was stillness. "What stillness have you denied an aviator?" and "What stillness has an aviator denied you?" and "What stillness has an aviator denied another?" and "What stillness has another denied an aviator?" You got the idea? And "What stillness has an aviator denied himself?" And if you're going to run a Games Condition Process though, for God's sakes, let's get a direct look at problems. I don't care what command is used or what version is used, let's get him to do a direct confront around here someplace. Every time we do a direct Games Condition Process on problems. Otherwise, you won't get that as-ised.

So after you've got these – five-way bracket all worked out, then you add another hooker on it like, well, "What problem about an aviator could you confront?" or something
like this. Or "... have you confronted?" or "... would you confront?" or – I don't care how you do that one, but throw that one in, too. You see how that would work out?

Now, if you did a terrific assessment on somebody and you got his goal and you got his terminal and you got it all taped and piped and it was going in all directions, you did him on the Prehav Scale, you could run him simply directly or you could run him on a games condition situation with regard to this. There's a number of routes. It's all which is the most effective, which is the most rapid. Okay?

The day you run a command though, that doesn't register on an E-Meter, is the day you start auditing areas where the pc cannot be effective and therefore you plus the pc, versus the pc's bank, simply adds up to you versus the pc's bank. You see how that is? Because he isn't there. He has withdrawn in that particular area to such a degree that his effectiveness never assists you, so therefore he ARC breaks, he gets present time problems, he gets very upset all the time, he's hard to hold into session and so forth, because you are actually auditing a bank. You see, you're auditing a bank without any assistance whatsoever from the pc. So if you want the pc to help, too, then you better assess it first on the E-Meter and get it taped. Okay?

_Audience: Okay._

Well, I hope that'll assist you a little bit. When I come back, I want to see half a dozen of you Clear.

Thank you.
CREATION AND GOALS

A lecture given on 3 August 1961

Well, I will say that in ten days you look less human! [laughter] Good to see ya. What is this, 3rd of August? Nineteen hundred and AD 11.

Thought you might be interested in where I've been. [Murmuring in the crowd, probably LRH shows them a picture.] Isn't that fairly marvelous? Pretty wild, isn't it? Well, that's just about how wild that country is. [laughter] Well, fortunately nobody has ever been able to civilize Spain. Henry the VIII, I think it was or some such Henry a long time ago, used to have standing orders to all British merchant ships. And when they got anywhere north of Cape Finisterre – any foreign ship got north of Cape Finisterre – a British vessel in sighting one – Cape Finisterre, you know. That's down there. That's way down there at the top of Spain.

Well, the standing orders were that any British merchant vessel or war vessel, that any foreign vessel found in those waters, must at once dip his flag in recognition of the sovereignty of the seas of the English; and if he failed to do so, he must be compelled by whatever necessary force.

Well, we don't get down into those waters much anymore and they don't come up here much, but it's certainly an interesting area. You know, that's only 650 miles away. Yeah. Very beautiful, very beautiful.

Found a very beautiful ship down there, too. The Espanoles had been at her, which is a kind of dry rot, which is _manana_². It's a fever which has _manana_ as its primary bugs, you see?

So I've been across all of these wild guarded waters where English vessels are supposed to coerce the firing of salutes and shots. And they – when they got this English vessel down to Spain, they took revenge for this order on a comm lag of about five hundred years or something like that, or three hundred years or something and so they just kept her there and kept working on her and they finally wore out the patience and pocketbook of her past owner. And they kept putting things in her like more mahogany, you see? That was just exactly what she needed was more mahogany; she didn't have any main engines, but what she needed was more mahogany. Most gorgeous interior you ever saw on a ship. Don't open the engine room because nothing there. [laughter]

And the Espanoles and the owner – who was not a sailor of this particular vessel – had gotten to a point where they had made sufficient number of problems to suit them all and they couldn't solve any of them. They just couldn't solve any of them! And so everybody threw up
his hands and they decided they'd better sell the ship in a hurry. And I've been waiting around since February for somebody to decide this about a good ship. And so we have bought her for buttons.

But she's a 106 feet long and 18 foot beam and she sleeps about twenty-two people. And for an additional – see, I sold some yachts over in the States and I've been kind of hiding the money since, you know? And I'm able to cover this one as a result. So I've been letting the money ebb and flow and disappear this way and that way, but I finally got it all collected back together again here.

And for only about thirty-eight hundred pounds of additional odds and ends, why, she all of a sudden becomes a vessel worth at least twenty-five thousand quid on the market. As a matter of fact, I could haul her up here with a tug right now and sell her for fifteen thousand pounds. Just nobody knew how to straighten her out, you know? She's all beautiful mahogany and varnish and everything is marvelous and she just glitters in all directions, but nobody could straighten out such things as how do you get her anchors up and down? [laughter]

Her current consumption throughout the whole ship – she's got air conditioning and hot water and everything – and her current consumption throughout the ship is about 30 kilowatts, or in excess of the consumption of Saint Hill, which is plenty of kilowatts! Look at our light bill sometime.

Anyway, the – with this tremendous, fantastic current consumption, they put in two Sallé diesels built in Spain and two little tiny generators and the diesels make so much noise that when a mechanic started them day before yesterday, he leaped convulsively out of the engine room! [laughter] And the whole ship started shaking from bow to stern, you know. So she has this 30 kw, you see, of potential power consumption and she's got about one watt to supply it and nobody could figure out how to get any power into her, you know? They couldn't figure out how to furnish all this. And she's had Grey diesel engines – very nice Greys, they were sometime in their career. They still run. But they kept wearing out their rings and they kept filling up their crankcases full of oil – fuel oil. You're not supposed to have fuel oil in a crankcase, you know? And they just kept getting all gummed up with sludge and there just wasn't anything they could do about them and they wouldn't run and they wouldn't push the boat and so on. So everybody kind of threw up his hands in horror.

So when they hauled the vessel – I'm late getting back here, by the way, because the vessel wasn't hauled till Monday. More manana. And when they – they hauled it, I sent somebody else down into amongst the brish-brash of the muck of the dry-dock, and got him to brush those propeller hubs off because there's something wrong with his screws, you see. Kept polishing up engines and repairing engines and the engines keep falling out of her. So, obviously, it isn't the engines. So when we got the hubs of the propellers brushed off, we find out that she is fitted with propellers which would make her do sixteen knots, but a Grey – a pair of Greys – at the wildest imagination would only ever drive her at ten. So what the propeller has done is prevented the engines from running, because a Grey doesn't develop its

---

5 Editor's note: Spanisch "Mañana", literally "tomorrow", is a humorous reference to the proverbial delays in something to be get done by Spanish workers. If you ask them when something will be completed, they will always answer "mañana".
horsepower until it runs at 2100 RPM and this has been very amazing to them all, because the engines ran very cool and there couldn't be anything wrong with the engines because they ran so cool. And everybody kept assuring me that the engines ran cool.

Well, a Grey – I finally let them in on the facts of life – has to be at a 185 degrees Fahrenheit or it doesn't achieve combustion! [laughter] And if you don't run it at that temperature, its crankcase fills up full of fuel oil. Some of the little facts of life, you know? Interesting state of beingness.

Anyway, I've had about ten days of wrestling around with my old love, the sea, and finding out how many things people can do, who know nothing about the sea, to make it inoperative. But we're just lucky, man. We're just lucky that it got that inoperative and they made that many mistakes, because they're nothing. I got a pair of Paxman 600 horsepower V-12s located up here – diesels that run on fuel oil of the very low quality – and I got a couple of light plants that are excellent and they will just take care of her lights marvelously and it's just a matter of yanking what's in her engine room out and putting in something new.

And as far as her water is concerned, she's all fixed up to consume water at the rate of about five or six hundred gallons a day. She's got bathrooms, you see, and wash basins every place, you see? You can't turn a corner without having full facilities to take a bath and wash your hands, you know. So there's no water supply! [laughter] Small omission, see. And they didn't know how to figure that out, because of course her bilge is all full of ballast and you can't get any more water tanks into her bilge. So they put a water tank up in the top of the pilot house. A couple of tons is just what you need up in the top of a pilot house. That's – it sloshes, you know, and makes the ship stagger and so forth.

It's a beautiful water tank. It has huge manholes, you know. And they couldn't solve that problem, so ... Actually, what they don't know is that you can get war surplus water evaporators that run on electrical current that have a tray in them. You change the tray a couple of times a day and one of them will make enough water for fifty men a day. So you don't carry a water supply, you carry a water evaporator aboard her. That's very easy to put in.

These problems are all relatively simple. But this owner and the Espanoles ran into them head-on and threw their hands up in horror. Yep, had a lot of fuel consumption, a lot of water consumption, a lot of electrical consumption and no fuel, no water and no electricity. [laughs] And then she could go anywhere that no engines could take her. And boy, her mahogany is beautiful!

Come to find out she's classed: She's a classed vessel with Lloyd's, which is quite amazing. Almost never do you find an ex-Admiralty craft, like a Fairmile B, that's still classified by Lloyd's and she's all in perfect condition, nothing wrong with her.

But due to our ability to confront problems and their inability to confront problems, why, ship falls in our lap. You see, see the advantages of Scientology?

The British vice-consul made a funny remark. He took me out to the airport when I left Santiago and of course this was just Spanish courtesy, possibly. You know, he didn't buy that "being in the locale". But he says, "I have learned more about ships in the last ten days since you have been here than I've learned before in my life!" He says, "I didn't know there was that much to know". I didn't even know I was wearing a hat, you know? I didn't. But I
didn't also know how little they know about them and yet he's the Lloyd's representative for the area.

No, they threw up their hands in horror. I did, too, actually, in the first twenty-four hours. I just said, "How could a group of people make this many problems?" That's impossible, see, unless they're a government. [laughter] How could they? How could they make this many problems? And yet they sure had and I said, "Well, there's nothing at all can be done with this ship. She's beautiful, she sits here, she's got gorgeous lines, her hull is good, no dry rot in her, her decks are good, everything's fine, she's beautiful, but nobody can do a thing with her."

They have just run her out to the far rim of total confusion, you know – no power, no water, no engines, no winches, can't handle, can't anchor, can't move her. And they'd fastened all the mahogany ply in her with iron fastenings instead of copper and of course they'll go to pieces in a hurry. Ah, man. It was just too much! And after about thirty-six hours or something like that, all of a sudden I came out of my stupor and began to confront the problems of the ship and found out they were all just – they were nothing. Weller, here, who is an expert on that sort of thing, all he's got to do is go down there and start pulling nails and hammering brass back in the same spot – nothing to that. We've got companies up here that'll drop a pair of engines into her just as quick as you can send them a telegram, you know? And just right in the next room in there, there's enough electrical fittings to rewire her from one end to the other. There's really no problems to her.

But, of course, it is dismaying that people would put a ship together, you see, that can't run, can't anchor, you see; has enormous electrical consumption and no electricity, has enormous water consumption and no water, has enormous fuel consumption and no fuel. They forgot one area where they could have put tanks. Guess where that was? Between the engines, of course! Right where you would expect to find it. And there's enough for an additional five hundred gallons of fuel between her engine beds. And they've got fifteen tons too much ballast in her which, of course, fills up the remaining space you could put tanks.

You see, if you put the ballast in a ship – your ship's got to have ballast, you know – that's in a book someplace, you know – particularly ships which are planing vessels, which are made to plane when they run, you see? And if you gonna get a vessel that stays up on top of the water and you know, runs like a skipped rock, of course you want to ballast her, don't you? Let's put lots of ballast in her and fix her up so she won't run on top of the water. Let's make her run deep, see? And then because she needs lots of fuel in order to run high, you see, well, you occupy the whole space with the ballast so you can't put any fuel in it. You get the nonsense?

It's marvelous! I watched 1.1 problem creation here. And actually these problems have not just been for lack of knowledge or lack of solution. A lot of these problems are just overt – overt creations. Nobody'd be that dumb! They wouldn't live to the age of five! Isn't it marvelous?

Name of the ship's the Eimor; her name will probably become The Hurrying Angel. For some reason or other that name is blank at the Register of Shipping and Seamen. For some reason or other that name has not been used. And that's John Masefield's famous novel
and you'd think the country of John Masefield's nativity certainly would – you know, I have submitted about three pages of names to the Register of Shipping, without finding more than about five names vacant? I've thought of every name I could possibly think of for a vessel and every one of them, but just this little handful, has been occupied. They've already got – you see, you can't name them twice because you might get charged for somebody else's bills. You know? And weirdly enough The Hurrying Angel was one of the names that's vacant. So there it is.

I've had that all ready to put on nameplate. I've got her barometer and her clock. They're a beautiful set – clock and barometer. They sit on the file cabinet in my office in Washington and years ago – years ago – I was trying to find somebody to cut the nameplate of the ship for that clock and barometer. Didn't have the ship but I had the clock and barometer. See? And I was going to cut a brass plate there for the The Hurrying Angel. And so at last I've got a ship to go with that clock and barometer!

Well, anyway, this is all part of an operation here which is going on. We'll be going down about October into southern waters for a winter of instruction and all that sort of thing. So maybe some of you will have a ride someday on The Hurrying Angel. And you'll say, "I'm very, very happy" when you have had a ride you'll say, " – I'm very, very happy that Ron audits more smoothly than he drives a ship." Because I drive hell out of a ship! [laughter] Okay. Well, you're invited anyway!

Audience: Thank you.

Okay. Well, now let's get back to where we were and where you have now reached. I notice we have some new faces. I welcome you and I notice, additionally, some new faces which have been acquired or have been uncovered, so on.

Now, something very funny is going on. People elsewhere are getting a spattering of Clears. And we're slugging at it here and we're slugging at it very, very hard. You'll notice there's a difference here. All of a sudden they make four or five down in Johannesburg. They've made more, since. They're making Clears all over the place and meanwhile some of you have flattened problems, confusions and emotion of various kinds.

Now, I guess it's just a question of how thoroughly can you make a Clear? And that's the whole question. It's just answered in that. I think that's about the way it is. How thoroughly can you go about this? How many brands of Clear are they? I couldn't answer this question. Because you can get people up to a perfectly good Clear read on a meter and it will stay there, and they'll go along just fine.

But how many zones are there above this state? And how thoroughly do you have to prepare the ground to attain one of those zones? And those are the questions.

Those are not necessarily well-answered questions at this time because Scientology, after all, is – well, I've been making Clears of one kind or another, stable or unstable, for a long time. Those that I made originally, way back when, the bulk of those remained stable. And the secret of those Clears was just that they had been able to – and I couldn't have stated at the time this succinctly – they had been made capable of confronting any type of mental image picture. That made a Clear.
And if you will read Book One and the chapter on it, it wasn't somebody who didn't have any pictures. This is some new interpretation. It was somebody who could control his pictures or who had a bank or whose bank wasn't victimizing him.

All right, taking off on this line, let's go back now – from ships to less mundane things – to the earliest unanswered problem in Dianetics and Scientology, circa 1948. The question: Why does a thetan mock up bad pictures? Now, that is the un – was the unanswered question and that question has remained unanswered all these years. You can see at once that that is a very, very interesting question. After all, he is doing it. Well, why is he mocking up accidents and collisions and burns and cripplings and so forth? Well look, there's all kinds of things to mock up. You could mock up this scarf! You don't have to mock up an automobile accident. But they do mock up an automobile accident. They also occasionally mock up scarves. But you'll almost never find anybody with a fixed pleasure moment.

You start running pleasure moments on a preclear, and they go into grief charges and they break down and life is horrible. Old Validation Processing, as Mary Sue was remarking last night, was the most productive of grief charges that anybody ever tried to run. You talk about agony and sudden death! All you had to do was ask a preclear to "Recall a pleasure moment. Thank you. Recall a pleasure moment. Thank you. Recall a pleasure moment. Thank you", and Niagara Falls would ensue!

And I remember one girl vividly back in Wichita, about 1951, she was being audited, and the auditor asked her to recall a pleasure moment, and she recalled winning a cup at a horse show, which seemed innocuous enough. And the auditor just opened his mouth ready to audit the next auditing command and the pc said, no, that wasn't a pleasure moment. And she really shouldn't have done – think of the other people she defeated to do that and she really didn't deserve the cup anyway and she went on down the toboggan. And the next thing you know it – apparently, the most horrible thing that could ever have happened to her was winning this cup at a horse show! And that's the way it goes when you ask a thetan about pleasure moments.

Now, what is this fixation on death, disaster, collision and whatnot? What is this? And let's get back to this original question: Why does a thetan mock up bad pictures? Why? Why?

Well now, theoretically, many things could be said about this and one of those things could be that he's getting even. He's been made to produce and made to produce and made to produce and made to produce, so now he mocks up a bad production. Got the idea? I mean that could be, basically. Now, we can look at the mechanics of it and we say, "Well obviously, the thing has not been as-ised, he has not looked at it so therefore, not having looked at it, it is still there." But remember, that is a mechanic and remember that this thetan is party to the original agreement that creates those mechanics. Why did he want to agree to these original agreements that then would make it impossible for him to ever as-is anything unpleasant? You see? Let's get terribly fundamental, here. And we find out that it must come down to the fact that – you can't say he wants to, but you can certainly say that he does mock up in preponderance; death, disaster, collision and what-not and you could say, then, that having made some kind of an original agreement he then caps it with some other revolt against the original agreement of some kind. Well, what is this revolt? Well, you could say that this revolt con-
sisted of – he's made to mock up, produce, produce, produce, produce, produce good things. So he eventually invents a mechanic, you see – a mechanical aspect – that when called upon to mock up something good, he promptly mocks up something bad.

Well, the direct thing, the proof of this is that you ask somebody to run a pleasure moment and he mocks up something bad. He doesn't mock up something good. You tell him to mock up something good and he mocks up something bad.

Now, we take some Espanoles and we turn them loose on a ship and we tell them mock up something good, you see? Well, they almost do it. You see, they just come right, right close to doing this, but somehow or another – don't lift the corner of the paint, see? See, there is going to be something bad about this.

You get maintenance men around sometimes in organizations and wow! You know? Just wow! How can they do these things, you know? You're saying, "Well, now straighten up the hall", you see. And you go back out and there's old machinery lying all over it that doesn't even belong to the organization. You say, "Where does this come from?"

"Well, it was here ..."

We've never seen it before in our lives. Well, yes, it's here. You know? You say, "Well, why don't you sweep out the lecture hall? There'll be a lecture tonight." And you go in, and they've dumped all the waste baskets in the place in the lecture hall. Well, that would be a direct revolt, don't you see? You tell them, "Clean up the lecture hall, because we're going to have a public lecture tonight and we want people to think well of Scientology." See, bang. The direct revolt response would be to go and get every waste basket in the place, go get the incinerator and so on, get every scrap piece of paper you could get out of the files and then get all the oddments of furniture in the joint and throw all these things in the lecture hall and then mix them. That would be a direct revolt. Then you would know this fellow was in a revolt and you would stand there with a machine gun with your hand pressed on the trigger and you wouldn't let it up. That would be a direct revolt, wouldn't it?

Well, so let's get an in – the – assuming that this fellow is in revolt – now this is going down scale from this. You see, that's a fairly high manifestation. All right, let's push it down now – this fellow has gotten down to about 1.1 – and you say, "Clean up the lecture halls", you see? So he – his revolt consists of sweeping the aisles only and sweeping the stuff in the aisles kind of back under the chairs and not having the chairs quite straight – they're not quite straight and the things the lecturer needs will not quite be there. Well, you can't censure him for that. Because he can always say, "Well, I have too many things to do." He can always have a lot of excuses, don't you see? And so he gets out of trouble this way, but he still makes his point: that he's damned if he's going to produce a good-looking lecture hall. You see the idea?

All right. Well, the highest harmonic would be "Well, to hell with you, I'm not going to touch the lecture hall." But there's a lower harmonic of this same thing which is you tell him to do it and he forgets. That's simple, isn't it?

I've even heard a court case was being tried. I was actually on the witness stand. I was asked some burningly intricate twisted question, you know, that looked like a Scotch still
gone mad, you know, and – by the prosecuting defense attorney, or whatever he was – and I looked at the man. I said, "Well, I've forgotten." It was some burning question that very much applied to the whole case. I just didn't care to be implicated. So I said, "Well, I've forgotten."

And this defense prosecutor went up, just – he was like a rocketry, you know, and "My God, how can you forget such a thing?!" You know? "How could you possibly forget such a thing?" and he's raving. And the judge said to him in a very cold, bored voice – he says, "The witness says he's forgotten." That was it.

That's amazing, you know? It took me by storm at the time! I didn't even think I'd vaguely get away with this one because it's pure corn. It's straight from Iowa. "I've forgotten." Wasn't even challenged; couldn't be challenged. So you – lecture hall was messed up and you've got a comparable level in occlusion.

And you see, the fellow, well, he can't remember all his past overts or anything like that so how could he be responsible for them? And we let everybody get away with it. Do you realize the degree that we let everybody get away with it? Where's the bird for instance that started the last war? Hm? He's around someplace. He's around someplace. He's probably gibbering in some Russian school about this time learning to say "Verdammt, gottdammt Hitler!" But there he is and they're letting him get away with it. Because what's he saying? He's said "I've forgotten." Simple mechanism.

So you get these various mechanisms that you can see out in life of forgetting and bad pictures and accidents and sudden death being mocked up in the bank and so on, as basically a covert response when you see them and that would then apply to most everybody. There must be a covert response of some character or another to an "I won't." You see? Instead of saying "I won't", they say "I can't" or "This is just the way it is", you see? "Yes, here are all these horrible pictures and I can't do a thing about it."

Now, the oddity is that the mechanism, apparently, is so submerged and is so lost that it itself has become a modus operandi. And that becomes the way of life and the fellow now isn't actually in active revolt at all. He just mocks up bad pictures and forgets. He doesn't know how; he doesn't know why or anything like that.

Well, there have been some civilizations on the track which were corks. Man, they were marvelous! You talk about production-crazy. These boys were really production-crazy – Arslycus.

If you ever want to see tiredness overwhelm the pc, run him into the area of the whole track called Arslycus. And, there, thetans were actively producing matter, you see. And they were hanging off walls, making walls and making tilework and mocking everything up, you see – actively mocking it up and smoothing it out and you couldn't get away. They had various mechanisms where they kept a piece of you in a big boiling pot or something of this sort and if you got away, why, then they put this piece into the boiling water and it caused you a lot of pain so you had to come back. There are all kinds of weird mechanisms here of entrapment involved and everybody had to produce, had to produce, had to produce, had to produce, had to produce, see? And it's no wonder that production got a bad name, because they were producing against their wish to produce.
Therefore, production against power of choice of production is revolted against. Creation against wish to create is revolted against and you get that dramatized by the bank. The fellow doesn't want to mock up the bank so he mocks up the bank. You see how that is? He's creating something against a wish to create. Well, evidentially his will to create has been badly overwhelmed. Both because he has overwhelmed other peoples' and because his has been overwhelmed. Do you see how this would work, both ways?

How about the fellow who ran Arslycus? How about the overt, man? Look at that level of overt. Thetans by the ton, all around, working like mad to build walls and build this and build that and finally, through some mysterious circumstance that nobody has ever been able to trace, Arslycus fell apart and everybody fell and fell and fell. It, by the way, wasn't on a planet. It was, of course, just a construction out in space as itself – nobody had invented planets yet and planets undoubtedly were invented to cure things happening that happened at Arslycus because they had walls and roads and courts and houses and towering buildings and everything. And of course they just ran without foundation – uninfluenced with gravity or anything else. And one fine day it all fell apart.

Well, which one of those workers invented disintegration? See, that's what had to be invented – not disintegration by explosion, disintegration because of gravity or anything of this sort, but just who invented disintegration? Who invented the idea that these things could fall apart? Somebody had to and, of course, it was the workers of Arslycus. This was their only possible response, was to out-create with some new idea – something worse than was happening to them.

Well, when you get the crisscross of production and creation going – and creation, compulsive creation, creation against one's will, and so on – creation itself begins to have a bad name.

But now let's take the reverse side of the picture. I was never as unhappy as when I didn't have any stories to write for anybody. Well, that's an interesting state, isn't it? You say, "Well, it's very tough sitting there grinding out stories and all that sort of thing." But nobody needed any stories – all the markets were full. I was good at that. I'd not only filled my own markets but several other writers' and these boys would be unhappy about it and I've really been condemned for creating like mad in the field of the arts – here, there and every place on the track – because I get interested, you know? And I decide, "Well, let's really mock one up!" You know? "Let's get some volume out here. Let's make it shapely." And the next thing you know, why, everybody around that would consider this, if this was the new standard – this is the trouble you get into – they'd be licked. You see, it's an out-create proposition. So you decide you're trying to out-create them, which you aren't doing at all. All you're trying to do is put something up, see?

So they decide they – you've out-created. So they say, "Well, this creation is bad", and so forth. Well, that actually doesn't affect you, particularly. What does affect you is not having any – any market for your creation or not having any observers for your creation or not having your creation wanted in any way. That's what's upsetting. It isn't creating; it's not having it wanted.
Well anyway, we look over this scene and we disentangle a few more facts here. Here – here's another case history that parallels it. Mr. Weller here is one of the most terrific carpenters you ever wanted to have anything to do with. And he runs maintenance here at Saint Hill. He can't miss walking down this passageway – particular passageway – and there's a spring broken on the swinging doors and it's broken today and it's broken tomorrow and it's still broken. The swinging doors won't swing. The days go by. Mr. Weller walks right back and forth past those swinging doors and he doesn't do a thing about it – till I finally look down my nose and I say, "Mr. Weller, repair the swinging doors." At which moment he repairs them with the excuse that he can't get the proper spring to do it with, so it's liable to break again anytime.

Well this, you say, would tab the boy. Well, it doesn't, at all. Because I asked Mr. Weller to fix me up something that is rather incredible, you know, like a file box out of mahogany with a swinging top or something of this sort – something that's very difficult and involved and can't be done in the realm of finite human carpentry – and he brightens right up and nobody can get him to tend the furnaces or anything else. He's right out there, right now, knocking together a mahogany box, figuring it all out, straightening it all out.

I just saw him a few minutes ago, having come back. Right away, why, he had set up a bookcase for me, upstairs. I get flooded with books. People keep sending me books and I'm always happy to receive books – don't get that idea. Books are just fine. I'm always happy to have books. But it was getting to a situation where all anybody had to do was send me about four more despatches and two more books and nobody would ever have seen me again! [laughter] I just would have disappeared!

So to solve this situation, I wanted some file trays for my papers and some bookcases and so forth and Weller, boy! By the time I came back – he's obviously been racing flat out. He's got one of these bookcases all built, apologizing for not having the other one all built. He's only built it three times as fast as factories – which build furniture untouched by human hands – would build them. It's too slow and he's got these file cases now. He's got only five of them done. There's two more to go and they're all laid out with their varnish drying and he's just proud as punch, see? He hasn't got anything against creating something rather fantastic and rather beautiful. He's got nothing against creating it at all. But he will walk past oddities that nobody will appreciate or he doesn't think they'll appreciate.

I imagine the staff here started making rather crude cracks at him after a while about this particular door, because the staff was walking through it several dozen times a day, you see, and there it was gaping open, ready to black peoples' eyes and so on and they probably snarled at him one way or the other about it.

And I've noticed there are people around who have asked him to put up – oh, I don't know – put serrated edges on the garbage cans or something of this sort, don't you see? And people have asked Jenner out here, the bricklayer, to do various things of this character. But it's not in the field of where they – (1) they don't think it will be appreciated; (2) they don't think it's probably the right thing to do; and (3) they don't think it's aesthetic, which all adds up to (4) they don't want to do it. Which brings us to (5) if they do do it, why, the serrations are going to fall off or into the garbage cans, don't you see? It's a revolt against creation.
All right, now there isn't a person in this room that can't paint, with perhaps an exception or two. Put a canvas in front of you and a brush in your hand and a nice big palette with numerous colors of this and that in your paws and just say, "Have at it, now. Let's – let's get something here. This fellow da Vinci has been getting away with it too long." [laughter] "Let's – let's get cracking here." And you would all turn around to me and you'd say you can't, or "I've forgotten how", or you have a whole bunch of things like this.

Well, that must be borne out of a conviction that a good creation in a certain field will bring one into a state of victimization, or will bring one into some unpleasant consequence. That's the conviction. And that conviction causes one to take a vast retreat and to back up like mad full speed astern and say, "I can't" or "I've forgotten how" or "I don't know how to do that."

You get two excuses out in the broad world. They say, "Well, I haven't got any talent" or "I haven't been educated." These are the two things which you hear consistently.

They used to bore me like mad when I myself was very deeply involved with the arts. I would turn out something that was bingety-bang, splash-bong, and then have somebody come along and tell me that he wasn't doing it because he had never been educated to. Now, there's a – secret of the thing is, if I'd ever listened to anybody's education with regard to this thing, it never would have gotten created, don't you see? Get the idea? Creating by the rules, as far as a painting is concerned, of course, immediately denies its self-expression.

So we look at these various aspects of creation and we begin to understand something more about this thing called a bank, and we begin to answer up this problem that has been around since 1948. And the problem is, with everything else he can do, why does a thetan mock up these things?

Now, I had an answer – I had an answer one time in 48 which was on the idea of harmonics. And I said, "Well, the guy's general tone brings about what he mocks up. And he mocks up something with resonance between himself and tone – you see, his own tone – and what he creates in the bank and that must be about the way he goes about this." 1948.

"The guy is at such-and-such a tone level." Well, that was a bit of a breakthrough. You could change a guy's tone level and he'd mock up something else and it's true. He will, too. But that doesn't give us the full story. And the full story is that an individual mocks up or doesn't mock up in an effort to prevent his will from being overthrown on the subject of creating. He's "protecting his self-determinism" is a very good way to state it; protecting his self-determinism with regard to creation.

If he could determine to create it, he would. But if he's being forced to create it under vast duress, he won't. And he therefore acquires mechanisms to inhibit his creativeness; and these mechanisms to inhibit creativeness are what we run into in processing. That's why old Creative Processing works, but why eventually they finally dreamed up – some preclears did – that the bank got solid if you made them mock up. Now, get that just as a mechanism to prevent creation.

See, "We can't do this", you see, "because the bank gets solid." There's another answer, you know.
Well, it's a very funny thing. I'm looking at one or two or three people here who've been around for a long time and used Creative Processing for a long time before any banks started to get solid. Banks didn't disbehave for a long time. We never heard about this and then we got this new mechanism.

Maybe some old banks did get solid but nobody ever objected. I never saw it happen – not until I started running some tests on the thing and paying attention to it, very generally, and this other series of mechanisms fell out of the hamper. Well, they'd already existed. It wasn't just people in Scientology inventing the thing, but the mechanism had already been established. This was a new method of not creating.

So methods of not-creating or methods of denying creation, methods of denying ability and so forth, are basically what you're involved with when you are processing people. That's the most fundamental fundamental.

Now, this is so boobytrapped as the basic road to Clear that it's something like driving through a – an antitank mined zone in an enemy sector on a bicycle and you go round and round and up the roads and down the roads and of course everywhere you see there are nothing but mines, barriers, pillboxes and chattering machine guns, you see? It's just not ar – it's not a driveable area.

So we have to figure out what the guy is afraid of on this subject of creation and disarm it from that angle. Now, what's he afraid of? Well, he's obviously afraid of being made to do. Creativeness, doingness. You don't say "creating", you say "doing." You see, this gets us a little closer to a driveable road, a little further from those minefields. You don't say "creating", you say "doing". Now that substitute actually is quite workable.

Now the next thing you get him over it – something there, some fundamental, has brought him into a state of mind whereby he believes that there are enormous consequences involved in his doing some of these things; otherwise, he wouldn't be so fantastically afraid to do them. You know, he wouldn't be inventing all kinds of mechanisms that, "If I mock up a good picture, it'll turn into a bad picture" and "If you force me to create something, then this way, that."

The most basic mechanism is why does the fellow mock up an automobile accident? Well, he's got an old mechanism around which goes like this: In order to get things created you have to hit somebody. That's the best way to get anything created. You have to hit a thetan and that makes him create and that's one of the most basic fundamentals you ever heard of. You have to hit him to get him to create ... Way back when.

So, therefore, when a person is beaten or defeated he's liable to start creating. Therefore, you get the birthrate of the (quote) "lower classes" (unquote). Birth rate of the upper classes isn't high because they aren't beaten. If you'd beat a few more women in the upper classes, you'd have a higher birthrate, but I don't advocate this! [laughter] But this is about the way it is, don't you see?

You get this beatingness and creation or punishment and creation or the way you respond to a blow is to create. How do you create? You respond to a blow. That's the best way to do it. If you don't believe it, get somebody to hit you sometime and you find out that you'll...
have a picture of it. Well, you didn't have a picture before. See, you didn't have a picture even of the scenery before. You were just skipping it – and get somebody to hit you and see if you got a picture of it. You'll have one. Well, what are you doing. Well, you're responding with a creation to a blow. So a fellow gets in an automobile accident. Whir, crash, bang! He's hit! So he mocks it up.

Now, this explains to everybody, too, that he's a victim. He's been made to create this thing. These would be the basic mechanisms back of this. He's been made to create it. He has responded, however, and followed the law which is: The best way to keep from being hurt is to create. Since, if one's being beaten so as to make him create, then of course the best way to keep from being beaten is to create and if one creates the picture, then the rest of the automobiles won't hit him.

Now, I suppose where you get the most involved point in an engram is when the fellow has already mocked up the engram in full, he thinks. Oh, he's hit – he's hit by a car on the highway, so he mocks up the engram and this, obviously, will keep him from being hit by any more cars, you see? And having mocked up the engram of being hit in full and now having it in full restim with all the mechanisms involved with it, he is now hit by a tank truck, so he mocks that up, too, you see? So that will keep him from – anything else from happening, don't you see? And then the tank truck catches on fire.

Well, this defeats him. You see, his best answer to a blow was to create and that always got him off the hook way back there in Arslycus and other places, a trained mechanism always got him off the hook. He always fell for it when other people did it to him. He wanted them to create and he hit them and they created and so on.

And so you'll have three phases here. You'll have engram one, engram two, and then a total not-is of engrams which is an utter defeat and the disappearance of engrams one and two and you'll find these things all present in a serious accident. The fellow is hit, so he mocks it all up and he thinks that's the end, but it's not. So he mocks all this up again and the additional, you see? And then something so catastrophic happens that he buries the lot, because he can't mock up. Obviously the mechanism is not working and people with invisible fields have simply gotten into a chronic state of where they believe utterly that it won't do any good to create. This mechanism no longer works, don't you see? Black field is the same thing. They've not-ised the mechanism. The mechanism has gone out.

Now, these are the various mechanisms involved with people mocking up painful pictures. They mock them up and there's nothing they can do about them, except mock them up.

Now it's a defeatist sort of a thing. A person is not really playing much of a game, because the pictures really have ceased to be visible to other people. That again is a protest against being made to create.

So you'd sum all this up to the responses to the summation of all overwhelmed choices. The responses to the summation of all overwhelmed choices. In other words, the person's choice is overwhelmed so he responds in some way, still trying to make his postulates stick, down scale, but still trying to make it stick. Now, the basic assumption of a thetan and the first thing that he wants to have happen, of course, is the communication formula. That's his game. That's his most fundamental game – right there in the Axioms.
If we modify the statement by saying it is the most fundamental game in the interrelationship of thetans – in other words, it's – he can have a game sort of all by himself just creating things. He's above Axiom 10, don't you see? He can have a game above that. But when he gets into an interrelationship and a real games condition, the first entrance point is that Axiom, and from there on all he wants to do is just make his postulates stick and make his power of choice felt – creation of an effect, in other words. He's got to create the effects and create the effects and create the effects.

Now, when he doesn't create the effects, he'll still try to create the effect. He'll still try to create the effect and even though he is unable to do so, he'll still try.

And of course, now we get down to Routine 3. Why is Routine 3 so effective? It is very effective. You're not pushing it as hard as you could in this unit, but it's terribly effective. It's because you're looking over all of the powers of choice he has hoped to effect, most of which have failed, and you're running out his failed powers of choice when you're asking him for goals. You're asking him, in essence, "What postulate and – have you tried to make stick." You say, "What do you want to do in life", you see?

Now, we're getting a little further from these minefields when we say "What goals do you have?" We say, "What postulates – make stick?" This is beyond him. Coo! The last postulate which he made to stick – if you just said it just like that – the last postulate. We could – "Let me see, I think that was somewhere about five minutes after the start of this universe!" It's all that time ago, don't you see? So here we are, all this long, long time ago, that was it and, of course, he's not going to process on that.

But now he has goals and these goals are in essence what postulate he hopes to make stick, re-formed and substituted into what conditions would he like to bring about. So the conditions he would like to bring about dropped back instantly and at once to what postulates he would like to make stick, which drops back to what postulates he could make stick, which drops back to power of choice over his own actions and postulates. Do you see that?

And everything we call a reactive bank is the odds and ends and bric-a-brac and mechanisms of one kind or another which tend to defend his assertion of self. And those mechanisms that are making a ruddy mess out of him – these very mechanisms – are basically intended as prevention of his postulates disintegrating and not sticking so you see, the disintegration of these postulates is what's wrong with him and, of course, his cure is so much more violent.

You know, you wouldn't think a fellow would react this hard. So he looks out there and he says, "Oak tree, oak tree, split apart. You damned oak tree!" It doesn't do it and he goes and he looks around at it to find out what's wrong with it and decides there's something else wrong with it and he goes and gets an axe. And he takes this axe and he aims a terrific blow at the base of the oak tree, you see? And the shaft quivers and the head flies off so he goes and he puts the head back on the axe and he pounds it in with wedges so it couldn't possibly ever fly off again. He gets back there and he spits on his hands and he braces his feet and he hauls off and he takes a terrific blow at the base of the oak tree and shatters the handle of the axe! [laughter]
So he says, "Well, let me see now. Let me see now. Hm-hm! Let me see now." And he goes back and he prowls and he snarls and so forth and invents a saw. And then he finds out the oak tree is on somebody else's property, by this time, you see? And it's not permitted to do anything to the oak tree. And next thing you know he's telling you how wonderful oak trees are and how one should preserve oak trees, and actually, probably, has joined or formed several societies, you see, to defend and preserve oak trees and to punish malefactors who go stand off and make postulates at oak trees and tell them to split apart. Don't you see?

But, functionally, what he's done there is trying to make his postulates stick – the original. See? He's trying to push it through. He's trying to push it through. And it isn't the postulate; it's the effect. He's still trying to have an effect on oak trees.

And the effect of making an oak tree survive is still an effect on an oak tree. He actually hasn't even changed his mind at all. He's simply modified it and the basic of this chain is the basic overt, which is why overts work so well. And the basic is that he has stood off and said, "Oak tree, oak tree, split apart. You damned oak tree!" and that will be the basis on this chain.

You find anybody who is part of the Peskadora Audubon Society for the Accumulation of Colored Paintings of Robins' Feathers and who devotes his entire existence to getting out papers on the subject of this; you, of course, quite rightly assume this bird has had an awful lot of anti-bird action! You assume this must have been the case and that it really has deteriorated like mad, because he's on an apparent "preserve birds" to such a marked degree that it is in itself an overwhelming situation.

Well, let's look just a little bit wilder and further on this thing, and we'll find out that this guy is not as dumb as we have thought he is. He is still trying to make his basic postulate on the subject of robins stick. See, he's still trying to do it.

Well, that's pretty good. He ought to at least get a medal for persistence. You uncover any of those states of mind and you go back to this.

Now let's drop back just a little bit further. Then why does he make this postulate of "Split apart, split apart. You damned oak tree"? Now, why is he doing that? Well, I don't know, somebody else created the oak tree. He's gotten into some kind of a games condition on creating, you see? He was mocking up oak trees and somebody else mocked up this oak tree. And they were making nothing out of his oak trees and he didn't mind this particularly but all of a sudden somebody boobytrapped it. And he somehow or another couldn't make nothing out of the oak tree that somebody put up there – he figures. There's something wild goes on around this.

And you'll find very early on the track thetans specialized in these fantastic mechanisms, you know? They said, "Now, if you'll just go in that hole there, in space, and throw out what you find in that hole..." you know, goofy games of this character. And the guy'd go in and he'd fool the other thetan, you see, and he'd mock up some things in there and start throwing them out, you see? [laughter] This would surprise the other thetan terribly, you know? All kinds of wild, crisscross gags of one character or another.
And the oak tree probably got mocked up basically and fundamentally on something on this sort of a basis; it was a substitute oak tree, don't you see? Somebody substituted the oak tree in the field for another oak tree in another field and the fellow couldn't as-is it because he'd had purposely lost for him the right oak tree that he could as-is, and he's trying to as-is the wrong oak tree, don't you see? And it's probably one of his own oak trees, you see, and it's got a postulate in it that "You must survive", don't you see? Now, he's going against his own postulate and it won't disappear and he still, two hundred trillion years later, is very likely trying to still have an effect on that.

Well, there's evidently something wrong, then, fundamentally with getting the wrong postulates, or something goes wrong in the whole field of postulates. So you say, "Well, what postulate – ." Now this is theoretical, this is not practical. You say, "What postulate could you make stick?" or "What effect could you actually create?"

Now, that would lay us out a process pattern which would be a very nice process, and it's theoretically very good. And it's been run with singular lack of success in all directions.

Well, why? It's going straight through the minefield, don't you see? Boy, there's antitank mines all over the place and pillboxes and trees fallen across the road and explosions and signs are all backwards and you're trying to shove the preclear through too hard. So what's he tell you? He tells you, "It's unreal to me. I can't do it", and so on. Well, as a matter of fact he's dead right. He can't because it's too direct.

Now, here and there you'd find a preclear could run this on a modified basis. I'll tell you a process that a preclear can run that is very close to it: "What decision would it be all right for you to make?" That's a very good process. That'll unconfuse somebody rather decently, because he's in a state about decision.

Now, a thetan must – as – to gets along, he must have some feeling that there are confusions and things which he cannot tolerate. There are motions and confusions that he cannot tolerate. So he must avoid these motions and confusions and he avoids them with various mechanisms of creation. These things do cross one against the other.

So if a person's tolerance of motion and randomity is raised, then his fear of the consequences of his power of choice being overthrown are reduced. You see how this could be?

But nevertheless and most fundamentally obtaining a tolerance of motion, a tolerance of catastrophe and that sort of thing would wash away, on a rather grand scale, fear of failure. You go out and ask a businessman, "What's – what would be the result of you keeping on selling dishpans" – take something rather esoteric – "and what would be the result of you going on selling dishpans and not recording them and not reporting the sales tax to the government?"

And he – he'd tell you, man. They'd fix him up, man. They'd fix him up good. They – they'd really – really fix him up. They'd send him up to the hoose-gow for a couple of years for fraud, and he'd lose his right to be a director or something and have to pay all the money back to the government and have to be – I suppose the worst of the penalties – he'd have to be polite to Inland Revenue or whoever does the collections or something like this. It'd be consequence after consequence that he can face, you see, by merely telling you about them. Yes, he
can tell you about these things and if he omitted doing this, why, he'd be avoiding the rules of
the game and he'd have rather terrific consequences. So the guy sits up all night and he creates
these slips of paper which the government requires.

I don't know why governments require slips of paper, frankly, but they do. It's just a
peculiarity like a lot of other banks. They sure love their slips of paper! You know, there isn't
anybody ever reads them, did you know that? And fifty thousand monkeys equipped with
fifty thousand pairs of spectacles wouldn't be able to peruse all the pieces of paper that get
accumulated for government in one day, you realize that? I have the statistic actuarial proof of
the matter, although it's been rather costly accumulating that many monkeys.

The point I'm making here is that the fellow has got to create this much administration
to stay in business and stay out of jail. That's a what? That's an unwilling creation, isn't it?

So how's he do it? He does it wrong. That's the best way to get around it. Don't do it
quite right. Fog it up a little bit at the edges, don't you see? And then get so crazy as to vote
for the kind of person, you see, that would make it necessary to keep this kind of a govern-
ment system where the government isn't doing any governing, you see; the government is
sorting paper. It's gotten so the armies and navies and governments of the world and so forth,
actually no longer travel on subways, roadways, passageways; they no longer sit in chairs.
The navies float on paper and the armies fire paper, you know, and the government rides
home to work on paper and so forth. Well, everybody is creating paper like mad.

Well boy, if you ever want to see corny arithmetic, you should look at some income
tax reports. That can get pretty wild. Particularly in the United States where everybody does
them himself. This can get pretty wild. Boy, they can add up 2 and 2, and sometimes oddly
enough it isn't even in their own favor, you see? I've seen fellows pay seven hundred, a thou-
sand dollars too much tax just on some kind of arithmetical error. The thing is of the silly na-
ture of adding up 6 and 6, you know, and getting 180! [laughter] They manage it! Unwilling
creation, don't you see?

And eventually, under this duress, they begin to mock up no income tax reports at all –
like Suzie even. You see, because it's just too much. See, it's just all too much, you know, and
the penalties are too much and it's nothing can be this serious, don't you see? So the best thing
to do is just forget the whole thing. Just skip it all. Let it all slide. So those are the responses
to creatingness, don't you see?

But it's going to produce – even that forgetfulness is going to produce an effect on the
government, let me tell you, man! They're going to be a missing slot.

I remember the old writer, Paul Ernst, one time. He was discussing a story with me
and he was just about to write this story, and I don't know if he ever did or not. But it was a
story to be called He Didn't Like Soup. It's one of my favorite unwritten stories. And this guy
from the twentieth century gets in the twenty-fifth century, and it's all mechanized and it's all
laid out and it's all taped and they've got this big endless belt, you see? And they – his friends
that he's now met in the twenty-fifth century take him down and they show him this endless
belt. And it's lunchtime, you know, and they're all standing there and he – they say, "Well,
take your plate of soup off now. Take your plate of soup off the belt and then you turn around
one and one-half paces to the table. And there you eat your soup, you see? And then you push
the belt eighteen degrees to the left and it – it goes down a little chute and it gets washed and so forth."

And then this guy from the twentieth century, he stands there alongside of the table, you know, this – with this big endless belt going by and he doesn't take his plate off. And this one plate of soup then goes traveling along this thing, you see, and it tips over the edge of the endless belt and goes into the machinery and the machinery stops. This blows out the fuses in the main powerhouse. The main powerhouse at once is reprimanded left and right from all directions; calls pour in; the switchboards blow up. [laughter] Here it goes!

And Ernst had it all traced out, the total failure of this entire, precision civilization and they asked the guy afterwards, as they're sitting in the smoking ruins of it all – they ask him af "Why – why – why didn't you take the correct action?" and the fellow says, "But I don't like soup!" [laughter]

I can assure you it will never happen in England! But there it goes! There it goes.

Now, there's your introduction of your various errors and the concatenations as they move on through, everything getting all complicated and so on.

So this fellow not doing his income tax return hopes to leave this plate of soup on the table or hopes that somehow or another that file cabinet will have the missing consecutive number in it and somehow or another in some part of the vast government structure there will be a breakdown, which will then cause the machinery to go off, you see, and the power lines to blow and the telephone switchboards to explode. He's hoping – he's still hoping. Got the idea?

So the creation of a confusion is the last echelon of a postulate and the last echelon of the confusion is the creation of a confusion by omission – not commission anymore; it's omission and therefore we're on a very safe road in processing of pcs if we give them bountiful exercise on the subject of the Creation of confusions. You see where we are?

Now, if you could devise an auditing command which stressed the creation of confusions by omission, why, we would even go a step further down, you see? "If you just sat still, what confusion would occur?" or "If you said nothing, what confusion would occur?" or "What not-knowingness would create a confusion?" or "What not-doingness would create a confusion?" And all of a sudden, why, you'd see a kind of all-is-revealed sort of a – of an atmosphere coming into view. "Oh, is that why I never go out of the house?" You know, that sort of thing.

Now, those are the roughest cases to get anything done with – are those cases which don't move, don't go and so on. This actually goes on down to catatonia. You should recognize in catatonia, the last possible despairing effort of a thetan to make a postulate stick somewhere. It isn't a notdoingness.

There is probably no such thing as a thetan who is not trying to do something. He can be trying to do something by not doing, which is what gets Confused. But there would be no such thing as a thetan, anywhere, who is actually – could be said in an absolute sense to be doing nothing. All thetans are busy, even with omission. They're all busy, even with omission.
So your Goals Assessment is basically targeted at recovering postulates he hoped would stick, which actually is basically knocking-him-on-the-head failures. You're getting his postulate-stick squared around, in other words, and you get a lot of these failures off and so forth. So that you would actually make a dreadful error if you never asked him for failed goals or secret goals or withheld goals. You'd have an awful mess on your hands if you never ask him for these other categories of goals.

If you just asked him for goals:

"Well, when I was a little boy I wanted to be a soldier."

"Well that's good. Do you have any other goals?"

"Well, just that one. Just when I was a little boy, I wanted to be a soldier and that's it."

And you wind up with a list of one. Probably, if your list was that limited, you could make a bet on the thing that the reaction you're getting on the E-Meter is the fact that that goal happens to be a lie. He never did want to be a soldier. The only basic goal he has is the defeat of an auditor. That's one to think about.

Now, very often a pc will become so confused on this blow-create proposition that because an auditor says something to him, then he has to create something. It's quite interesting. He's so confused about it that just being talked to causes him to mock something up. In other words, the blow doesn't have to be a blow. It's just a mere slightest drift of zephyr of air, and he instantly mocks something up, you see? "Well, now it's my signal!" Or, conversely, if he goes down a little bit more, just this mere waft of air causes him to obsessively mock nothing up. So he got out of session; he gets all sorts of ideas and so forth.

I knew this one so well that I used to have a modus operandi, which was just a straight modus operandi. I used to start a session – this is the original short sessioning. Short sessioning has another purpose these days, but this was its original version. I'd start a session on a pc and I'd get him all set and I'd run a little bit through a lock and so forth – and about ten minutes, you know? And I'd say, "Well, how do you feel now?" and bring him up to present time, everything is fine; end the session. Then just sit there for a moment and then he'd hand me a case – now it was safe.

You note it sometime – note it as a mechanism. A pc that you're having an awfully hard time with and so forth, why, just give him a little short session and he'll hand you his case. That's the phenomenon that I'm pointing out, not the fact that he's influenced by short sessioning.

You say, "Well, do you have any present time problems? Or anything like that you could, now – you know? Is there anything you're worried about in life? Do you have any ARC breaks with anybody?" and so on. "Good. Good. All right. Well, now that we've checked this thing over, is it all right with you if I end this session now?"

"Oh, yes, yes. Fine."

"All right. End of session."

Now, he's fool enough to crow, see? And he says, "Well, a couple things I didn't tell you. Ha-ha! As far as present time problems, I'm being shot tomorrow morning by Castro",
[laughter] and so forth and he gives you the lot, see, because it's safe now. You're not demanding that he create anything, so he'll create. Marvelous! I mean, watch it happen sometime.

And after he's given you all the dope, why, wind up on him and say, "All right. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?" Now you've got all the gen, carry on.

He's on a total reverse. He creates when he's not supposed to and when he's supposed to he doesn't. He's got it all locked up backwards and as far as occlusion is concerned, you could assign occlusion to many things. But basically occlusion is a thetan's last answer. It's the last answer of omission. It's overt act by omissions. It's his last effort. He just hopes something will happen to the oak tree if he forgets it. What might happen? It's leaves might go all haywire, and worms might eat it up and almost anything might happen to the oak tree if he forgets it. But that's his last answer.

Some process such as "What confusion wouldn't occur if you forgot?" Probably would make no sense to you at the present moment, but I'll guarantee you can find pcs around that'd be the most sensible sentence you'd ever uttered in your life. That would be marvelous. Come up with a total roaring automaticity of answers to this thing. All kinds of things wouldn't happen, because he's on a failed forget. It's how far can you go.

Well, now you're attacking the same targets. Naturally, a tolerance of confusions, a tolerance of problems, a tolerance of motions winds up fine. But remember failed postulates is what you're after, and that's closest attack level is goals, which is failed postulates.

Now, trying to get some version of something that runs a failed postulate was very difficult to do, but we eventually achieved this and I was able to get around to goals. You'll notice that failed postulates first showed up at the 1st Saint Hill and then goals all of a sudden showed up down in the South African ACC. They're sequitur in actual fact – getting a pc's goal, see? Very good.

Now, trying to find out exactly what a pc hopes will happen if he does exactly what he's doing would be another version of running Goals Assessment. You'd say, "Well, now, what do you hope will happen if you keep on exactly as you are?" If he can't answer this, you can undercut it. "If you keep on exactly as you are, what won't happen?" Now you're asking him for the failure.

"Oh, well, I won't get run over by cars", and he'll give you all sorts of things. If he keeps on just as he is, lots of things won't happen and this expresses itself as caution. And this is laudatory, you see? This is commendable caution. And all of a sudden, why, this sneaky idea starts rising in the back of his mind that there might be some other side to this coin. It even starts occurring to him that if he keeps on exactly as he's going, something is going to happen someplace! See, you've run the not-is off the front of the – of the shell.

And, "Well, if I keep on going sak-tha-rah-thu." You could also run an intentional series of overts off a pc simply by saying to him, "Well, now what won't be damaged if you forget it?" or "What could be damaged by forgetting it?" and maybe the both questions would produce some rather fantastic reactions. They're both practically the same thing. He's still trying to create an effect; he is still riding out Axiom 10. Well, if he is still riding out Axiom 10,
then for sure, man, whatever he is doing has an intentional effect connected with it somewhere. And if this has gone into forgettingness, then part of the forgettingness is to not-is the intentional effect. But it's almost integrated; it's almost intelligible; it's almost on the top of his mind.

Another way of expressing this: "Who would be sorry if you didn't get better?" Now, that sounds like a different type of question. It's more socially acceptable. But actually you haven't asked him, really, that question, or what he thinks you asked him at all. You're just asking him, "If you went on knuckle-heading along, here, in a total occlusion, who'd get hurt?" That's what you've asked him, not "Who would be sorry?" But that's more socially acceptable, you see? Little kids are always telling you this.

"What damage would forgettingness cause?" Another type of question along this line. And you're running O/W now, crossed with unstuck postulates, crossed with forgettingness, crossed with this and that and on the whole subject of creation of an effect, or creativeness, you're right on down to rock-bottom. Well, that might be a pretty high level of theory, and it might or might not have any degree of workability and actual application to the preclear, because as I say, it's through fields full of mines and this would be a pretty rough passage, in many cases.

But that is the road you are paralleling. And if you haven't got a map of the other road, because the devil himself couldn't draw one and you at least know what more or less is on it and I hope that helps you out.

Okay? All right.

There'll be a lecture tomorrow to make up for some of the lectures I've missed, if that's all right with you?

Audience: Yes.

And right now, I will say, good night.
Okay. We have – this is what? This is the 4th of August.

*Female voice:* Yes.

Haven't got my sextant with me. How can I tell the date? [laughter]

We're going to lengthen this course to eight weeks. [laughter] I'm not going to do anything particularly to – on the cost or anything like that. We are lengthening it to eight weeks just basically because you're being pretty slow, man. I mean that's all. That's being pretty crudely slow.

Now that isn't actually in effect for anybody but people who aren't here yet. That is to say that would only be effect – in effect on people who have not yet enrolled. Your course is still four weeks, and you're still behind. I figured out a way to give you a lose, you see. And I want to invite you to some attention to the checksheets. Make sure that you get those checked out. And I would like to make this statement, particularly to those people who are leaving: It isn't the new technique or the new idea that is wanting. It is sound technical application.

Throughout the world, Scientology has, here and there – where it has – fallen on its face solely because of lack of technical accuracy of application. That is utterly fantastic. Its basic methodology of auditing is just not applied. And in the absence of the basic methodology of auditing, you cannot get a result, and that's it! I make that statement categorically.

A bum auditor never got a good result. He got a sporadic one once in a while, and then tried to get it on the next pc, and then he kept looking for new and startling ideas that would get this idea again on the next pc. But of course, it never did. And he figures out there's something very inconstant about the ideas of Scientology or the actual processes of Scientology. These must be inconstant. No, he should look closer to home. His application of processes is inconstant, so therefore, his results are inconstant.

What it takes to comprise a blunder in the technical department is of such a wild order of magnitude that you normally, when you're supervising processing, don't even bother to ask for it because nobody could be that dumb. And yet, that is the exact blunder that is made. For instance, you seldom ask, "Well, did you report for sessions?", you know. You just don't go into that order of magnitude.
You're wondering whether or not the pc might not have had some tiny little ARC break that held up his processing and all that sort of thing. That is not the order of magnitude that causes technical results not to occur. It's the order of magnitude of "Did you report for the auditing session?" Casual statements very often have a very disarming effect and you're liable to get the sudden truth dumped in your lap, you know.

You say, "Well, did you change the process often enough every hour?" Yeah, you've had a wild, non-... non-result profile, see, over twenty-five or fifty hours of auditing. It's this kind of thing that you're looking at. You may have perfectly nice Auditor Reports, but they haven't anything to do with the sessions that were run. It's quite incredible, quite incredible.

Picking up this Form 6 discloses this, too. You start running a Security Check Form 6 about "What have you done to pcs?", you know. And one of the questions on there is, of course – well, in essence – "Did you fake auditor reports?" you know. And you'd be surprised how many falls there are on that.

The auditor wants to look good, so he writes down a good auditor's report; it didn't have anything to do with the session. It happens. It's happened over the years all too often. So, this, of course, has had the effect of making me work three times as hard as I might have otherwise, because I couldn't figure out what was happening because I myself was not looking for the gross error.

But the error that was gross is gross, man. I mean it's a really marvelously gross error. And such a question as "Well, did you change the process often enough each hour?" is liable to get, "Oh, yes!" [laughter] "You see, this preclear has to have a new process every four or five minutes, you see, because he loses interest." You'll get some of the wildest rationales, you know? And most ARC breaks that occasion auditing are actually an auditor – simply bum TRs. That's all. The auditor doesn't press on, carry through, bad Model Session, that sort of thing. And you'd be surprised what that does.

You yourself, I am sure, have noticed with enormous relief on your own part while being a preclear that an auditor who just ran on down the line with a good Model Session – he might not be very brilliant in the way he's handling the data you give him, but he's giving you a good Model Session. And all of a sudden your confidence gradually rises. You noticed that?

Audience: Yes.

And you noticed what happens to you when you run into several flubbed auditing commands and flubbed bridges, and flubbed this and flubbed that, and how your confidence deteriorates? That is a direct monitoring factor.

This, by the way, is a new field, a brand-new field in the whole field of psychotherapy – the application of the therapy to the person – that has never had any slightest study; not until Scientology. That sounds astonishing, doesn't it? But it never has.

Oh, I'm sure some old witch doctor has educated some kid that he was bringing up to be a super witch doctor or something of this sort. I'm sure he's educated him to the proper way to handle a rattle, you know, and say, "Boo" and scream at the right places. But I'll also call to your attention that those barbaric and uncivilized practices, when they are actually rendered
according to rote and the way they are supposed to be done, they're quite astonishing; they get a pretty good percentage. They at least get their twenty-two and a half percent. [laughter]

Psychiatry doesn't, man. It doesn't get any twenty-two and a half percent. And boy, they handle an electric shock one way one day and another way another day, and then they change it all around and handle it some other way, and they don't know what they're doing. But then you and I, of course, are apt to be bemused and amazed at the psychiatrist because we don't understand what his goals are. And of course, he doesn't have the same goals we do. And you can ask him for his goals and he'll give you some of the most incredible rattletrap bunch of nonsense. Sounds like nonsense to you.

"What is your goal with regard to patients? What are you trying to do with patients?", you see, something like this. And you're liable to get stuff that will curl your hair. I mean, it has nothing to do with your goals. Has nothing to do with helping people. Hasn't a thing to do with helping people. Hasn't anything to do with curing insanity. You can say, "Well how can a fellow be in the field of psychiatry if he has nothing to do with helping people and curing insanity." And you could rattle off yourself the pattern goals which ought to exist in psychiatry. And they don't exist in psychiatry.

And many of those goals are missing in medicine, particularly in the field of surgery. And you ask a surgeon, "What are your goals with regard to a patient?" and you, of course, could tailor-make a whole bunch of goals that a surgeon should have. Well, it's seldom that a surgeon has any of those goals. And so you're very dismayed because you don't understand the man.

And in Freudian analysis, the methodology of application alone prevented Freudian analysis from working. I'm sure that Freudian analysis can work because I can make it work. In 1945 I ruined more cases for the United States Navy. I told you about that, I'm sure. I ruined cases left and right by finding guys out on a park bench and pulling some second-dynamic traumatic experience, you see.

And then they were keeping records on the effect of hormones on ex-prisoners of war and that sort of thing, you know? And of course, I had access to their records. So of course they were running a wonderful test program for me. It must have cost the government hundreds of thousands of dollars. And they would write down in the records how it affected the patient on this day and how it affected him on the next day. And, oh, these were beautiful statistical records, so all you had to do was alter the psychic attitude of the patient toward sex, then go look at the records a few days later, and of course you had the direct test of what you were doing.

The government was very nice. In view of the fact that they intended to do nothing for the fellow but were merely trying to find out. See, they were just trying to find out. And you – I asked old Doc Yankeewitz, "Well, what are you trying to find out for?" And he said, "For? For? For? For?" Sounded like he was playing golf. Stopped him in his tracks. Evidently, his thought processes had never gone beyond that point. He'd been well trained, but his application of methodologies, application of the theories of psychoanalysis are almost 100 percent the reverse mirror to the Auditor's Code.
If you don't believe it, look them over. It's almost 100 percent reverse picture, and then is inconstant. They didn't even employ it the way they might have done, you see. So maybe these theories would have worked, but who would know? Because the theory was applied in such a ruggedly random fashion from one practitioner to the next, from one day to the next, by the same practitioner, and mostly reversed as to what would do anything for the patient.

But methodology, its application – and only then can you get a consistent and constant result. And it starts in with TR 0. And frankly, a person can't even read an E-Meter if he's so agitated about looking at the pc. And, you know, he's got to sit in session, but he's got to look at the E-Meter. And by actual observation, I have found out specifically that the person doesn't get the data on the needle or tone arm. If his TR 0 is bad, then his recording of the E-Meter and what it says is fantastic. Tone arm can be at 5, he says it's at 2, you know. I mean he just can't record, he can't read the E-Meter.

Now, what do you do? You sweat in going out and teaching other people and so forth. Perspiration is doing a Zambezi Falls from your brow, and your sleeves are rolled up, and you're getting ready to call for the rack and whip, you know. You're getting to – you're getting desperate, see. You've told some auditors that when the needle is tight like that and won't drop on a can squeeze with a high sensitivity knob, that the case probably needs Routine 1. See, you keep telling them this, you see. And you get this case in, and at sensitivity 0 on the knob and a near Clear needle, and the tone arm with nice action in it, you find out that this person has been run for three days on Routine 1. So you say, "Well, now study your E-Meter", and you get out E-Meter Essentials, and you put E-Meter Essentials under the nose of this person and you say, "Study that E-Meter Essentials. Now, study your meter. Get so you can read a meter; get so you can read a meter."

And he reads it all through, and he passes the examination about it, and three weeks later does the same trick with another pc. Only this time the pc is totally stuck with sensitivity at 16, and can't even find him with the tone arm. [laughter] And all of a sudden, why, "Well, what are you doing?"

"Well, we're running Routine 3, and that's all we're running, and the pc has such long comm lags, however, that it's impossible really to run Routine 3, because we only get about one goal a session." [laughter] "Well, I think – we think we found his goal. We think we found his goal though already because the whole meter just stops moving whenever he mentions being in session." [laughter] "So we found his goal all right, which is 'to be in session', obviously."

And you say, "Wait a minute now. Read this E-Meter Essentials here. Read it. Read it, would you please?" And you are just banging your head against the wall, because that isn't what's wrong with the pc. That isn't what's wrong with this auditor. He ought to be a pc. But that isn't what's wrong with him. What's wrong with him is he can't confront. It's one of these horrible, wide, wild fundamentals. It upsets him so, the idea of looking at a pc, that of course he can spare no attention for the meter or if he looks at the meter, he can spare no attention for the pc. And these two things, attention on two places, of course, adds up to the definition of a problem, doesn't it?
And so you've got two counter-postulates, what you... here you'd have two counter-objects. And you've got two things with which you are unfamiliar that you are looking at at the same time, and of course, it looks like a problem. And a person's indecision rises. If indecision could be measured in inches of mercury, it'd be the height of the Empire State Building. And... hasn't anything to do with being able to memorize a meter by rote. It has everything to do with being able to connect what the meter is doing with what the pc is doing and regard them as a unit. They actually are two things, until he gets that connection straight – got it.

So, the advice I will give you is simply, basically just this: look for greater technical gains when you have achieved greater skill in application. Don't necessarily look for greater technical gains because you have given them some new ideas. That's the thing to concentrate on. And when you've got that concentrated on, when you've got that smoothed out and squared away, all of a sudden this new factor – ideas and the application of ideas and handling the pc's ideas and all of that – that all ensues afterwards.

But as long as the person is upset and worried and maybe not even realizing he's worried, about the mechanics of how he does this thing, he of course has no judgment. And that's the basic stomp on judgment, is the person has no judgment as long as he himself is sitting in the middle of a problem of "can't apply." Well, he's sitting in this problem of "can't apply", and you expect him to have judgment about this case. Well, he can't do it.

So ideas come after, even though they apparently come before. Handling the ideas, the theories, processes, what process when, that sort of thing, comes after somebody knows E-Meter and TRs and Model Session and the other things – has these things pretty good, can do an assessment on the Prehav Scale accurately and well, and can do a good Security Check. When he can do all these things, now he ought to be worrying about what makes people Clear, because of course, this is the fundamental. These are the building blocks on which this idea of Clear is built. And it's like trying to build the top of a skyscraper without even sky-hooks, to just get an idea about clearing and then without any methodology, try to bring it about. Won't work. I had a lot of experience with this.

Now, I don't necessarily state that the TRs are the most ultimate drill that will ever be invented or even perhaps the best drills that have ever been invented, but they are very widely effective, and they are very applicable, and they are very useful, and people will sooner or later get over the hump with them.

Nor do I say that the last volume to be written on the E-Meter is contained in E-Meter Essentials. There still may be things to be known in that meter although some of the things I have found out about an E-Meter in the course of just the last year had me astonished. I didn't know there could be that much left in that meter. And there was. And this work is pretty well summated now in E-Meter Essentials. Well, that isn't the final text, but it is certainly a useful and usable text and serves our purposes at this time.

I don't say that the wording of Model Session is the best wording that could be devised for all countries, all places, and all preclears. But it's generally applicable, and it works out a good average. And therefore, is a workable structure and therefore a workable methodology.
Now, the basic laws of auditing, unfortunately, have never been stated on one sheet of paper. I have never been this adventurous, but there are certain definite laws that regulate the choice of the command. How do you run commands? Or how do you figure out a command? How do you add up a command? There are some laws relating to that. There are several laws relating to processes, whether they're good processes or bad processes. You have the one – a good example of what I'm talking about in Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought. If you were to run somebody on "can't-have" on self and "have" on somebody else – like this process: "What could you give somebody? Thank you. What wouldn't somebody else give you? Thank you." Well, he'd go right into the ground right away, you see.

So there are several process rules, but these rules are relatively flexible. They are not terribly fixed and most pcs that you try to run a games condition process on are going to tell you sooner or later that it actually should be "can't-have" on the other one, "have" for self. You'll probably run into that yourself on the bank. Well, that's – you're being so hopeful about it, that there it goes.

Well, this violates, unfortunately, another rule. And that is that running "have" for self, under long and arduous testing, has yet to produce any gain. It doesn't upset anybody. It doesn't chew them up particularly, but it doesn't improve them either. And I have looked at an awful prolonged parade of cases on which that particular facet was established, so that you would just be throwing away an auditing command if you said "can't-have" for the other fellow, then "have" for you – you know, his havingness, you. That command would be lost every time. It would be a meaningless command. So you can't run it that way.

It's "can't-have" for self, the other fellow's "can't-have" for you, his "can't-have" for another, another "can't-have" for him, and so on. That is your basic games-condition proposition. Even though it might appear more comfortable to the pc to run it "can't-have" and "have" for himself and so on. That might look much better to him, and it might feel much better. But if it feels much better, there's another little rule that comes up – is the degree of reality of the pc. And it's so weird that pcs can run glibly processes they have no business being able to run. They can run them with great glibidity. And they can just chatter off answers left and right. They get no better. Nothing happens.

Well, they're working behind a protective screen. "Nothing is real and nothing means anything anyway, so it doesn't matter what I do." And these processes don't hit at that particular button, so of course, they just continue to run and the pc can run forever. And he's running without comm lag. He's running without difficulty. Running CCH 2, he'll walk around the room and touch walls and – this was the first time this showed up wildly. Why, he'd just run 8-C forever and just nothing happens. Nothing happens at all.

You've seen cases like this. So you have the reality factor. You have the reality factor which enters into commands and processes. And that is to say a person should have a reality on what he's running and at this point, with commands, in enters the E-Meter.

So the E-Meter moves in because that thing which will cause the needle to change its pattern is real to the pc. I know, it doesn't sound real to you sometimes. You say to this pc, "Well, have you ever had any difficulty with oceans or planets?" or something like that, and all of a sudden he falls sixteen dials. You've run into the clam on the beach, you see, some-
thing of that sort. It's real to him. It isn't very real to you, but it's real to him. So your own unreality sometimes defeats you in admitting that somebody could have such a good reality on being a clam and such a bad reality on being a human being. [laughter]

So your own reality factor doesn't have to get dismayed or pushed around. You've got a simple test called an E-Meter. And so in putting together auditing commands – actually the best way to put together an auditing command is to put it together with needle reaction, and just choose your words of various kinds, and so on.

Well now, this only has one limiting factor: is after the pc has been run for a relatively short space of time on any bracket process, only then do some of the outer brackets become real to him. So he can run it for himself, run it for himself, run it for himself. It fell for himself, you see, but you couldn't get it to fall for the other fellow. So you didn't run that other leg. Well, after he's run it for himself, run it for himself, run it for himself for a while, all of a sudden this other one shows up. And we get the broadening effect of commands. We get the broadening perimeter.

Actually, there hasn't been a lecture on this since November of 1950, Los Angeles. It's a picture of the dynamics, and they're concentric. They're a series of concentric circles. I think it's been sketched around someplace, but there was a full lecture on it back then. A series of concentric circles. The first dynamic is the inner circle, and then the next circle is the second dynamic, and they go on out to eight circles.

Well, the pc's ability to reach is reflected directly in the pc's ability to conceive of somebody else having an idea or an action. And so, as you run a command, his ability to reach betters and the command you started with can become too narrow and now operates as a restriction on the pc's gain. There hasn't been much discussion of this last point at all, but I've just run into it using: pc giving somebody's, or denying somebody, the pc's interest and the – then the other person denying the pc their interest.

After it had been run for quite a while, it started to become restrictive. Why? Well, the pc's ideas now were reaching further, so denying another the pc's interest could be dropped down to just denying another interest, you see. "His" could be dropped out, or "her" could be dropped out, see. Pc identity could be dropped out of the auditing command because it was too restrictive.

The pc now could conceive of other zones and varieties of interest, don't you see. So the auditing command modified to: denying another interest and another denying the pc interest, you see. And more legs could be added to the auditing command, too.

And you'll find this is very common in putting together commands: that you get the first leg of the bracket is the most real, and then the second leg of the bracket becomes real after a while, and then the third leg of the bracket shows up and becomes real. You see how this works. And out it goes. And you get a wider and wider and wider perimeter of application. So that, frankly, there are some processes which are so steep, run on certain pcs, that they cannot conceive of a bracket interchange between themselves and another. They cannot conceive an interchange. Self can conceive of interest; another could conceive of interest, you get the idea. But for self to conceive of interest for another, that's impossible. You get the idea?
So each leg of the bracket stands as an individuated unit without any interchange amongst these brackets. Well, now if you tailored up the auditing command to run as a totally individuated type of auditing command – you see, each leg of the bracket is totally individuated, and there is no interchange with another leg of the bracket – it'd be like shooting.

All right. Let's just use shooting here. "Get the idea of shooting self. That's fine." "Get the idea of another shooting self." Well, this becomes a little hard to do, you see. And this is about all that you could get to fall on the meter. But after you've run as much as you could get to fall, you're going to get the rest of the legs of the auditing command showing up.

Well, in view of the fact that it really doesn't harm anybody to run an unreality – it doesn't really harm anybody to run an unreality if they're approaching a reality from some other quarter – why, you could put all those brackets in right at the beginning. And you could say, well, "Get the idea of shooting yourself. Good. Get the idea of shooting another. Good. Get the idea of another shooting you. Good. Get the idea of another shooting himself. Good." You see? This is kind of a built-up bracket.

Well now, these commands at the beginning would not at all be real to the pc. The pc would say, "Get the idea of shooting self", oh, boy, can he get that, see. It falls off the pin. He thinks about it all the time. That's marvelous, yes. And – "Now get the idea of shooting another." Absolutely no slightest reaction – not a bit. He hasn't got a clue. Shooting another? Nobody ever does that. He's heard of wars. He's been to motion pictures. He's even seen TV – to get to the utmost in violence – and still cannot really conceive of a person shooting another.

And as far as another shooting him is concerned, nobody ever would.

The world is full of kind people and its full of nice people. And wars are fought with chessboards and carved men. Everybody knows this. And there's just no reality. But after you run it for a little while, "Get the idea of shooting another." You've been uttering the auditing command, "Get the idea of shooting another" – if you've been watching your meter, you all of a sudden see when you utter this command, you get a needle reaction. Pow! He can conceive this now.

And you could ask him at the same moment, "Well, is that real to you?"

"Oh, man, yes, Sir. Wow! Oh, that's something I don't want to do. Yeah. It's pretty terrible doing something like that. And then having to call the ambulance, you know. That's pretty bad."

And "Get an idea of another shooting himself."

"Oh, yeah, that's what everybody ought to do."

Well, all of a sudden that particular aspect of the auditing command isn't quite so hot. It's not too hot, but "Get an idea of another shooting you." Oh boy, oh boy, it starts to fall and you'll notice that command gets hotter and hotter and hotter according to your needle reaction. Well, it's getting more and more and more real to the pc.

So if in doubt in putting up auditing commands, choose, if you possibly can, a bracket and command wordings that *all* fall on the meter. See? If you can do that, why, you're really
cooking. Everything's fine. But remember that if you choose a very limited scope of application that the command itself is going to restrict sooner or later the pc's recovery.

Now, supposing all you could get to fall was: pc shooting self; another shooting himself. Well, after you've audited this for twenty or thirty hours, all of the – you see, in the meantime the other actions of it would have become real to the pc, too. And you get all these other things, and they'll start stacking up as automaticities. And he'll start getting some kind of an automatic feeling like he ought to shoot everybody or something like this, you know, or has he shot people? – he'll start to worry about it. Because you haven't let the pc look at it, don't you see.

So therefore, an auditing command – part of the rules of auditing commands is, an auditing command can at any time be broadened and made more general and must never be made more particular. You can broaden an auditing command. Don't ever make it more particular. Don't start out with, "Get the idea of shooting another. Get the idea of another shooting you." All of a sudden, find out it isn't working too well, so add in "Get the idea of shooting yourself. Get another idea of another shooting himself" Boy! Have you goofed.

Now, that is making a more restrictive auditing command. And when you've developed an auditing command and you're going to change it in the course of processing, you must never change it in the direction of making it more specific. You must always change it in the direction of making it more general. Follow that? And you follow why?

If in doubt, take the broadest, most particularized you know, just the most possibly involved and – form of the auditing command with eighteen legs to it, and right – run it from the outset. If you're in doubt about it, just start and run it from the outset.

Then very often your pc, in getting audited, is getting – they all of a sudden start turning on a set of familiar somatics or something of this sort. Well, you can suspect, of course, withholds and you'll probably be right. You can suspect present time problems, and you undoubtedly will be right. But you should also add into your list of suspects, even though it isn't terribly important, the fact that the auditing command is too narrow, and is too specific and has probably reached a point where it ought to be generalized. Now when you generalize an auditing command, you don't change it any more than you have to. In other words, you don't change "woulds" to "coulds" and other particularities of the auditing command. You keep it in exactly the same verb form and so on. You just change its targets.

So it's always legitimate to change the targets or directions of an auditing command, but it's never legitimate to change the wording form of the auditing command. You can add more legs, in other words, or you can add more directions for the auditing command to go or you can add a more general way for it to go. But the basic form which you had – "how", you were using "how" – you better not change it. It better be "how." In other words, don't Change a "where" to a "how" or don't change a "what" to a "who" or something of this sort, you see. Don't monkey with those mechanics. You get what mechanics I'm talking about now, you know. You're running "Think – " Well, don't suddenly start running "Get the idea of – " because that's a wild change.

You can say that you have not changed the auditing command if you have generalized the targets in the command, and if you have not changed the verbalizations of the general
command. Now for instance, "Get the idea of shooting self, get the idea of another shooting himself." All right. That was all we were running at first for some reason best known to us. All right. You can't now say, well, "Think of shooting yourself. Think of shooting another. think of another shooting himself. Think of another shooting you." You're running an entirely different process.

But you can just add more legs or add a greater generality to it such as 'Get the idea of shooting self. Get the idea of another shooting self. Get the idea of shooting another. Get the idea of another shooting you. Get the idea of another shooting another. Get the idea of others shooting another." See, we're just going out further. "And get the idea of others shooting themselves." See? All this is perfectly legitimate. You're just adding, adding, adding, but you're just adding scope and direction, aren't you?

Now, you can drop portions of an auditing command equally easily by saying, "Get the idea of giving another your interest." Supposing you were running this one. It's wrong, but supposing you were running it. "You get the idea of giving another your interest" could be altered very easily – "Get the idea of giving another interest." You've dropped the pronoun which was more of a particularization than all of a sudden it was necessary to have. Maybe it was necessary at first, but now it is not necessary to have this thing so you can drop it.

All right. But "Get the idea of – ", you started out with "giving" – "Get the idea of denying." Oh, no, man, you've just changed the whole process from one end to the other because you've changed the verb. You see?

Now, this process with all these legs goes eventually into this cycle: The pc gets free enough on the whole process and all parts of the process – the pc now gets free enough to be able to consider all of the various legs of the process and the pc isn't running motivator, motivator, motivator all the time, and so forth. And you could just say, "Get the idea of shooting" You get the *redundio ad absurdum*. This would then cover – you've accumulated up to this time, let us say, forty-five legs to this auditing command about .45s. And you – it's got more particularities. You've got the thing involved out there until it's running all over the pasture, you know. And this starts to go pretty null.

Well, if you wanted to polish it off, get all the missing legs that you've missed, and so on, well, just drop the whole lousy lot and go back into a simplicity but use the same auditing commands such as "Get the idea of shooting", period. All of a sudden, why, the pc will add the targets in, and he'll add everything else in. But he's now capable of doing so. Don't you see this?

Usually an aberration is located as a total imprisonment and in a total individuation. Auditing commands, as you run them, resolve the *degree* of imprisonment and individuation. And as this degree lessens, don't suppose because you have knocked out just the individuation on one leg that you have flattened the whole command. Yes, you've ceased to have tone arm action on just one leg of it, but there were many other legs which you've left untouched, don't you see. So you can always "check out" an auditing command, which is another little rule that you should follow.

It isn't enough to say that the auditing command then – I'm letting you in now on some postgraduate college auditing command – a mock-up here. It isn't enough to say that an audit-
ing command is flat because the tone arm has ceased to move while it was being run. That is only a workable statement at HPA level. It's going to hang up some pcs here and there. Not seriously enough to really upset the game, but, give them a headache once in a while.

The tone arm ceases to move when the targets of the process have been flattened. Now the targets of the process mean self-another, let us say, or something of this sort. Now, the tone arm has ceased to move because those targets were exhausted. It does not mean that the process is exhausted. And so therefore, this is the rule: Before leaving an auditing command, regardless of the "twenty-minute rule", which is only a signal, you should check out the auditing command – this would be the very thorough auditor – for all possible variations which might produce new action. And you very often find that they all flatten off in fifteen minutes. But it was a good thing to do, don't you see?

You check back over the process, and you found out the one person that the command never applied to was "Mother." For some reason or other, this auditing command just isolated and made it impossible to use Mother. You can get auditing commands that'll do this, you see. And because it was "his" or some stupid pronoun or something of the sort. And yet it was "Mother", and "Mother" kept cropping up and toward the end of the auditing process, the pc is left there sitting with a static picture of Mother.

Now you check out the command, and you'll say, "Well, now how do you feel about this?" is a nice, general statement, but you should be much more interested. You should say, "Well, do you have any still pictures now?" "Is there anything – what do you think about the command in general? Is there anything to which it did not apply?" "Is there anything that it missed?" So forth. Bong! All of a sudden.

Well, you say, "What was that?"

And the pc says, "Well, it's a – it's a static picture. Could that be a picture of my mother? It's right out in front of me here."

And you say, "Yes, yeah. What about this? Well, what about this?"

He says, "Well, you see, the auditing – I've been dodging this for the last hour or so because the auditing process doesn't touch that particular aspect of it."

And you say, "Doesn't touch what aspect of it?"

"Well, you said 'shooting himself', see. And actually Mother is a herself, and so forth, and she used to talk all the time. That's all she ever said just morning, noon and night. 'I'm just going to shoot myself if your father keeps on the way he is going. He is always here nagging at me.' " Some Dianetic phrase ending it up, you know. And all is now revealed.

Remember that in dealing with reactivity, you're dealing with a Simple Simon type of intelligence. On any point where the pc has been extravagantly reactive, he has been extravagantly stupid. And he can add up more horses in more beds in less time, and on an auditing command, is just walking in the middle of pieces of pie carefully, you see. You see, you didn't say pies. "Have you ever stepped in any pies?" So therefore, when he was in the bakery that time when it caught on fire and walked over pies, he can't find one pie that he stepped on, you see. There's nothing but pies that he stepped on, so he can't answer the auditing command.
You've heard this kind of logic. You yourself have faced up to it occasionally. Well, it isn't that your pc in general is being exorbitantly stupid. It's just because on a reactive point in the bank, you get this Simple Simon, totally identified, idiotic nonsense. And the pc is as unconscious of it as he will be when he said ... Running engrams in the old days, sometimes the pc would give you one word every ten minutes, you know, talking very low and very slow. And the pc's totally convinced he's chattering like a magpie, you know, giving you one word every ten minutes. No way to boot him out of it. He eventually runs through it. Well, he says, "That auditing session certainly went fast." You've just sat there, you know. [laughs] Nothing but weights on the clock hands, you know. Certainly went fast.

Well, a reality factor enters the case as the case is being audited, so therefore, reality has to be kept pace with, with an auditing command if you are really doing a slippy job.

Every once in a while you'll get a pc who is a bit hung up. Other processes will solve it. It'll work out in the long run on the crude basis, so therefore, we don't bring this up. We're just talking now about the very fine points of auditing. It'll sometimes, though, show up sufficiently seriously to cause the pc physical discomfort or something, you know. Can't answer about Mother shooting herself, you see. Just can't do that because... This quite escapes you how this generality of pronoun couldn't be adapted, but it doesn't escape the pc. It's impossible.

All right. The handling of a pc, the use of the methodology, the slippiness with which you can do a Security Check, all these things add up to advancing cases. And when these things are omitted, the cases don't advance. I don't care how clever the solutions are which are arrived at by a D of P or an auditor or anything else. If those solutions are terribly clever in the absence of methodology, nothing will happen to the case – that I guarantee.

Once in a blue moon, a fellow like this will have a win. One of the ways to have a win is to stick the pc in a manic. Pc gets in a wild manic. "I feel wonderful. I feel wonderful", you know. And it wears off in twenty-four hours and he goes into the depressive state. All you've done is shove him over the hump of a little bit of an engram. And it looks like you had a win, you know, to some auditor not using methodology.

This used to happen to me all the time. I never got so disgusted with anything in my life. I finally got very used to this phenomenon of the pc telling me, "Rave, rave, rave. I just feel wonderful. I love the whole world and everything is fine and everything is wonderful", and so forth. And I would just say to myself, "Well, we'll find out in seventy-two hours." We would, too. "Oh, God! Why did I ever get audited " you know is your next immediate sequitur response. [laughs] You just put him on a little toboggan.

Processes which we're using these days don't turn on these manics the way running engrams and that sort of thing used to. Those used to turn on quite regularly.

But anyway, in trying to convince somebody that it's worthwhile knowing his tools, you run into quite a barrier sometimes because the fellow's never sitting there looking at himself audit. And if you run into this too badly, remember the Auditor's Code and the Instructor's Code are two different codes. They're actually mirror faces. They're quite reversed. Never fail to invalidate the wrongnesses of a student, you know, that sort of thing.
Make the student in question or the auditor in question – and borrow a tape recorder and a blank piece of tape – and make him sit there and do all the TRs 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and then do Model Session from scratch to the end. Just do that, you know, under a coaching basis, but don't give him any flunks. Put it all on the table. It makes a very rapid, short, little piece of tape, you see. It's one TR at a crack. You know, three "Do fish swims" and that sort of thing and go right on through to the end. And then turn the tape on and say, "Now, what in all that would you flunk?"

Well, you do something like this only, of course, at a time when somebody believes he's doing it all letter-perfect and doesn't believe he has to do any of the TRs and believes he's got it all taped. You've got to show him that he has something to learn in it, and that the cruder course is usually the kinder one. Don't go 1.1ing about it and say, "Well, with a little more practice, you'll come along all right." No, I'd just say bluntly, "You stink. Get on the ball, and if you don't believe it, why, we'll let you listen to yourself on a piece of tape." And wow! You know?

It's something on the order of the fellow knows that he sounds exactly like Caruso in the bath. [laughter] Something on that order. And if you were ever to give him a tape recording of all those flat notes ... [laughter] Well, you have to bring it home to them.

Methodology is quite important. It's the most important factor we've had, and the only reason I'm stressing it is because there has been our greatest failures. The greatest failures we have had in dissemination of Scientology is failed methodology. The methodology wasn't there, it wasn't exact, and it wasn't – certainly wasn't being followed. And as a result, processing, and so on.

Now, it's not an accident now, that we're making Clears. It's not an accident we're making Clears because we're pushing methodology, pushing it very hard. You won't make Clears in it's absence, let me tell you.

So them's the – them's the words of advice I give to these dear departed. You will be remembered, however, particularly on the despatch lines. [laughter]

Well, now, very probably you would like to ask a parting question or two, so if you do wish to, spit now or forever hold your speech. [laughter] Any questions?

All right, then. We can assume now, [laughter] that you know your business, you know your business thoroughly and backwards, and any complaints I get, I will not-is because I know they are not true.

Male voice: I'll take a rain check on it.

Female voice: That will save you a lot of work on your own despatches.

Well, I would like to say just a few words to you about this new development because – I gave you a lecture on it last night, but you talk about new ideas – don't downgrade new ideas. They're very important. It's just I'm telling you they don't get anyplace unless they're applied.

Now there is the biggest barrier in organizations, and easily the biggest barrier in disseminations is the not-doingness of people. And next in rank is the misdoingness of people.
But the not-doingness of people ranks above the misdoingness. It isn't so much by their misdeeds ye shall know them, it's by their not-deeds.

And therefore, I'm very, very happy to be able to jump this barrier. I can answer now, bluntly, an old philosophic question of the value and quality of not-doingness. Now, this is a very fundamental, philosophic question that has been with man for Lord knows how long – "to do or not to do." It isn't the Shakespearian "be or not to be" that worries man. It's the "to do or not to do." And it isn't really on a specific instance of "to do or not to do." It's the generality of "to do and not to do" that worries him. Is it better to lead an active life or to lead a quiet one?

Well, for instance, romping around France over here in the last few centuries, I used to alternate rather consistently between two types of existence, one and the other. One was a political soldier's existence, rough, tough, fast and hard, you see, alternated with almost mathematical precision with a philosophic existence – almost a sandwich, one life right after the other life. And in the same pages practically – the Encyclopaedia Britannica talks about this quiet fellow who was well liked, never got around very much, wrote a couple of books and so forth. And you flip a couple of pages, and you find out about this rough, tough character who chewed everything up in sight, see? Same guy.

Well, this was basically an unresolved, philosophic question. Just look at Matisse. Is it better to do or not to do? If you do, of course, you get into trouble. You commit overts, obviously. Spattered brains all over the place. Empires falling and thrones reeling, you know. And if on the other side of the picture you don't do a thing, you get into trouble. And this is what makes it a philosophic question because each is surrounded by a considerable confusion. Those are two islands surrounded totally by confusions. And it amounts to just this.

I had this demonstrated very clearly. I used to be very, very nasty to – (I put this in the first person so you won't feel pushed around on it.) I was a young writer up around New York City. I was just about the meanest young writer that ever lived. If an editor rejected a story, he was in for it, man. I'd meet him at a party – I'd meet him at a party, and as one of my friends said, "My God! The horrible things you do to people!"

"Why, I never treat people badly."

And he says, "Ron, I have seen you take the skin off of a person square inch by square inch, and make him like it." [laughter]

And before the war, it actually was almost traditional in New York City that you'd better not reject one of Ron's stories. And no other writer ever dared criticize my stories or tell editors they were no good. They never dared chop up anything, this was for sure. They were scared. Just plain scared. I don't say that I was putting up a vicious mock-up, particularly, but I could get very nicely sarcastic, particularly at parties when there were lots of people around, you know. I never had any trouble at all.

And after the war, I was very nice to everybody. I was very pleasant. And writers started criticizing me like mad. And editors every once in a while would write me nasty letters. My rates were superior. They were up. My numbers of readers were up. All these things were up. Well, what had happened here?
You solve it. It was an unresolvable problem. To do, in other words; to just go out overtly and claw everybody's eyes out in order to protect and effect a sphere of interest, you see, and a sphere of economic interest; or to be nice, pleasant, well-liked and get along well in a sphere of interest and economic interest. Look it over. Both answers were wrong.

Obviously, it did me no good at all to go around with that many overts. It's a wonder I didn't become an editor. [laughter] Editors, you know, are best defined – are always defined by writers as failed writers. What is an editor? He is a failed writer. I never became one, but there it was.

And on the other side of the picture – let's look at the other side of the coin – to get along well with your fellows, that didn't work. That was an unworkable doingness, and so forth, because obviously the clique that wanted my markets, naturally, would chop me to ribbons because they knew there was no danger involved.

So what did you do? Were you nasty in the field of the arts or were you pleasant in the field of the arts? And there were all sorts of contradictory lessons in this zone – very contradictory lessons.

Such as in Hollywood one time, a fellow criticized some scenes I wrote. And they could make life hell for you, you know. I blew up in his face. He was a producer. He says to me, he said, "Ron", he says, "I – I think you must have had a ghostwriter write these scenes because I don't think you can write that badly."

Well, that is the signal that you are now going to have an office in the basement, don't you see. And that is about the end of that, so – the way Hollywood goes. So I just said Raow! You know, walked back into my office, got a blank copy of a contract, brought it back in the producer's office, tore it in about forty different pieces, all small pieces, threw it up in the air, and it came down like a snowstorm, and I said, "You can go ahead and sue to get me to finish my contract, but it won't do you a bit of good. I'm through."

Well, of course, they just wouldn't have it in any other way that I had to have a better office, and I had to have this and that, and they pushed me on upstairs as fast as possible. And they were very careful not to invalidate any of my scenes. And in view of the fact there wasn't tension in the air, the scenes were pretty good. And everything was running along beautifully. So that was a reward for a total phony doingness. Totally rewarded.

Well, time marches on. One time in the navy I quit one hundred percent. I started telling people, "It's been a long war." That was my pat phrase. And I would tell admirals or anybody else. "It's been a long war." And their immediate, direct response was, "Ah, well, you mustn't quit like that, you know." They had been, the moment before, just raving, you know. And "You mustn't quit", and so on. And of course, I had them backed up against a wall.
They'd look at me and here I had campaign ribbons all over me, and they just, you know, said, "Well, what do I do about this", and it put them in a total know. It was a not-doingness.

And nobody could get me to do a thing. They'd post orders for me on bulletin boards and things like that, and I'd never report and read them. And they'd tell me to go here and do that and do something else. I'd just never bother to do it. They'd come around and beg me to after a while, and so on.

And I'd in an offhanded sort of a way go up and slouch through it one way or the other. Do it all right, but – now that was – they just couldn't do enough for me. So that was a total reward for not-doingness, huh? Doingness gets a total reward. Not-doingness gets a total reward.

Back on the other side of the coin – being rambunctious, being mean and cruel – well, that kept everything going all right. The being nice and so forth and pleasant and quiet, that didn't work at all. But it didn't work at all being mean and cruel because look at the overts you stacked up. You began to hate the whole world, you know. No answers there, see.

I'm just going over this stuff because you yourself can think of times when you have faced this particular problem. I'm sure you can think of times. "Should I do this thing or be this way? Or should I be quiet and nice and orderly, you see, or should I be a chromium-plated bitch?" You know. This is the question. Not the Shakespearian soliloquy, but to do or not to do, that is the question.

Well, the reason you have no answer to it is the basic datum is missing they're both overts. Only the longest, continuous overt is not-doingness. And very far from escaping – well, my dear, dear friend, Paul van Niekerk down in South Africa, wrote me all about the Seychelles Islands. He is proposing not-doingness like mad. He says these islands are paradise. The greatest danger is the lush fruit falling off the trees and hitting you. And he said all you have to do is walk uphill until you find a climate that you like and then just sit down and relax. What's he proposing? He's proposing a total not-do, isn't he? Well, that's great. Nothing wrong with it. We can yearn in that particular direction, and that's fine.

Let's look it over here, in my particular boots. Supposing I did go to the Seychelles Island and walked uphill and found a climate and sat down. Just supposing I did, right at this particular instant. Well, just look at it in terms of overt. Look at it in the term of overt, not term of responsibility or other thing yip-yap, or rights to do this or that because man's got himself all taped through this, so that he guides himself with false beacons the whole way, see. Just look at it for what it is. It's one God-awful overt.

For instance, I'm pulling an overt right this minute on East Grinstead. They gave us a bunch of yak-yak about death lessons and the newspapers up here were not particularly friendly or kindly. They're going to have a lousy parade tomorrow. They're going to have a lousy parade. They have a bank holiday parade. It's quite a feat. They were down here on their hands and knees trying to get us to cooperate. They wanted me to be Parade Marshal and they wanted Mary Sue to be hostess to their guests and lords and ladies and everything, and I just said "No!" And because Waddingham can make a couple of quick quid out of driving the car for them, why, I said, yes, well he could borrow the car – as long as they paid Waddingham very well.
That's an overt because I'll tell you, if I hadn't been on deck last year, they wouldn't have had any damn parade. It wound around all the wrong streets and the wrong corners and tried to get itself wrapped around every available telegraph pole. And even then wound itself up on the side streets five blocks away from where it should have been, and probably would have been there till midnight. I kept it from being a total debacle, but it's an overt because, of course, Saint Hill is actually quite a peg in this community.

But I'm not kidding myself. I don't feel bad about this one way or the other. But basically through the root of this, we're just to some slight degree getting even. Give it another month or so, why, I'll start telling them, "Well, if you people had been a little nicer about your death lessons and so forth, we wouldn't now be trading at Crawley."

And they'll say, "What death lessons?"

"Don't you remember how mean you were to Saint Hill?"

"Well, grudge, grudge, grudge." And we'll bring it all around the circle again.

But of course, all this is totally knowing on my part. There's nothing reactive about it; it's a plot. [laughter] I won't take the blame for the rain. [laughter]

Now, there's your "do" and your "not-do" – your "do" and your "not-do." And the greatest overt that produces the greatest amount of confusion is, of course, omission.

Have you ever noticed the randomity that can be produced by a missing datum in any given problem? You notice that? Right now, I have some randomity with regard to this ship, you see. I don't have all the data and books on the performance of this particular type of hull. And lacking them is making a considerable confusion. And they apparently exist, but nobody is willing to answer up to them, and I have to wander through a lot of things, but it's causing a lot of confusion.

A false datum can cause some confusion, but nothing compared to a missing datum. Look at man with missing technology about the field of the mind. If you want to know what missing data can do, he's been staggering around for the last fifty thousand years, running into blank walls. He's involved himself in autos-da-fé and every other kind of weird, oddball activity. And civilization after civilization has perished one right after the other. And civilization today is almost synonymous with weakness. Various other factors exist, all because he didn't know any – didn't have any instruction books of any kind. He didn't know how the mechanism worked. He didn't know what made it go together or anything else. Well, that randomity is just produced by a missing datum.

Well, how about a missing beingness? Now the ultimate, of course – the near ultimate in not-doingness is a missing beingness. You can be there, you see, and just not do anything, but at least you're there.

How about not being there? You realize that'll produce more confusion? All right. Now, there's one more... That's why this is only a near ultimate. There's a "not being there." The near ultimate is that one, but the ultimate, of course, is "forgetting."

You not only are not there – doing nothing, but you're not there, you see, is the next step down. Doing nothing; next step down, not there to do anything; and the next step down
from that is to forget all about it. And these, one, two, three, produce in that order increasing magnitude of confusion. And this is the production of confusion.

Do you realize there is probably some place in this universe, a power station, right this minute where you are supposed to throw switches in and out. And you're not there, and you've even forgotten that it exists. Isn't that interesting, huh? I imagine there's some activity someplace – some activity someplace – that is just – well, did you ever look out across a bunch of mounds which were once stone walls? You know, just utter ruin.

Rome is a wonderful place to look around. But there are other countries have them, too. Did you ever look out across that? And did you ever have a feeling, a rather pleasant feeling about it? Old ruins. Did you ever have a rather pleasant feeling about it? Did you ever kind of like old ruins? You know? Think, isn't that nice. Look at that cloister, you know.

I ran into one in Spain one day. I came running down a hill on a motorcycle, and here was the most enormous arch in front of me. And boy, was it – had it been a grand arch, and, man, was it a ruin. And oddly enough, it didn't even have an identity anymore. Nobody could even tell you what it was. I remembered it very well. It probably has a great deal to do with my having difficulty sometimes speaking Spanish. But there, there is that action.

Axiom 10, insistence upon. A thetan never, never, never, never, never – this is the rule – ceases to try to have an effect on anything. He never ceases to try. No matter how he looks, no matter what he is doing, he never ceases to try to get Axiom 10 in effect. He just never ceases to try. No matter how many trillennia have gone by, he has not stopped trying. And you are trying to process people who are in the middle of about a hundred thousand continuous overts which they are doing right this minute.

How are they doing them? Well, they may be in life here, but they're not doing anything in some direction. That would be the least of them. You see, doing something is apparently the least overt. It's quite interesting, isn't it.

And look at the success which you have in handling this in processing overt. You know, running overts. But how about withhold. Withhold evidently produces a considerable difference. Ah, withhold apparently is a little more so, isn't it. A withhold seems to be the more therapeutic side of the O/W situation. Produces the greater gains on the pc when you get the withholds off. Well, what is that? You can marry that up to this other thing of not being there.

It's his not-doingness in some version or form or another that is weighing heaviest on his case. His not-doingness is weighing heaviest on his case. And there is no picture of "Should I do or should I not do?" These are not data of comparable magnitude. "Do" and "not-do" are not data of comparable magnitude. "Not-do" is enormously greater, and the fellow sitting down on the Seychelles Island having abandoned all the world, you would say, well, he can't possibly – we've all agreed that he couldn't possibly be committing any overt of any kind whatsoever. Then why does he go to pieces? That's the question.

How has this businessman who has been in there gouging his competitors, ruining his employees, just raising hell in all directions, pulling national security to pieces just – you know, anything he could do – "Well, let's make a deal with the Russians, you know. They've
got some material and so forth, and we can black market it through Switzerland", you know. He seemed to be fairly – fairly bad shape, but he was still functioning. And then one day he listens to a medico, and the medico says, "You ought to retire." Ha, ha, ha. And we see this bird in a few years, or a year, and sometimes in a month or two, and the guy is just a collapsed mound of flesh. He's a gone dog. He's carrion bait. That's all.

Well, how does this retirement produce such a fantastic effect? Why do men die on an average earlier than women in the workaday world? Well, women are still doing more or less what they did before. They didn't retire. But the man did. And he introduces a "not-do." And even though he is advised to do this and he thinks it's the thing to do, and everybody's agreed the thing to do, basically underlying all that, this unknown factor existed: It was one God-awful overt.

Now we gloss over the overt very nicely. In Amarillo, Texas one time, I saw a sign on the wall, and it says, "If you think you're so valuable and needed, go down to the graveyard and look. Those fellows thought so, too." A nice western type of... [laughter] Unfortunately, it happens to be totally incorrect. It's not right. It's not right.

A thetan, down underneath it all and over all of the motivators and excuses and so forth, knows he was important to that zone and action and knows he is important to life. And knows he has a function in life. And when he doesn't perform it, he knows he is performing the greatest overt he can perform. There's only one greater overt – is to forget it. And that is the final effort to have an effect.

You can have an effect on an area by not doing anything in the area if you can have no effect from doing something.

All right. Now, let's take the gradient scale of effect then. All right. It runs like this. You do something and have an effect on things. Axiom 10.

Now let's float on down and see the undergrades of this. You can have an effect on things by not doing. That's still an effect on things.

All right. Now we could have a downgraded, lower effect, a lower order of effect – but still an effect and actually a worse overt in not being there. We not only not do, but we are not there either.

Now, below that gets the lower grade, which is to forget it. And that still has an effect on things. Believe it or not, it still has an effect on things. A very rambunctious effect, too. You can see that in everyday life. You forget to bring home the milk and you produce some randomness, you see. All you've got to do is to forget to do something and you can produce a considerable amount of randomness.

Well, how about forgetting a whole lifetime? Not just a quart of milk. But don't you think that might produce a greater randomness? Well, it does, oddly enough. And it's an overt, and the fellow realizes it's an overt. He recognizes totally the overt character of forgetting. And there is whole track occlusion, and I've been on the track of it here for a long, long while to nail it right on the button to where you could actually resolve this thing called occlusion because it's been a considerable target over a considerable period of time.
And that is occlusion. It is the overt of forgetting. And the law behind it is: that *a thetan never ceases to try to have an effect on targets he has selected. He never ceases to try.* And the only thing which could ever pry him loose from those fixated effects and so forth would be something like Scientology. He is imprisoned to the degree that he is still trying to have a hopeless effect on something. And there is his imprisonment. And that is his most basic imprisonment. He's his own jailer. He's trying still to have an effect.

I dare say there's – there are armies whose bones have been wheat germ for a long time, battlefields totally forgotten, on which you are still trying to have an effect. And your last order of effect, of course, is to forget it – because of course, that doesn't ever permit it to as-is, does it? Ah, that's the overt. It can never as-is if you forget it.

When a fellow goes totally bad and gets even meaner than I was when I was a young writer, he forgets. "That'll show them. That'll get even with them." When you get it on down, all the way down to the bottom, of course, it's just that: occlusion. You make an occlusion on it, and of course it will never as-is, and that makes the finest variety of overt ever heard of, and you're trying to process people who have thousands and thousands of these things.

Now, if O/W can stall a case, and if it's a mere matter of withholds – if the mere matter of withhold can stall a case ... You see what I'm looking for here is speed-up of auditing, not anything else. But if the mere matter of having withholds can stall a case, how fast or how much do you think a case could be stalled by not being there. That's a withhold of self, isn't it.

All right. Now there's a deeper grade. How much do you think the case can be stalled by the withhold from self and there, and from doingness and from the subject, and from any knowledge of the subject, and from any acquaintance, and from any communication with any beingness of the subject? You get the idea? Kowww! And that's why the more occluded a case is, the harder the case is to audit. And there's the mechanics of it.

So you get somebody and you run them on "What wouldn't you mind forgetting?" they're apt to make some very interesting case gains. Because you're really running withholds. But you're running withholds of a specific variety.

But the auditing command which would add up to something like this would be more likely in this zone and area. It would be – this is some generality of pattern of command – it would be "What confusion would forgettingness create?" That's just – not necessarily a deliverable command; it's just the model command out of which you could get many commands. "What confusion could be created by forgettingness? What confusion have you created by forgettingness?" would be your rock-bottom, all-the-way-downhill form.

Those are not the auditing commands. Those are just the theory statements. You ask yourself that question, you're liable to get some astonishing answer. I suddenly realized that I'm still getting even with the Middle East of about the five hundred years on each side of the year zero. I'm still getting even with it. I'll show 'em. [laughter]

Forget all about it. And what would be the consequences of forgetting all about it? Hmm! Nobody would know the succession of kings if I forgot all about it. Nobody would know the various dynasties. Nobody would know the national boundaries. Nobody would know the customs. *Ha-ha-ha-ha.* Nobody would know anything about the weapons. All those fellows
and all those glorious deeds which were supposed to have seen posterity would all disappear. See? I must have done a good job on it because of all unknown archaeological areas in the world, the Middle East is certainly one of them. [laughter] That's the overt.

But we've looked on forgettingness as a sort of a passive thing. And we've looked on not – you know, "The fellow's just unfortunate. He forgets, you know." And we've looked on – we've looked on not-doingness as the natural state of beingness and all of a sudden find these are the most horrendous overts that a person could possibly run, of course, opens up a brand-new, wide horizon for faster processing.

Okay. I wish you all a very good weekend and I wish the three who are becoming dear departeds all the luck in the world and all the success in the world. And I'll be hearing from you.

Let's have a contest. You make more Clears than we do and we'll make more Clears than you do. [laughter] Okay? All right.

Good night now.

*Female voice: Thank you.*
FORGETTINGNESS

A lecture given on 8 August 1961

Thank you. This is August what? Eighth.

Audience: 8.

The 8th. Very interesting, the word eight, the letter eight, the numeral 8. You know, I've been seeing it around since Phoenician times. And they stuck – used to be two money bags. You'd set a money bag on top of a money bag. That's right. That's where we get eight. So I hope you've made a lot of money today. AD 11.

Well, there isn't anything to talk to you about, actually. No new developments except the mind.

Now, I suppose you'd rather ask questions, wouldn't you?

Female voice: No. [laughter]

Well, I've just made a little breakthrough that might be of great interest to you. The reactive mind is basically that area of occlusion which the pc is unable to contact and which contains within itself a total identification of all things with all things. And until released into the realm of knowingness, continues to react upon the person, compelling him into actions, dramatizations and computations which are not optimum to his or anyone else's survival.

Oh, you think I couldn't do it again, huh? [laughter] Well, I'll show you. Peter, roll back the tape. [laughter]

Therefore, we find in this mechanism called the reactive mind, we find that residual of unconfronted, not-as-ised material which the individual is seeking to avoid. All the discreditable things of his existence are, of course, contained in this area, the knucklehead. And he has various mechanisms of survival connected with all this. And eventually the fox, who has run across the river and has been caught, and who has lost his tail on the chopping block to a farmer, will always come back and explain to the other foxes the great virtues of having no tail whatever.

I imagine if you painted somebody with some kind of paint which was utterly unremovable and completely eradical–unradicable, that he would eventually find vast virtues for that coat of paint.

But one doesn't expect the indulgence in this direction that the reactive mind has received, because now we learn that the only reason anybody can do anything is because he is a reactive creature. Circa: Psychology, its definitions, early half, twentieth century.

You can't write, you can't paint (you didn't know this, did you?), you can't accomplish anything in life – none of these things – unless you're totally plowed in and have a very large reactive mind.
Well, in view of the fact that Locke, Hume et/and company were unable to do anything much about it – and by the way, their early articles on it are quite interesting – the articles on the mind. You should read them sometime. The "faculty psychology", circa 1550 A.D. on forward – a great many articles on it and they're all quite interesting.

"Faculty psychology", of course, contains the perceptions, and it's a study of the perceptions, "faculties". It doesn't mean the professors. I thought it did for a long time and then I did a double take on it one day. And they're quite interesting articles. They actually do try to take apart the various fields and zones of perception and thinkingness and attention and feelingness and that sort of thing.

And they are very innumerable, very clever analyses of this, that and the other thing. They're not applicable. They don't go anywhere, mostly because they are directed at knowingness, and they are the psychology, you might say, of knowingness, or awareness, or the analytical sphere of existence. It's quite interesting. They had analyzed and done quite a great deal with the analytical spheres of existence. And they kept getting thrown off their ponies as they would ride them down their pages. They would keep getting thrown by the fact that man didn't act in a rational fashion. And they would get it all stacked up very nicely how man is rational, man always reacts in a rational fashion, men are always acting for the best in this best of all possible Panglosses. And you get a sudden departure from optimum survival. Well, in saner periods, this was harder for men to understand, and they tended to just skip it.

And then all of a sudden – leave it to the German and the Austrian, and the Russian – they went off the springboard and went straight into the middle of reactivity. And they got the ideas of stimulus-response mechanisms. And they – a new philosophy came up in Germany – Leipzig, Germany – Professor Wundt, 1879, Leipzig University.

His papers are also well worth reading someday when you've got a comfortable summer afternoon with nothing else to do. They're sort of ho-hum. [laughter] But there is the cry of desperation. This is the cry of desperation. It is the last ditch "God damn it" of philosophy. That's about all it is.

It says, "Well, we will cease to consider this dirty beast, man, as a rational being, since every time we ride our ponies down our philosophic pages, we get thrown right straight into the quill pot. Because he keeps doing things irrational, and we know very well that he should be rational. So therefore we'll abandon the idea of rationality in man entirely and completely, and we will label him from here on out as an animal. And he is nothing but an animal. And we will say that he operates, not on the spirit, the soul. He has no tender responses. He has none of these things, but he operates totally and completely as a machine, a biological machine. And he is just an animal, and anybody that tries to make him anything else is a traitor to our desperation." And that, in essence, was precisely the point of departure of Professor Wundt.

And all the psychologists of the world at that moment rose and bowed toward Leipzig because this got them off their horrible dilemma. No longer did they have to confront the idea that a rational animal was inexplicably irrational. All they had to say is, "he is always irrational", and they had solved the problem neatly and no longer had to be bothered with it. And that they made no progress, then, to amount to anything hasn't disturbed them at all. They
have had peace of mind in their own subject. They have not had to observe anything. They have not had to explain anything. They have not had to accomplish anything or do anything, actually, except punch buttons.

They said, "Well, you see, it's obvious that if you kick a man hard enough in the stomach, he gets a stomachache. That's all you need to know about it. If you take food away from a man, he will do anything to get food – rob, steal, burn, slay, anything. So therefore, to handle men, you kick them in the stomach and take food away from them." And so they have taught every government on Earth. And governments are now totally convinced that they are governing a stimulus-response mechanism which can be predicted on an unpredictable level.

They think man can be predicted, if you beat him hard enough, you see. It all works out according to the textbooks. See how simple it is? You know, you never have to be troubled thereafter. Nor do you have to inspect the fact that there are just as many unpredictable reactions to these things as there were to the earlier one, that man is sane but is sometimes unpredictable.

Now, that man is insane has just as many unpredictabilities. It is not true that if you kick men in the stomach – well, they don't even all get stomachaches. And in addition to that, if you take the bread away from them a hundred percent, they do not necessarily at all rob, steal, burn, or anything else.

Why, I know fellows that you – all you had to do was walk up to them and say, "Well, all right. Now what we want you to do is just so-and-so and so-and-so, and if you don't do that, we're going to kill off all of your family and starve you to death, and ruin your business", and so forth. And the fellow stands there and says, "ptt." And they go ahead and kill off all of his family and ruin all his business, and they come back and say, "Now are you going to do it?" And he says, "ptt!" [laughter] So you know what the psychologists do with that case history? They hide it. [laughter] And psychology could now be called "that vast morass of hidden case histories which dispute their theories." And you look it over, and I think you'll find out this is about right. It all looks so neat, except if a datum comes up that belies their favorite theory, they put it aside.

A theory. Now, up until Scientology, a theory about man was too precious, much too precious. It was evidently very difficult to get an idea up to this last ten to twelve years. Man really considered it a tough thing. You get an idea, man, you're really doing something. And if you get a theory about how things work, then whether that theory is true or false, whatever else you must do, you must stand there with that theory guarded on both sides by raging lions and machine guns. Nobody must assault that theory because it's precious. Ha-haha-ha. It's precious and must never be – never be threatened. And that was true of the old faculty psychologist. Honest, men went to the stake to protect their theories. And in the field of psychology, they will throw away all evidence to protect the theory. The theory is the thing. Theories are precious.

Now, in old Scientology 8-8008, it talks about abundance and scarcity of all things. Well, we're looking at – up to that time – at a scarcity of theories about the operation of man. And in Scientology we're looking at an abundance of theories. We don't care grass for a theory, see. Just whether or not it works in a heuristic science.
Ah, but this assaults the finest citadels of learning. You mustn't have anything that just works. Now you're in the field of the crass artisans. You're in there with the people who eat garlic and black bread, you see. You're not dealing there with the quill pen in the ivory tower, you know.

Somebody's going to come along, you say, well, your modus operandi is always being threatened by the fact that somebody's holding grandly forth about this or that, and it's not backed up by any workability. And what you overlook is the fact that he doesn't think it has to be backed up by any workability. It's enough that he dreamed up a theory about it, no matter how horrible this theory was, the theory is precious. He isn't interested in its workability. And he does not think that the workability or non-workability would prove or disprove the theory, because he doesn't think the theory is subject to proof or disproof. And that you miss all the time. So these people appear irrational to you. They're not. They're just protecting the scarcity of theories. You think, well, it should be workable. You should be able to do something with it.

Man has a shell pass over his head a foot away, and he goes into a state of shock or paralysis. Well, you say somebody that knows anything about the mind should be able to go up to the fellow and say, "Give me that hand" a few times or something like this, and the fellow comes around.

And he says, "Wooohh!" He says, "That was a rough one."

And you say, "Well, that rough one was a couple of months ago now. Let's – give me that hand."

And the fellow says, "Yeah, what do you know."

Comes out of it, see? You think that ought to be...that ought to be what you ought to be able to do. And actually, that is so reasonable that it is very difficult sometimes to conceive an idiocy such as a fellow who knows all about the mind doesn't have to be able to do anything about that. Or help anybody or apply it or do anything with the mind or better anybody or worsen anybody or anything. See, it's enough that he has a string of Roman candles after his name. See? That's all. None of his knowledge has to be put to test.

The psychiatrist, for instance, or the psychologist today, explains to you very defensively that he has spent years in a schoolroom. That's enough. You say, "Well, what can you do with the mind?" That has nothing to do with it. That has nothing whatsoever to do with it. He spent years at it. And he is now a member of the North Pole Psychological Association for Theories About Penguins. [laughter] Mmm. And he's a fellow of the Let's All Get Together and Swap the Papers we Have Written Society. And that's enough, man. That's enough. And the world at large sits there and says, "Where are the mental practitioners?" That's kind of what they keep wondering. Where are the mental practitioners?

Well, they've been gone so long, the world kind of can't have them. The last effective ones they had were witch doctors. The Zulus have still got good mental practitioners. They go around and get a shot of nearsphenamine for their accidental acquisition of the spirochete. And then they promptly walk around the corner and into the corner of the kraal and see the witch doctor to get the spell taken off, too, so the mental side of it is cared for.
The Zulu is very careful to do that. And it drives the medicos down in South Africa halfway around the bend. Their perfectly good neoarsphenamine is apparently not enough. And it isn't either. That's true. That would be true in any lineup. You take anybody that needs some neoarsphenamine, he probably is in such a traumatic state anyhow that you'd have to do something rather heroic to make his physical rehabilitation occur. So the Zulu's right.

Now, that's the basic history on which we're operating. Unless you understand some of this basic history, some of the other things about existence are a little bit hard to assimilate.

For instance, why isn't the Scientology practitioner at once embraced by governments and Industry everywhere! – clang. Well, they haven't had any. And it's just been an absence for so long that their havingness is shot on it. So they hire a bunch of theorists, you know, that can't do anything. And their havingness is somebody who can't do anything, because there hasn't been anybody who could do anything, don't you see? All you've got to do is shift this frame of mind, of course, and the Scientologist is the only one who can fill the bill. The others can't.

Do you know right now that the United States has literally acquired, in a relatively short space of time, thousands of companies who are now testing people with lie detectors? Just thousands of companies all over the country. They don't know anything about it. They don't know how to do it. They haven't a clue. They're turned out by the big lie detector colleges and so forth. They know nothing about the mind. You can take these boys and put them over the jumps and – I mean the practitioners, you know – and you just leave them sitting there with their eyes as saucers because they never knew one of their machines could do this sort of thing. You know?

And you say, "What about this, what about this little fact, this one little fact here, that nine percent of your people apparently are not registrable on this machine? What about that fact?"

"Well", they say, "that's right. It's nine percent – nine percent of the people just don't register."

You say, "Why?"

"What?"

"Why?"

"What do you mean why? What s tha – you've interrupted the conversation here?"

You say, "No, why don't nine percent of these people register?"

"Well", he says, "It says right here in the textbook of the Keeley Institute" or at the Keeler Institute. I get them mixed up. One solves drunks, and the other solves lie detectors.

And they say, "It says right there, read that line? It says 'nine percent – nine and a half percent of the people they put on the machine ...' That's it, you know.

And you say, "Why?"

And they say, "Look, it says right here in this textbook. It says 'nine and a half percent of the people don't register on a lie detec...' Aren't you satisfied?"
You say, "No, why?"

And they say, "Well, to hell with you. You must be a Scientologist." [laughter]

No, people are being fired by these characters who know nothing about the mind, know nothing about their machinery. They're being fired, they're being hired. It's a rather pathetic thing.

Now, you and I know you can get a large strata of people who never register on a Security Check. They're not up to a responsibility of registering on a Security Check. You don't get a fall with the needle. The fellow's sitting there with his hands dripping red, and you say, "Have you ever touched any red paint or blood or murdered anybody or anything?" And the fellow says, "No, no, no." The fellow says, "No, no. Never did." And the needle doesn't even quiver.

And we know that this is an irresponsible character who can't work – we have to look sideways to find his actual identity – and he cannot work. That's one of the main things. He cannot have solutions. That's another thing. He's every reason under God's green earth why he shouldn't be in an industry,

what he had forgotten. And that is the level of action. And that's the sequence of action that a thetan does on any given subject.

When you enter engineering school, you have to postulate that you know nothing about engineering. When you enter the school of arts, you are asked to postulate that you know nothing about arts. Get the idea? Well, take that in a finite application down here on Earth, and you've just about got it.

Now to some degree we do this in Scientology – to our shame – where you go to school, why you're asked not to – to not-know what you know about the mind, you see. But actually nobody has ever made that request of you. The reverse request has been made, however: "Please look around and find something you don't know about it."

You know, actually find something you don't know, not just say you don't know – just find something you don't know about it. And of course, we've moved you off from "know" back to "not-know." We've moved you from second postulate to first postulate. And in the field of first postulate, we can operate because we can move back rather rapidly to native state. And the peculiarity of what we're trying to do, which is to say to a marked degree return a thetan to native state with the total ability, added, of experience. This is what we're trying to do, you see. And this, of course, parallels in training. You have to find out what you don't know about the mind in order to find out about it. In other words, we're backing up. We're doing a reverse line.

That is to say, in engineering school, or the arts colleges or something like that, they ask you to not know and then learn a lot of nonsense, because there is an awful lot of this stuff is pure nonsense, you see. It has no workability. That's marvelous.

For instance, they've just made a breakthrough on planing hulls with liquid strips. They learned all this from this tremendous upsurge of water skiing that's been going on, you
know. And then they kept looking at fellows on water skis and then kept looking at fellows on water skis, and all of a sudden it dawned on somebody that you ought to put water skis on a boat, that water skis were a better hull and had better hull performances than hulls. And so I'll be a son of a gun if they didn't put water skis on boats.

And I was almost startled out of my life on the Potomac one day. I was going down the Potomac in the Huskie and I saw this boat which was about eight to ten feet off the water, it was this twenty-four foot cruiser. And there was some fantastic, you know, Rube Goldbergian mechanism whereby, you know, you probably pumped wheels and turned levers and ground screws; and you got these enormously hidden girders of some kind or another moved down underneath the boat, you see. And then the boat in some tippy fashion was put forward and eventually got up there. And then you rigged propellers in some fashion to get these propellers to operate down underneath the water skis ten feet below the engine. And you hung it all together with baling wire and shoestrings, you know, and the mechanic's chewing gum, because he gave up long before. And that was about the first real adventure on this.

And then we learn a little later that they had them up safe enough to where they let Prince Philip run one for a little while down here. And they had – and the navy was building some, and they went way up in the air and did about – supposed to do about forty-nine miles an hour. And Prince Philip, I think, got about fifty-five out of one, but leave it to him. And they were – everybody was very upset, because this wasn't supposed to go that fast. But – nervy guy, that fellow.

Anyway, the score is that they had them all on stilts, you see, water skis. And then all of a sudden somebody got real smart and said, "Well, a water skier, now, isn't – just because his eyes are six feet above the water skis, is no reason the bottom of the hull of the boat has to be six feet above the water skis." See, they got real smart, and they said, "We'll put the hull of the boat in the water. And we'll put the water skis right up against the hull."

And as soon as they did that, why, the boat in one of the roughest Nassau races – Mi-ami-Nassau races – ever run ... And that channel out there, that Gulf Stream off Miami, can really get rough. And a boat so equipped came in twelve hours before the nearest competitor. And all they did was tack water skis on the bottom of a hull. They put four water skis on the side of – each side – of the hull. It was very interesting.

Well, I've got a book upstairs – Marilyn sent me – that is the technology of planing hulls. It's a very recent book. It's not an old book at all. And it came out just before anybody made a practical breakthrough with the water ski. It's very recent, and it is old as Methuselah. Its data is all went. It is an antique. And there it sits, brassy new covers and everything else, out of date.

For instance, it tells you rather amazingly that you must never let the forefoot of the boat rise out of the water. If you're going to have a planing hull, you must never let the forefoot of the boat rise out of the water. And these water ski boats do nothing else but rise out of the water, you see. And they explain to you how it's utterly impossible for a boat to be run with its forefoot out of the water. And this is very convincing, too.

Nevertheless, there's a lot of good data in the thing. It proves completely that as soon as you get rid of displacement, you go faster. That theory is very sound. But there is this odd-
ity connected with it. You see how this data gets booby-trapped? Here we can look at the last end of the Nelsonian theory of shipbuilding, see, because he had stuff that planed, too. And it begins right there at this point of where somebody observes somebody on water skis and said, "Why don't we put boats on water skis", and right away, all their technology goes blooey. Well, it must have been an awful lot of invented technology for it all to go blooey. For this much technology to blow up all in one package, there must have been an awful lot of false nonobservation connected with it, right? And that's for sure. That's for sure.

Right at the beginning of the book, it says, "Of course, it's impossible to actually model test planing hulls." That's a wonderful assumption, since I could figure out how to water test a planing hull at fifty-five. But they never get them at fifty-five because you can't get something to go tearing down the length of a swimming pool at fifty-five. Don't you see? You can't get anything to start and stop that fast. And then the water, they would think, was turbulent, you see, if you poured water at fifty-five miles an hour, so they just gave it up.

Well, as a matter of fact, I've seen many a smooth stream of water running at fifty-five miles an hour. If you throw enough water down a pipe, why, you'll get fifty-five miles an hour worth of water. Which is relatively unturbulent providing the pipe is maybe seventy-five feet long. About the middle of the pipe, if that's very smooth and there's enough volume of water, you can certainly get volumes of water going down a pipe which would certainly serve to test this sort of thing.

The theory is real wonderful, but if we look too hard, it'll blow up. And with the theory blowing up, there will go all of our MRINA buttons, and all of our importances will blow up because our importances depend totally on theory. Well, that's the first and foremost thing that we have changed in Scientology. We mustn't neglect that point – is our importance depends totally upon our workability. That is the total dependence of Importance. If we could make what we know work, we're important, and if we can't make it work, we're just another theorist, and the world is full of them.

There's the first time this type of thing has actually appeared. The early days of engineering have a smattering of this in it, but here is a late engineering subject called hydrostatics and hydraulics which still has a great deal of the sacredivity of the theory. If anybody'd ever built a science of hydrostatics, one single discovery couldn't blow up the whole science unless the science itself was a bit of a phony. Right?

Something would have knitted together in this ancient science that went, but nothing did. And now the forefoot of the boat has to ride out of the water in order to make a boat go fast. It has to. I mean there's nothing else to it. There's all sorts of weird things have been going on here.

But if you can make something work, then any body of theorists eventually blow up. The only thing that ever blows theories up is demonstration of a workable counter-theory. The workability of a counter-theory is what blows up a body of false theory. So if you have objection to the false theory which is being stacked up and foisted off on man in all directions, the way to blow it up is simply have a high level of workability.

And you'll find all of the falsity and pomposity of the entire sphere and area will blow up without any further protestation from you. You just go on and do your job, and it will blow
up, believe me. You don't have to pay much attention to it, any more than you've paid attention to a little thin zephyr of air blowing through the room.

You can do your job, you can do your job. And therefore you'd better know how to take a reactive mind apart, *ka-bango-bango*. Because there is the vagary. There is the unpredictable. There was the thing between faculty psychology and modern (quote) (unquote) "psychology" of 1879. There is the bone of contention, and that is all they are arguing about, that Freud called it the unconscious.

We don't care what it's called. They were aware of the fact that there was a zone of unpredictable impulse. We know more about that zone now than any other body of people on Earth. So any breakthrough that we make in that particular zone is, therefore, a very valuable breakthrough. That would come right on the center line. How to cure Arslycus or something, that would be different. That would be *interesting*. But this other is vital. And I found the point where this thing breaks through when I say forgettingness/confusion.

What forgettingness would create a confusion? What forgettingness would cause a problem? There is the breakthrough point, but that isn't as far as it goes. It goes further than that, and I can give you a little additional datum on that today.

Man *wants* it to be forgotten. He not only uses forgettingness as a continuous and continuing overt act, but he *wants* forgettingness to occur.

He wants all of his evil deeds wrapped up in the Stygian darkness of yesteryear. Man is basically good and this is his basic impulse. But if his deeds are considered bad, then there's only one cure for them that he knows, and that's to forget them.

So you ask this blunt question, and it can be put in these very few succinct words: "What should be forgotten?" Just that very few words. "What should be forgotten?" You just ask somebody that. *What should be forgotten?* He'll recover almost at once a screaming impulse to make something forgotten. And there is where his volition and the reactive mind cross. And they cross at exactly that precise crossroads.

Now, I was around in the vicinity of this, the way you'd spot it with a bomb salvo, but we're standing right in the middle of the X with that one, because there is where his volition desires occlusion. And sitting back of all of his confusion is actually a knowable volition. He wishes a forgettingness to occur. And that wish for forgettingness to occur, then creates actively the reactive bank. And that is exact – the exact point between the analytical and the reactive bank. And there's where those two points coincide, with this addition: that we're ahead of the creation of the reactive bank. That is the basic, basic impulse on the creation of the reactive bank and therefore is a very important thing to know.

One, it is reachable. That's why it's important. It isn't a theory, it becomes workable. And it is the impulse which brings about the creation of all of this thing we call the reactive bank without any slightest anything. I mean it's all there, I mean that is, that is the postulate just ahead of all the rest of it. "What should be forgotten?" is the question that uncovers it. Because the statement which starts the reactive bank: "It *must* be forgotten", or "*They* must forget", or "*He* must forget", or "*She* must forget", "The other one must forget", and there is the inception.
And after that, a person can have a reactive bank. Now, when you're trying to clear people, you're trying to clear them of reactive bank. So obviously, this is not a workable statement. The other I've just made right up to this point is a workable statement. This is not a theoretical statement. You theoretically could sweep out the reactive bank with that piece of knowingness all by yourself. You see, theoretically. But of course, that of course will become the most easily forgotten point of Scientology. Isn't that interesting?

So you see why I'm punching it up to you and why I'm drawing you pictures and putting red arrows in the direction of it and exclamation points behind it, and so forth, because it very easily could slide on a broad, general basis. "What should be forgotten?" And of course, the insistence that the actual postulate – "What should be forgotten" is the unraveling question – and the postulate itself is "It must be forgotten." So if the postulate is "It must be forgotten", what do you think amongst the human race would be the most forgotten of all postulates? It would be the postulate: "It must be forgotten", actually. And therefore, would be the least likely to be as-ised and so would start the concatenation of accumulation which we call the reactive bank.

It's an idiot truth, you know. I mean it's idiotically observable. It's – you know, it's one of these things that after you see it sitting out there, it looks like a red barn in the middle of a white plain, you know. You just couldn't miss it, you see. But it's been sitting there all the time, but everybody's not only been missing it, they've been walking straight through it. Interesting, huh?

Well now, this does quite a great deal as you work with this thing. There are all manner[s] of variations, and we get another rule that goes along with it for the handling of hidden standards. This is a cousin to this. And we get a new rule for the handling of hidden standards. If you find a hidden standard in processing a pc, he says well, his ear – his right ear burns, burns more or burns less, and therefore he knows processing is working, you should take your Security Check and move the ear into the Security Check. Now, isn't that an odd place to move this hidden standard? But here's the rule: You move the hidden standard into the Security Check, and then you ask, what is hidden about it or what should be forgotten about it, or about ears, you got it? And there goes the hidden standard, just like that. Zooooooom.

Then two things occur. The pc no longer has his attention bound up on this object and he knows he's getting someplace in processing. And you've at once accomplished a goal of considerable magnitude.

You'll find that is probably the most pleasant auditing you will ever do, is exactly that auditing. You get it out in goals by running in difficulties.

You're running a Goals Assessment, don't you see? And you're running in difficulties. You're doing a Goals Assessment – talking about Routine 3 now, and you'll find yourself using Routine 3 more and more and more in general – and you say, "Well, what would you – what would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" See, that nice one.

And after you've stripped all the motion out of the needle, you're going to be sitting there with a list of hidden standards. Well, that's great. I never told you before to do anything about them particularly. I said there were things you could do about them. And now I'm tell-
ing you, you have to do something about them, and that is you move them all over into the Security Check as terminals.

Find a terminal for each one of the hidden standards. The actual operation is this: while doing a Goals Assessment, Routine 3, ordinary run-of-the-mill Goals Assessment, introduce this question and bleed it down. Introduce it often, every now and then, every few sessions, something like that. Get this one beaten to death again, and you will get a bunch of goals which amount to hidden standards. And the question, of course, is: "What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" or "What would you have to have happen to know that you're getting better?" or "If what happened, would you know that you were getting worse?" "What would tell you, that you were getting worse?" You got the variations of this sort of thing?

In other words, you take all of that class of question which would hunt out the hidden standard. And take those and then acquire a terminal for each one. Find a terminal more or less for each one. That's no laborious thing. The terminal's usually sitting right there. He says, "Well, I'd have to stop getting these terrified feelings in the end of my nose." And obviously, it's the end of his nose is the hidden standard. That is the terminal. He's told you. There's no reason to beat your brains about it because it's not all that important, don't you see. So there's your terminal. And your next step is to move the whole thing over into the Security Check. You don't do anything about it. You've done that far. You've done the Goals Assessment part of it. You've wound up with the terminals. At once that he gave you the hidden standard, you asked for the terminal. And you write that down on your Goals Assessment sheet, you see. Now, don't do anything more about it than that at that time. But when you come to the Security Check part of Routine 3, you move that whole bunch of hidden standard terminals into the Security Check. You find out what he's trying to hide about them. You find out what shouldn't be known about them. And you find out, in particular, what should be forgotten about them. And of course, that is the question that would break the back of any hidden standard.

The fellow said the tip of his nose. Very good. The tip of his nose. That's fine. So you say, "Well, what should be hidden about the tip of a nose?"

"Well, what's hidden about it? I can't see it. Obviously."

It is hidden. There isn't anything you could do about the tip of the nose because, you see, you can't see it. You get cross-eyed, you know, if you tried to look at the tip of your nose before you. And that's pretty desperate. So obviously you can't do anything about that. Well, what should be forgotten about it? And now this will all of a sudden emerge into pay dirt.

So no matter how the question is avoided, you could walk around the question and sooner or later go home on it, you see. There'd be some variation of what you know about it. And the formula statement – which I may or may not make with complete precision – is any psychosomatic difficulty or any livingness difficulty which an individual has, is in difficulty because he does not want it known. There's something about that that he does not want known; and something about that class of thing that he does not want known. He wishes to hide it and he wants others to forget it. And that is the story of psychosomatics, and that's all there is to psychosomatics. If you can make it work from there on, you could make it work.
And that's all there is to it. But of course, you see, obviously that it belongs in a Security Check.

And this opens up a great big page. When I was very young, extremely young – it was a long time ago on the early track – I worsened the life and shortened the days of a very clever and a very, very fine old man who was a very fine variety. You wouldn't have called him a wizard, that's kind of a low scale. But he was a wise man. He was a very, very wise man. And he used to despair of my ever learning anything because I wasn't ever supposed to become a wise man. But he had great big books. And it used to be my lot to stagger around with these books when he let – wanted them moved and that sort of thing. He'd put them on easels and so on. You had to put these books on an easel because they were as big as that rug. And you opened them up, you know, and the hinges of the book would groan like the doors in one of those old radio programs. [laughter] And it's very interesting, the emphasis – the emphasis there in that particular library on the subject of rememberingness. Absolutely fantastic. Rememberingness was the only thing ever taught.

And you could pull one of these books out of the shelf and stagger in with it, you know, lurching from side to side and open it up on one of these easels and it would groan, you see. And the papers would – they wouldn't whisper, they'd sort of rasp as you open them, and so on.

Stuff was really locked in brass there, you see, and there was all this knowingness, and it was all knowingness, knowingness, knowingness, knowingness. How you made things sick, and how you made them well, and how you did this and did that, and made animals make bodies and all kinds of weird things like this, you see. And it went on and on and on and on and on. And to the best of my recollection and belief, there wasn't a single scrap in the whole thing concerned with forgettingness.

But you see that as "forget" and "remember" are opposite sides of the coin, that obsessive rememberingness would bring about, sooner or later, occludingness. You got that?

If "know" and "not-know" are the verse and obverse parts of the coin, the faces, you go in the direction of "got to remember, got to remember, got to remember, got to remember", you have already said to yourself, "I might forget." [laughter] And in view of this, you will find that the hidden factor of forgettingness, will start showing up like a small, gray ghost. And then it will get less gray and less gray and darker and darker and bigger and bigger, and eventually you will wonder, where did all that big black mass come from?

Well, earlier than that, you had to set up a postulate "to forget", but it was probably disrelated from the exact thing you were there. And the relationships as they came through, became accidental on your terror of forgetting. You must remember, you must remember, you must remember, don't you see. And every time you say, "I must remember. I've just got to! If I forgot this, it would be terrible. I've got to remember this. I've got to remember this. I've got to remember this", and so forth, concentrating all the time that it must be something building up there, that says, "You're Liable to forget, boy. You're liable to forget." You see?

So a fear of forgetting actually can be built up by a terrific concentration on remembering. Very interesting. You can press on one of those buttons and get the other one.
Now, the poor devil who is sitting there in the South Sea habitat. Not Phil Hudsmith who is down there – who is – he's desperate today. I mean he's down there photographing the last of Tahiti and he can't find out from his office whether the film he has taken is any good.

Imagine being in Tahiti with all the atmospheric conditions that you have to combat with color photography, and you're trying to find out desperately – you're trying to find out whether or not the – any of the film you have – of the hundreds of thousands of feet of film you have taken, if there's just one foot of it that's any good. Or do you have to shoot it all again? And nobody will tell you.

The guy gets pretty desperate, you see. But he's in a different situation, and I don't think he will go into this one. But the standard Robert Louis Stevenson type South Sea bum, you see, was supposed to sit there and try to forget. The reason he went to the South Seas in the beginning was to try to forget. Don't you see?

So he uses drugs – no, at first it isn't drugs. It's liquor – liquor. Probably women first – probably women. And then – at first he moves in location. That's it. And when he gets there it's women and then they pall or something of the sort – or he can't get any – and – don't tell me women won't cure most anything. He goes in for liquor, you see, and then he "must forget", you see, and then this doesn't help him forget. Well, what's he doing running out here? You see. But he's now got to go in for liquor, you see. But right after this, you'll find him normally trying to go in for dope or something like this, and eventually death is his last remedy.

What's this? He's trying to forget, isn't he? Well, what is all this urgency about forgetting? See. If he just relaxed, it would probably all evaporate anyhow. [laughter] But I think the guy's bragging actually. I never ran into many fellows that could be that sinful in one lifetime.

But this very insistence on forgetting, of course, brings this thing up day after day after day. It's getting loomier and loomier and loomier, whatever he's done. You get the idea? He presses on one button over here, and the other button fires off, you see. And then he requires assistance to press on this button. He goes out and buys some weights of some kind or another to sit on the button, and he does various other things, you see, trying to get this button to stay put. And this other button, is the one that's giving him trouble, and he isn't paying any attention to it at all, see. "You're remembering. Well, you get away from here. We don't want anything to do with you. Now, all we've got to do is forget."

So they get on opposite sides of these coins, and this develops an awful confusion. And eventually they develop this mechanism of death and occlusion and so on, and just bury the lot. And what's buried then becomes the stimulus-response mechanisms of the reactive mind. Because, of course, his power of choice and his postulates are being overwhelmed. That they are being overwhelmed by him is no less factual that they are being overwhelmed. Because he's the only one that could overwhelm his own postulates anyhow. You see how this cycle of nonsense goes?

Well now, that opens some new doors for you. Opens some big, broad, new doors. Now, just get inventive for a moment and think of how you might apply this principle to a general Security Check.
Now, I already had some of you doing negative Security Checks, and we found out they were quite successful. Well, let's do a hide Security Check. Let's just assume, perforce, not that the fellow has done any of these things, but let us assume accusatively that he has hidden doing these things. And let's ask question after question, line after line, just on that basis only – we just snidely, meanly, viciously assume that he is hiding each one of these things.

Now, we're not asking him if he's done them, you see. We have already assumed that he has done them. [laughter] We're just asking him how he's going about hiding them. "How are you hiding all these rapes?" You see? We just take the standard Form 3 Security Check, and just use the word "hide", just as an example, you see.

And it says "Have you ever..." I remember the original Security Check, "Have you ever cooked a company's books?" I thought that was awfully poetic. [laughter] "So have you ever cooked a company's books?" Now, well, that's letting the fellow up, you see. That's letting him out. No, let's ask the question something of this order: "How would you go about hiding having cooked the company's books?" Well, that's kind of letting him off, too. You can alibi your way out of that, one way or the other.

Well, let's suppose the needle trembled on that one. Well, then let's lower the boom. Just ask, "When did you first hide cooking the company's books?" Get the idea? That's a very, very accusative type of action. But all of the difficulty you're having with the Security Check would rather evaporate. The difficulty is trying to get the guy to remember because these things are reactive responses, don't you see? So you just cut – undercut the reactive response and you just assume it's there. You say well, he's hiding it someplace. Of course, in a couple of hundred trillion years, he's naturally cooked an awful lot of companies' books. That's true of anybody if you were given a whole track check, which you aren't necessarily doing.

But the next thing you know, you'd find your whole track Security Check became very easy to do. If you did a Form 3 this other way, you'd find whole track. But I was just giving you an illustrative example of the uses of these principles. And the use of this thing, well, whatever's wrong with the guy is what he's hiding, don't you see.

Well now, let's go for broke on this thing. "Who should forget cooking a company's books? Who should forget it? What should be forgotten about a company's books?" Ha-ha. That's an employment Security Check that would be an absolute killer. I gave you a dissertation a little earlier in this lecture about the Keeler organizations. I never could quite regard them before with contempt and I have now managed that. Because there goes their nine and a half percent. There goes their nine and a half percent.

If you attack Security Check questions from the viewpoint of the first postulate – that is to say the commonly accepted first postulate which is the third postulate, "forget" – of course, the fellow just couldn't stay calm about it. The reason he's calm about it, even if he knows it he's – he's forgotten actually what it did.

He's forgotten the consequences that associated with it. He's carefully forgotten these things, so he can tell you, "Oh, yes, I cooked the company's books one time." you don't even get a tremble on the needle. Why? He's forgotten all the emotional response, the charges, the fear, the overt act of it.
He's got all this stuff forgotten. The fact of cooking the company's books, he's conversant with that.

So you very often will have a criminal sit down, tell you, "Yes, I looted, murdered, robbed, burned, did this, did that", and after a while we get the idea we're not security checking. We're listening to somebody brag. You've heard that happen probably. You get no real reaction on the needle for some of the darnedest things. Well, if you want to see the reaction cut into the needle, I'm pretty sure that if you asked about forgettingness, you'll see that needle start acting. And you'll see the charge come off that security question.

So there went the Keeler Company's nine and a half percent and we can now regard them with contempt. Or maybe it's the Keeley Company. I'm not quite sure which it is. One of those names there cures drunks and ...

[laughter]

Now, if you were to do a company Security Check of this type, and you were just asking it just to clear each question as you went down the line, of course you wouldn't have a prayer. You just wouldn't have a prayer because this would plunge into the whole track inevitably. Because you're now undercutting and underprocessing death. You're going right on down below death, because death is the last effort not to remember.

So interrogation for companies should be short Security Checks. They must have nothing to do with anything except the person – what the person would actually be expected to do in his new employment. You know? We don't want people around who are going to cut the staff to pieces and cause people unhappiness or get – try to get other good workers sacked. What they very often will do, is try to get good workers sacked. On an insecure person, that's one of his first impulses. And to protect your own people, you actually ought to check across such a line.

So you'd have to have a very brief Security Check. It couldn't consist of more than fifteen or twenty questions if you ever expected anybody to complete it. And then if you ask on a forgetting – or hiding or forgetting, you know, a general not-know pattern – if you ask these things and strip them down, and strip them of total reaction, you would actually be totally sure of the security quality or lack of it, of the person you were testing regardless of his case state.

You watch. You do a sec- some of you have already done this negative Security Check, and you've seen a little more needle reaction, haven't you?

Well, of course, you're going to hop up the needle reaction again the second you start asking about hiding and forgetting and not-knowing and any one of the odd number of postulates. Any type of action of that character, you see. Hide is about your fifth postulate, by the way. You're doing harmonics of the same thing as you go down the line. I should probably sit down and figure out the rest of them up to about twenty-five or something like that to give all harmonics on the same scale. It would be of use in Security Checking. You see what you could do with that?

All right. As long as you were trying, then, to do this kind of action and as long as you were trying to undercut the reactive mind, it then follows inevitably and invariably that goals would come under the same heading. And you could also do goals with this sort of thing.
Your pc is just having one awful time trying to get a few more goals, and he is comm lagging like mad, and so forth. Well, what's more natural than to ask him, "What goals have you had that you have forgotten?" Well, that sounds like a very mild sort of a question to produce the considerable reaction that it will produce because it'll produce considerable advance reaction to the other, you see. All right. Now, let's ask a more pertinent question. "What goal should be forgotten?" And of course, you'll get goals on all legs of all brackets. "What goal should be forgotten?" If you ask it plural, you're liable to trigger an automaticity, see. You can think of it right now. There ought to be a lot of goals that should be forgotten, man. A lot of them. All dynamics, crisscrossed and so forth.

So of course, you don't, however, commit in either a Security Check or an assessment, the blunder of the Robert Louis Stevenson character in the South Seas. You don't have this thing sitting on the "I must forget", with a total concentration on "forget". Because it's just – you're trying to bring up this fellow's memory and ventilate and aerate the atmosphere and straighten it up, but at the same time, if you specialized on nothing but forgetting, you might run into some sort of a mess. You might get into zones of occlusion, which are absolutely overwhelming. You might get on a forgettingness stuck flow, don't you see? I'm talking now in terms of dozens of hours of auditing, and you did nothing but talk about "forget", you see. No, you're going to have to let him up. You're going to have to talk about "remember", too.

So in a Security Check, you would have to ask the question – maybe after we've disposed of "What company's books should be forgotten?" and so forth, we'll have to ask the question, "Have you ever cooked the company's books?" which is a direct invitation to remember. You see this? And after we've said to him, "What goals should be forgotten?" why, we'll have to take some time-out and ask him what goal he has. Not necessarily what goal should he remember. Let's not get into a one-two dichotomy here, but just ask him, just what goal he has had. Got the idea? Which, of course, is asking him to remember one.

You'll find that this at first – as in the case of all processes which have a deep-seated residence in the reactive bank – is perhaps a little bit hard to apply. Oddly enough, it sounds so simple to apply, but it might be a little hard to apply at first glance and you have to get to living with the lion a little bit, and then all of a sudden it'll get very easy.

If, however, you find yourself stammering over, "Let's see, uh, what the hell was I doing? Uh, let's see, wha-what's the next auditing question? Model Session? Model Session? Scientol – I don – wha – what are we doing here? Uh, well, well uh, here we are in, uh, well, is this New York or Pompeio?"

You know, I mean in auditing it, you're liable to feel yourself hit a little confusion here and there or something like that. Ride it through. It'd be quite normal. That would tend to disappear in a relatively short space of time.

But the confusion – forgetting the confusion, of course, is a one-two sort of thing because a confusion is something that asks itself to be forgotten because it has never really been remembered. You don't – you very seldom see somebody remembering all parts of the confusion. Well, there was a heavy wind earlier today. Do you remember every rattle of the leaf on the tree? No, here were too many rattles of leaves on the tree, don't you see? So even while it's happening, a confusion tends to be forgotten. Or much more accurately, tends to be not
known because you just didn't observe it. You're not knowing it when you're looking at it, don't you see. Which is probably what makes a confusion a confusion. You're just not knowing what you were looking at when you were looking at it, and so this gets difficult.

Okay. Well, enough of this. I trust that this won't upset the tenor of your ways. You are doing Routine 3 right now and heavily specializing in Routine 3. You go right ahead and specialize in Routine 3 and if you're having any difficulty whatsoever in barreling through Routine 3, keep this lecture in mind because it will help you out a great deal.

What I would actually do is get the pc's hidden standards out of the road now, using the formula which I just gave you. In doing a Goals Assessment, to know if he's getting better, to know if he's getting worse, what would have to happen? "If Scientology worked, what would have to happen?" Any type of question of this character which would reveal a hidden standard. Get the hidden standards down, get some terminals for them, and then forget them. As far as the Goals Assessment are concerned, just go right on and run some more Goals Assessment. When it comes around to the Security Check, plow in with those hidden standards and find out what should be forgotten about the tips of noses and what should be forgotten about unkempt hair, and what should be forgotten about these various things. And the next thing you know, those hidden standards will blow up in smoke. Why? Because you have brought knowingness into the thing. Okay? [agreeing murmurs]

Well, I wish you luck. I wish you luck. It isn't that you will need it. It isn't that you will need it, but you will have, I think, a better, wider look at this.

The restoration of memory on the whole track is, of course, the index by which you can measure a case gain most easily. The person who has no recall on the whole track of any kind, who doesn't think he has ever lived before, of course, just announces the fact that he has plowed in very heavily into forgettingness. But the fellow who has nothing but delusory recall on the whole track, of course, is doing a pretended knowingness on the whole track – a pretended knowingness on the whole track. And you'll find out that this is a games condition of magnitude.

Do you know what that's all about? I'd better make some mention of that just while I'm on the subject.

It is giving somebody some knowingness that isn't. Do you understand? It's denying knowingness by giving him instead a false knowingness. So that one appears at the same time to be very cooperative and not playing a game at all, because he's giving you all the hot dope, don't you see.

But right alongside of this thing, we of course get a pretended knowingness. It is – and that pretended knowingness is actually denial of knowingness. He's denying you knowingness. That's all. That's the game. See, you're not supposed to know about his whole track, so he gives you a whole bunch of stuff that hasn't anything to do with the whole track. Well, actually, it's a games condition which is all wrapped up between forgetting and remembering all at the same time, don't you see. It's all compounded in a games condition, and it's in terrible confusion. And my, do you hate to have people talk about their life as Napoleon. Have you ever sort of listened to somebody running on like this and just flinched?
Audience member: Jesus Christ.

Huh?

Audience member: I've listened to about twelve Jesus Christs.

Yeah. Well now, this sort of situation – this sort of a situation is your reaction. Your reaction is not actually to whole track memory, to which you might accidentally assign it. Your reaction is addressed to this: You realize you are listening to a games condition, and that without anybody announcing it, they're considering you a target for a game, such as to give you information that isn't giving you information, to appear to be giving you information when they are not giving you information. And that, of course, rattles you. This you don't like, because you smell a games condition here, and you aren't aware of being an opponent to this person. So you kind of go, "Aw" and "I don't like it", you know.

Now this can build up to a fact of where, if this is played on you long enough and often enough, then your own occlusion is enormously assisted. The game also has a target which is to occlude your whole track with pretended knowingness of their whole track. So it's quite a games condition, man. Don't think that it isn't. And don't think that it isn't a wild target.

But I've seen guys around in Scientology who've gotten to a point where they'll remember something on the whole track and then never open their faces. You know, never say a word about it because somebody else has been going on about that period or something of the sort, you know.

What's happened to you then? You've answered up to the game by permitting yourself to be put on a withhold of your own past. You see? So it must be a games condition if it results in these nonbeneficial aspects. You got the idea?

Now, if your whole track opened up from beginning to end and you remembered everything you had ever been and everything you had ever done and everything that had ever happened to you, would that be good or bad? Would it be good or bad?

Audience: Good. Bad.

Well, I'll leave you that – I'll leave you that to find out, [laughter] because you're right on the verge of discovering it.

Thank you.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS SEARCH
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Thank you.

I was late because I thought Mary Sue probably had something to say to you. Good excuse, isn't it?

This is – well, for a while she was talking to you, but then I guess I interrupted her too punctually, you see. And now that I'm late, she isn't talking to you. What a – what a ball!

This is the 9th, 9 Aug. 11. Okay. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And here we go. You know all there is to know. There isn't anything I can possibly tell you now.

What questions do you have?

Female voice: I have one.

Good. "Was ist?"

Female voice: It's about running Havingness. If the pc's needle is ...

A question about running Havingness. Okay.

Female voice: Yes. The pc's needle is ahm – ahm, fairly loose so that it drops off the bottom of the ...

Pc's needle very loose, dropping off the bottom of the needle – meter. Okay, go on.

Female voice: Yes. At the beginning of the session.

Beginning of session.

Female voice: And it doesn't drop so much at the end of the session – though it's still more than a third-of-a-dial drop.

Mm-hm.

Female voice: Would you say his havingness had gone – gotten worsened?

Oh, yes. It is very loose at the beginning of session, toward the end of session it is not so loose and the question is: does this indicate that the pc's havingness has dropped? Yes.

It also indicates, of course, that the pc has run into some ridges or has gotten tangled up in the bank in some fashion or another. And of course, all ridges are can't-haves. All valences are can't-haves. All wild and confused postulates are can't-haves and anything that is hanging fire with the pc is a can't-have. So any time your pc gets stuck on the track, the first phenomenon you encounter is loss of havingness.
And the phenomenon of havingness is a registry – well, I guess it's the primary registry and a secondary, *apparent* registry is that the pc is stuck in a lot of ridges or he's stuck on the track or he is messed up in the middle of some problems or confusions or something of this sort. And it appears to be, of course, that the track, the ridge, the difficulty he is in would be the cause for the tightening of the needle and basically the cause for the tightening of the needle is the fact that he is losing havingness or this is a series of things of lost havingness.

You see, a pc grips things to his bosom in anxiety to have when his ideas about havingness drop. You see, that is the first manifestation.

Probably if you didn't have the slightest notion concerning the remotest possibility that under some stretch of the imagination you could have nothing. Now if you untangle that, it just amounts to the fact that you would not take any steps to possess anything unless you had some inkling that there might be a none of it. Or it might be difficult for you to get it, you see. Now, this difficulty of getting it does bring about this phenomenon of personal possession, so what you really see happening is that the individual runs through a bunch of bank and track, all of which tells him he can't have. When he thinks of can't-have, he pulls it in on himself and you get a tightening of the needle.

*Female voice:* So any tightening, even if it was so loose that it dropped out the bottom, it's still very loose.

It's still very loose, but slightly less so – it's a drop of havingness. You can tighten the pc's needle. You could tighten it from a total looseness to almost a total stick with sensitivity 16 by phonying up a piece of news for him concerning loss.

This isn't a laboratory test – basically, you look at it humanitarianly and it's a cruel thing to do, but if you suddenly convince him that he had just lost... "Did you hear about the National Provincial Bank suddenly going broke?" you see, or something of this sort, "And all of its depositors – and the government's refusing to make any of the deposits good." You know, something like this. And he had all his money in the National Provincial Bank. Just before and just afterwards, you'd see a sudden *wham.* You'd get a tightening of the needle.

So any news of loss would bring about a tightening of the needle and therefore, it could be stated that a bank is a substitute for the composite losses of the person. Not necessarily the reactive bank, I'm talking about all of his – the standard banks, you see, and any picture that he has and so forth.

For instance, why do you still have a picture of the Battle of Actium, if you do have. Well, you obviously haven't got the Battle of Actium. You've got a picture of the Battle of Actium. So, the losses of things are substituted for by mental masses and these mental masses, electronically, bring about a tightening of the needle. I'm overstressing this point now. It's pretty obvious what happens. But your question is very well put. Does that answer it?

*Female voice:* Yes.

All right. Okay. What other question do we have?

*Another female voice:* I've got one.

Yup?
Female voice: Supposing you have run one goals list and it's all nulled out and you ...
Supposing you've run one goals list and it's all nulled out. Okay.

Female voice: Yes and you've had sensitivity say at 2 and you're not getting very good reads. When you start a new goals list and you start the assessment by elimination, can you raise the sensitivity so as to get better reads?

Oh, and when you start a new goals list ...

Female voice: Yes.

... and you want to get better reads on your second goals list and your sensitivity was 2 and you want to do a different job. No. No, leave that sensitivity right where it is for a third-of-a-dial drop or as near as you can get to a third-of-a-dial drop. You can't have a pc, you know, who doesn't get a third-of-a-dial drop at sensitivity 16. If you're going to do a Goals Assessment by elimination, you do not keep increasing the sensitivity no matter what list you are working on and so on. You just do it all on a third-of-a-dial drop. Otherwise, you're knocking out far, far, far more than you need to knock out in doing a goals elimination. And it's going to take you fifteen times as long in order to do it.

In other words, you don't increase your sensitivity doing a goals elimination or a terminals elimination at any time, whether it's one list or two lists or for a goal or for a list of goals or anything else. Never increase it. Always a third-of-a-dial drop.

Female voice: Like that?

Yeah.

Second female voice: She's ...

Well, all right.

Second female voice: She has a case that you can't hardly – couldn't hardly read the needle on them anyway, you know and it's normally at 1 sensitivity, but on assessment ...

Well, do you get a third-of-a-dial drop?

Female voice: Get two-thirds. Get it off the bottom on 1, normally, but when you start assessing, there's practically no reads.

You're getting no reads. All right. You're not getting any goals.

Female voice: That's true.

That's easy. I'm not trying to dismiss the question. The question is quite well taken – that's a very intelligent question. But you say that you have a pc and you just get practically no read at all, even though he does get a big drop, you get no read on the goals and you want to increase the sensitivity in order to get reads on the goals. Nah. You're trying to make goals do that you haven't got.

Female voice: Yeah. Okay.

You haven't got this person's goals, that's all. Follow the same rationale. Okay?

Female voice: Right. Thanks.
All right. There's something else about goals that I noticed going along. You say a first list and a second list. Actually, you know, I never get a first list and a second list. I work on a list that I add to and it's a sort of a revolving squirrel cage. You know, I just keep putting down – every time I get to the end of the list of goals, I shake them – keep shaking them down for more goals at the end of this list and the list just accumulates. And that doesn't even mean that I've gotten rid of all the goals on that first list, see. I actually got a listing of 163 goals and I started going down this goals list, and 60 of the goals are still alive and just by the fact that I reached the bottom of the list, I start asking for new goals, you see. I don't wait until I got them all gone before I find some more. I try to keep the list cumulative and it's quite interesting. It'd work faster that way. Now, I don't know whether you're doing it that way or not, but I'm just telling you right now. Okay?

Male voice: Ron, a question in theory here. What makes "the" goal, the final goal that you get, persist?

What makes "the" goal persist? The final goal that you get. What makes it persist? I was wondering when somebody would get bright enough to ask that question. What makes that valence persist? See. Why? Well, the final goal persists because it's got an answer and the answer is the terminal. Well, the terminal is the answer to that goal and this betokens an enormous amount of success.

The appearance of a goal, when you finally get it, is actually the long-term problem of the case. And all problems have persistence and what you've done is reach in and pick the central problem of the person out. This goal is a hope that he can do something about this problem. That is what a goal really is. It's a hope that he can do something about the problem and the problem, of course is inherent in the goal and this problem has persisted for the duration of track practically. That's a very long-term proposition ordinarily when you're doing your regular Goals Assessment – unless you've got present time problem comes out to be your Goals Assessment, you see. But it will just be on the chain and you've just picked it up late in some late form. So the persistence of a problem is due to the fact that nobody ever as-ises the confusion of the postulate-counter-postulate and the motion-counter-motion and these things are all pinned in place anyhow so it's – it's a big byaaah. All right. Now, this has a hope about it. This big problem, it has a hope and the person hopes to do something about this problem and therefore, he answers up as the hope. He can't confront the problem, but he can confront this hope about it, you see. The problem, if it – if the problem were totally confronted, wouldn't be there. So he's never been able to confront this problem and don't think you're going to get him to. You go on a via, so you get him to confront the hope.

All right. Now, the hope itself is pinned in place – and there's the goal – by the fact that a valence solves that goal, maybe. You know, it's sort of stated that way in his mind, you know.

The total solution to this goal and the beingness that will achieve this goal is absolutely, concretely and without any variation whatsoever, a nine-foot cat and there is no slightest doubt about this and that's the way it is. Except it, of course, might not.

So it's a total certainty with the invalidations of uncertainties hung on it, so that of course hangs up the terminal. So the terminal is hung up, the hope is hung up because the
problem is hung up and the three are all there in a – in a bunch. Now when you get the hope, the hope rather tends to lose its charge when you get the proper valence that goes with that hope, see. So then you've got – now you're in the realm of terminal.

Now, all the time he's working on this and going up and down the line on this, you're actually cutting away and orienting him on the subject of this valence, this beingness, and eventually it starts dawning on him what this "beingness" is there to do. And what the beingness is supposed to do and what it can't do and the clarification of the beingness of course, it's sort of: you let the pc – now, I'm just talking theoretically – you let the pc look around at this great problem through the eyes of this beingness that solved it. So of course he's right in the middle of this problem, so he's busy confronting this problem all the time and he – if he confronts it enough on the Prehav Scale runs, he eventually winds up at the other end having confronted the problem – the problem disappears, the valence disappears.

The goal might or might not still be there. If the goal were still there, it'd be quite surprising, but it might be. On a proper assessment, it wouldn't be there. The valence wouldn't be there, the goal wouldn't be there and the problem wouldn't be there. See, that would be on a perfect assessment, perfect run. Quite interesting. All – all three of these things would blow up and you wouldn't get this particular persistence.

There's a sneaker on this, and that is the state of beingnesses: What are beingnesses? Now, you already have a thetan that is totally invalidated if he thinks he can't do it but has to have a pat beingness in order to do it. You get that little sneaker on the end? In other words, he's a gone dog. It's like machinery, you see.

Now, when a fellow's been overwhelmed by a machine, man, he has had it. When you see a pc sitting there who is nothing but machine, who thinks as a machine, who answers on a machine, who is a machine, that is about the most invalidation you could get. In other words, he isn't even alive. He isn't even alive enough to be overwhelmed by a beingness. He is only – you get how far this is?

That fellow will come up to a beingness and a machine overwhelmingness, though, is an example of this, you see. The individual has disappeared – and it – actually the machine is an overwhelmed valence and the machine has overwhelmed the valence he was in to such a degree that, well, it's – it's lost, too. And you get this minus-zero thetan who hasn't a clue who, what, when or where, was overwhelmed by a machine. But actually between that machine that overwhelmed and the thetan, there's a beingness that got overwhelmed and you quite ordinarily will be sorting out a valence or terminal and you'll find all of a sudden you will sort a machine. The machine will be showing up there and then the machine goes off and you have a beingness and now you've got a terminal. That's quite – quite amazing. And sometimes by the way you get the machine as the terminal and then you run that and then you'll find out for the same goal, you very probably will have to find a new terminal after that machine's gone. Because there's a sandwich there, you see?

All right. Now, this next point, the point I'm trying to make here, is that in all acceptances of beingnesses, you have betokened failure. The person must have failed as himself to have a beingness to carry on for him. So this is, of course, your basic invalidation and that lies back of that.
Now getting rid of the valence and squaring around the valence and orienting that particular problem, which made the hope called a goal and the valence take place and stick. In orienting those things, you make a MEST Clear.

Now, let me call something to your attention. You've not done anything about uninvalidating the thetan. See? He's sort of looking out from underneath the covers, you know. All you've done is reorient this thetan on the subject of valences and he's got the clue on the subject of valences, but he's still got problems and he really isn't himself yet and when he becomes himself a hundred percent – now of course all beingnesses – he has no necessity for beingnesses. So the basic definition of Theta Clear is: No further necessity for beingnesses. Got that? All right.

Well, that's just – that's a very exact definition. No further necessity for beingnesses equals Theta Clear. But even though he has no necessity for beingnesses, he might not be able to do everything he would like to do and so you have a Theta Clear who can't necessarily tear up ladies' scarves in the thin air and you move from that point to OT. Do you get what this is? You get how that gap would be closed? It would be an able, a very able thetan. Well, all you have to do is have him know he's a thetan and be able to be a thetan and be able to exist without any assist – his beingnesses, and you, of course, have a Theta Clear.

So if a fellow can exist without synthetic beingnesses which are solutions to problems he can't confront, you've got a MEST Clear. See? He's still in a body, you see. That's why you call him a MEST Clear. He's got body beingness yet. But he's gotten rid of these synthetic valences. These synthetic valences aren't bothering him now, so that's out of the way.

But he's still pretty dependent on a body. He doesn't think he could walk down the street. He doesn't think anybody would say hello to him if he walked down the street without a body. He knows pretty well they wouldn't. He can get the horrified idea even if he's Clear just of this. So you can get the horrified idea of walking through the local town and being utterly ignored by one and all. He doesn't like this.

He keeps lugging a hundred and some pounds of meat around with him. [laughter] And he keeps putting up this meat and saying, "Say hello to it", you know and this is his level of conviction. But all he needs then – the only thing he's depending on actually is MEST beingnesses. No longer any synthetic mental beingnesses. He had no dependence on those things at all. Well, that's a MEST Clear.

But remember he's still dependent on MEST and he's still dependent on a MEST beingness. Well, when you don't any longer have a dependence on a MEST beingness and identity you have a Theta Clear. That's a real honest-to-goodness Theta Clear. And every once in a while somebody writes and says, "Well, we've cleared this fellow up. He was cleared some time ago, and now we've cleared him to MEST Clear", you know. There's always a burning question that you can ask on the thing. "Well, is he still lugging around a hundred and some pounds of meat?", you know. Does he have to? And if he doesn't have to, why of course, he's Theta Clear.

And then if somebody wrote you and told you that he'd made an OT, however – he'd personally made OT, you know – why, the only test question you'd have to ask him is, "Well, how did you hold the pen?" If he writes you, "With my hand, of course", you say "Why?"
you know. And of course, you don't send him the halo. It's a halo you have to issue for OT, you see. [laughter] We've had some in stock. They're – they're surplus. We've had some surplus halos in stock for some little time. They were originally made for Christianity and then nobody could qualify. [laughter]

Okay. What other questions do we have?

Female voice: What is actually wrong with a case that takes such a tremendous time in doing the Goals Assessment on them? What are they doing? Are they playing a game with the auditor? Are they in a games condition ...

Nah!

Female voice: ... on auditing or are they just ...

Yeah, well, yeah. There's something in that. They're not playing a game with the auditor. They're in a games condition with the auditor.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

But maybe there's more to your question.

Female voice: No, I just wondered ...

What is going on with the pc ...

Female voice: Yeah. That it takes such a tremendous ...

... who takes such tremendous long time in getting assessed and up to a Goals Assessment? What is this pc doing?

Female voice: Right.

Well, of course, if we could say specifically exactly what this pc was doing, he of course would be assessed much faster. So we probably at this moment don't have all of the answers for exactly what it takes so long and we're work – we work instead on the auditor trying to get him to make a perfect approach to this situation. That is our best answer to it at this time and the most enduring answer.

But what is wrong with this pc? Now, you're asking me mostly for conjecture. I say it's conjecture, he could be doing an enormous list of things and amongst them, of course, you could include as a common denominator to all of them, he's in some kind of a games condition with regard to life. But he isn't kidding the auditor and I don't think people are playing coy and being mean and so forth. They aren't, really. They're doing all right.

They just can't bring themselves to give up much. The guy is actually being asked to give up his dreams. They're the most valuable commodity there is. There's been a poem written about them – when the last of a man's dreams is dead, why, the man is dead, you know. And if you badly do a Goals Assessment, he sort of gets the sensation like he's being killed, dream by dream. And that is why I say we got rid of some of that when we took this third-of-a-dial drop, you know, as a Goals Assessment. You're not trying to rub the pc out as he sits in the chair after all. Let's just find out if this goal is consistent and continual.
Now, giving up something valuable to the auditor is what being assessed for a goal entails. And the common denominator of a games condition is "Thou must not have. Maybe me neither, but thou certainly." [laughter] And you run into an obsessive games condition of this character. You could go over the hills and far away, and probably do something about this. You probably could approach it like this:

"Who used to ask you what you wanted to do in life?" And of course, the needle will fall off the pin on anybody who was having a hard time giving up a goal. Because it's certain that he has been plagued by his parents and associated personnel and maybe even by the military and other people. Some oblique, wild program of "You have to make up your mind what you are going to do in life" or "You are such a disappointment to us" or something like that.

I've noticed that girls very often – I've had a lot of girls – I've seen a lot of them from time to time who actually are just totally knocked in the head because they were – their parents expected so much of them. And they somehow or another didn't measure up to it and there was this terrific nostalgia about all this and this terrific, "Well, I tried", you know and now they feel totally degraded and very upset and they were supposed to paint twice as good as Leonardo da Vinci, you know, and sit in the model chair and look three times as good as Mona Lisa.

And simultaneously with this, they were supposed to marry a millionaire and there have been a few little mild goals laid out for them more or less of this character, don't you see. You know and they just weren't ... I'll tell you a good example of this. The day of the Saxon is still with us, but the Saxon has – in America and England – has a peculiarity and the peculiarity is – is "Don't let him be." That's sort of a motto, you know.

And other races find this as very peculiar. You get down to Spain and you run into waiters. And it's all right to be a waiter. Nobody looks down on you if you're a waiter, you know. And you get out to China – Spain kind of draws the line from that point on down because a waiter is still able to dress and so forth. They start drawing the line on the laborer and they don't kind of want people to be a laborer, you know and it's just a little bit beneath it all. But out in China, my God, a man can be a laborer, a rickshaw coolie and next month be a warlord and it's just totally rolly coaster, you see. And everybody respects any beingness they run into, which is quite amazing!

You know. The fellow's a coolie, so it's all right. There's nobody chivying at him saying, "Now, when are you going to be the construction boss?", do you see? No, it's perfectly all right he's a coolie and he's supposed to carry a basket and every time he passes the tallyman, the tallyman pops another bamboo stick into the other box and this is the way life goes. And he carries this basket and they fill it up and he carries it back and he empties it and that's all right. And nobody finds any fault with it.

His wife isn't standing around saying, "Well now, Wong – ." [laughter] And you don't have this vast notion of "getting promoted" or "getting on in life." In other words, they leave these beingnesses at rest.

Now, this could be at two positions on the Tone Scale. It could be a harmonic, you see, of a – of a decent attitude, and it could be a total apathy about beingness, you know.
Well, the fellow was there and there's nothing you can do about it. That doesn't happen to be present in China. The other condition is more alive. It's quite amazing to watch this.

You – you're around a brick foundry or something like that and some bird all of a sudden lays down his brick paddle and comes over and offers you a cigarette and asks you for a match and sits down. And he's covered with dust and grime and he – all he's supposed to do is stand there with a paddle and pat the bricks as they go by or something, you see. And he is of no importance of any kind whatsoever in this area. He'll have a long, drawn out, very familiar conversation with you about the political issues of the day and about this and that – totally relaxed. He has no apology for his own beingness. He's doing a very good job of patting bricks.

And you run into some of this in the West Indies. I had a fellow one time whose name was Horatio Nelson and he let go of a barrel – he was rolling a barrel of rum, he was part of a longshore crew – and he just knocked off. He saw me standing there and he came over and had a conversation with me and he bought me a drink and I bought him a drink and then he went back to rolling his barrel of rum and there was no apology for it. It's quite amazing. No apology for beingness. It's very weird being in a society of that after being in a society where everybody is apologizing for their beingness, you know.

And you get in America right now young boys or – fellows in their late teens, twenties, something like that – why, they're always explaining to you how they're about to be promoted, you know. And in the services, it's enough to drive you mad. I mean every reserve that you ran into was explaining how he was really supposed to be commissioned an admiral, he left this job in Chicago which was paying him 865 dollars a week, and he'd given up all this to come into the service and he didn't amount to very much here now, but in spite of all this – you've heard that. What's the guy doing? He says, "Forgive me for being. The beingness isn't here. I mean I'm not – really not in any beingness, and I know it isn't adequate. And I feel like I should apologize for it all." You get the idea?

So you get this – I'm a little astray here on this other question – but you get this condition in American, English-type societies, at the present moment more dominantly. So that must mean that in this particular society, at this particular time, there's a tremendous amount of chivying at someone to make one amount to something else.

You see, there must be a lot of pressure on the subject which in itself serves as both an invalidation of the person as he is and a demand that he be something else, and that he have some (quote) "ambition" and that he have some goals. And you get somebody who has been clawed at on the subject of "You've got to have goals, you've got to have goals, you've got to have goals", and he finally just sits back sullenly and sets his heels and then eventually gets overwhelmed, so he starts giving you a bunch of goals that have nothing to do with his goals, but are – which are bought goals, you know. They're just foisted off on him.

Now, sorry to go astray on you about ethnology, but it happens to be a hobby of mine. And you get a condition here whereby the individual feels that if he voices any of his own goals or own opinions, he's going to get slapped down. Now, the various responses he could give, you see, was as he worsened in this condition, he could get to a point where he wouldn't
give you any at all, you see. He'd give you no goals at all. You ask him for a goal, and he
doesn't tell you anything. He doesn't even think of anything. You understand? He's just numb.

Now, this can go down – and as I was talking yesterday on the business of pretended
knowingness – well, there's a pretended goalingness. [laughter] And he'll sit there and pretend
to have goals just to satisfy you, you see. It's kind of a delusory state, you know and he does-

In other words, you could apparently be dragging goals off of a person who in all hon-
esty thought he was giving you his goals. And all he was doing was handing them out of a
little goals package over here that was laid in by Mama a few trillennia ago, you see. And he
just keeps giving you these things and keeps giving you these things and they aren't his goals.
You got the idea?

Well, there are various conditions could exist here. Let's review these conditions again
just for succinctness.

There could be the condition where the individual is just knocked in the head on the
subject of goals. He feels he'd just better not give you any because it's just going to be invali-
dated anyway. Now, when you actually do then start to erase this fellow's goals, he feels this
is true. You start erasing the goal that he just gave you, and he says, "You see, see, the audi-
tor's making nothing of my goals." So this confirms it, so then he's much slower in giving you
his next goal. All right. Let's – there's that case.

Now, there's the case that will just dream up goals to please you. It's just a delusory
sort of a – of a package. And then there is the case – different than that – of the person who is
giving you somebody else's goals in whose valence they are in which somehow or another fits
on their own valence chain and naturally they would tend to marry or associate with people
who were on their own valence chains. And they'll sit there and give you somebody else's
goals by the package.

So knowing these various conditions about goals, you could speed up a Goals As-

Now, we're getting awfully – we're getting awfully adroit here to do this sort of thing. I
wouldn't really frown at you if you weren't able to untangle somebody's difficulties in this
particular direction, but you could hit at it and you could knife around on it. And you could
take these three classes which I just gave you and you could ask questions such as this:

You could say, "Well, if you did give me a goal, would I just invalidate you?" And if
you got a very deep fall on this sort of thing, of course you've got an ARC break going on the
subject of goals and you should do something to clear that up. You're not trying to erase the
goals. You're just trying to find out which one will hang fire. It's quite a little bit different,
you see. So you could handle that.
Now, there would be the – another condition here. And this condition would be a simple condition of individuals trying to please you. And you could ask – this guy's very glib, you know. He says, "Well, what I want to be is a carpenter, I want to be a bricklayer, I want to be this, I want to be that and I once wanted to be a singer. And I want to do this. And I want to do that." And so on and so on and so on. And he just goes on and he gives you goals and it all seems to be automatic and he runs on and on and on and on and on. Well, after a while you suddenly wake up to the fact that he gives you these things and there's no charge on them. What is happening here? Well, if there's no charge hardly on the list at all, we can assume then probably that the individual's just dreaming them up. Just – so on. So you can ask him a question something on this order and search this thing out real well. And some condition of this character, I think I'd ask the person, "What would happen if I asked you for a goal and you didn't give me one?"

You know, this would disturb the needle quite considerably if that were the condition the person was in, you see? "Well, I don't know", and so on, and he'd get into the idea of having to please you and so forth, and you could straighten this out with the pc, you see. Two-way comm sort of a thing.

And then the next thing that you could do about this sort of thing is somebody else's goals. Well, it's right here in this lifetime and you have already seen me -. Well, the class at large hasn't seen this particular one. Well, we just had a couple of students here that – it was rather remarkable. We didn't get anyplace on this girl at all, until I asked for her husband's goals. And, boy, they just came out brrrrrr and she even misread it at first, you know. She read it "goals for her husband", I think it was being run at and we got that shifted back to where it should have been which was "her husband's goals." That was what we wanted to know. And boy, she just ran like a canary bird on her husband's goals. I mean, marvelous. Didn't have any goals of her own, apparently. Had her husband's goals. Had some goals for her husband, but was giving her husband's goals as the response, don't you see.

Well, I'd be awfully tempted if I ran into that particular one myself to get awfully clever about the whole thing and say, "All right. This is a girl who runs on a man's goals. Obviously in her husband's valence. In her husband's valence that solidly, the terminal chain must be a man that looks remarkably like the husband."

And I'd be likely to get a falling Terminal Assessment right at that moment. You know, just shortcut the whole thing and then check it back for the goal. Well, I'm not teaching you how to do this particularly. I'm just saying how I would – might go about shortening up some of these things. Very circuitous. I would find out that this person ran off brrrrrrt on goals for husband and didn't run off brrrt on goals for self. Didn't have any.

Then we must assume that the husband has stolen the wife's valence or the wife is, you see, in some kind of a state of "in the husband's valence" or there's something going on here which is not routine nor ordinary. That is not very usual. Everybody gets in a little bit in somebody else's valences. They get mixed up in valences.

You get a southern girl in class here and Suzie starts to drawl. I mean it's – this kind of thing. That hasn't anything to do with it. I'm talking about this person actually doesn't have
any goals of their own but just runs on another person's goals. As though they were their own goals.

Now, I'd sort that out. I'd immediately suspect that that other person was on the terminal chain of the pc. And I would start finding out what this other person was in an effort to blow the person.

And I would do a Terminals Assessment "on that husband" or "on that wife" or something like this, see, or "on that father or mother". I'd just do a Terminals Assessment. I don't care how long it took me to do a Terminals Assessment. I would just go on and on and on and on and all of a sudden you would find that terminal would blow free. And then we would go back on a Goals Assessment again, we'd probably find out it would match up with one of those terminals. We very likely could get a terminal hanging fire though before we got the goal, don't you see – just an entrance on such a thing.

You have to find out what the pc's doing. That's the golden rule of auditing. What's the pc's mind doing? Now, those are a lot of particularities and a lot of mechanical approaches and so forth. And I'll give you a much better answer now. Of course, the person is not-knowing their goals like crazy. The person is not-knowing their goals, you see. You ask for a goals list and you get a bunch of not-knows. You say goal, pc thinks not-know.

Anybody who sat there and every time I asked them, "Do you have another goal?" and they said, "Well, now let me see, I don't know." I would certainly take it that they were running a not-know on goals if they did this consistently and continually and so forth. Then I would suspect that the person ought to have a lot of goals that shouldn't be known and the – there're all kinds of variations once you understand this principle. You could just have a picnic with it.

And on a Goals Assessment, if you understand the exact principle, how they're not-knowing the goals, you know. You ask them for various kinds of goals that would blow these things out. You're already doing it – secret goals, withheld goals and all that sort of thing. But there are lots of ways of doing this. You shouldn't shorten your scope of action. There are tremendous numbers of ways of doing this.

You could say, "Now, have you ever thought you would like to do anything which wouldn't be generally accepted socially?", you know? Not "Do you have a withheld goal?", but "Now, have you ever thought of doing anything after that you did it you would have to carefully cover up your tracks?" That's another way of asking for a withheld goal. "Now, is – do you – have you ever had any goal that other people sure as the dickens better not find out about?" "Have you ever had a goal to make people stupid?" "Have you ever had a goal to not know?", you know? "Have you ever had a goal to make other people not know?" "What varieties and versions of not-knowingness or forgettingness would you have me put down here on this goals list as your goals?" This can get pretty crude, you see?

"Now, let's see, what goals do you have with regard to stupidity?" Interesting question. "What goals do you have with regard to escaping knowledge of?" "Are there any subjects – are there any subjects which exist as academic or scholastic subjects which you would rather not have any understanding or knowledge of, of any kind whatsoever?" And you all of a sudden may hit the jackpot, don't you see?
The person says, "Well, hardly any. There's just algebra, geometry, physics, chemistry, reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, uh –." Then you might ask somebody, "Did you ever know anybody who had the motto of 'know thyself'?", "Who was that?", "Who didn't think you'd succeed very well in life?" Oh! "Who didn't? Who was that now? All right, now. What goal did that person have for you? Now, what goals did you have before that person started talking about it?" And all of a sudden you'll get a very fast – much faster moving goals list.

"When you were a child did you – in this lifetime, did you attend a specialized school of any kind which was fitting you or readying you for having fits in some profession?"

"Oh, well, yes, I went to military school from the time I was eight until the time I was nineteen."

"Well, how have you never mentioned this before?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, I've just been trying to forget the whole thing."

"Well, what is the goal of this particular school?"

"Well, I was supposed to become an officer."

"Ah – an officer of what?"

"Well, I just never got along very well – that has nothing to do with it. I never had any goals in that particular sphere, so we'll just skip that."

"Well, yeah, all right. We'll just skip it. Now, getting back to this military school, what were they fitting you for, to do particularly? What subjects were you seeking to avoid in this particular institution of learning?"

And the person says, "Artillery. I just always flunk artillery. If I could – I had a goal in that school all right. And that was to get out of those artillery classes! Ha-ha-ha. Yeah. I did have a goal. Yep. That's right. I had a goal. Yeah. Yeah. I had a goal to get out of all the artillery classes. That's right."

You say, "Well, that's fine."

The needle fell off the pin along about this time, you see. Well, it might be just a cognition surge so explore it further and further and you say, "Well, artillery. Have you been resisting becoming an Artillery Officer or something of the sort like that?"

"Oh, well, if you look at it that way. Yes, I suppose, could say so. Yes. Yes."

"Well, did you ever have a goal to become one?"

"No. Never. Never. Never! I've never had a goal to become an Artillery Officer! [pounding the table while speaking] No time have I ever had a goal to be – . I wouldn't even think of it! That's it! There's no reason to ask me anymore because I just tell you, that's it. That is a closed book!" Now, you can go on with your Goals Assessment if you like, but uh ...

[laughter]

What have you just hit there? You have run into a road barricade of magnitude on the subject of this person giving you any goals of any kind because somebody was trying to give them a goal and now they're reacting totally on the subject of having been given a goal that
they didn't want. They are now resisting giving anybody any goals that they do want and you could get a crisscross going here on the subject of goals.

But you have to loosen up your mind in doing a Goals Assessment on the potentialities of a person being beaten down on the subject of goals or the person beating other people down on the subject of goals, you see? And once you've loosened up your own mind on how many ways could a pc be boobytrapped into giving a slow, numerous, covert, inarticulate or any other type of a Goals Assessment. Once you've loosened yourself up on this thing, you can outguess him.

Oh, he sits there, and he says, "Oh, yes, I have goals. Yes, I had a goal to be a pitcher. And I had a goal to be uh – once upon a time I wanted to be a cricket umpire for some particular reason or other and yes, I wanted a goal to drive trains. I had a goal to be a politician. Wanted to be a painter, bricklayer, cat. I remember I wanted to be a cat one time, and yeah, lots of goals. Oh, yes, I can give you lots of goals." And, boy, they will too, you know.

You invalidate the pc, of course, by being too direct in questioning, but the temptation – "Well, now are any of these goals factual? Did you ever really want to be any of these things?"

"Now, if you hadn't – if you hadn't come up against it so heavily on this and that and being all these various things – well, just confidentially, what – what would you have been before they wanted you to be something else? What would you have been?", you see?

Ah, well, that's a different story and all of a sudden this mad tirade of pleasing the auditor slows down to nothing, you see. And the goals that don't fall, well, the pc just isn't giving you goals in some fashion. You're just not getting the pc's goals. That's all. Or every time you say "goal", the pc goes into a ridge. He can't have it. You can't have it. He can't have it and so forth. Because the needle phenomenon which Madge mentioned earlier would demonstrate the can't-have of course at once. Needle tightens up and that's it. You say goal and the person can't let you have goals, they themselves can't have goals. There's various approaches here. I mean I could just go on by the hour giving you various approaches to shake all this stuff loose, so forth.

There's another oblique approach, is the horrors of ambition. I imagine that would be very, very useful today with modern youth, because apparently one of the things you mustn't have is ambition. They've gone to a negation. You find this very broadly but factual. A person doesn't want to amount to anything. A no-beingness situation. So you might have a dissertation, "Well, what trouble would an ambitious person get into? If you made anything in life and you made a lot of things in life, who'd take it away from you?"

Just go the various – round and round on all the conditions of games conditions and processes of this character. Who stopped this fellow's goals? Who blunted them? Whose goals did this fellow stop? And how did he blunt them? And can we walk into the middle of this and with a que- a few quick flips of the wrist disentangle the whole ruddy knot and just to get the thing rolling?

There's where lack of the use of the principles I've just been talking with, or a lack of a broad, imaginative approach to the subject is what slows these things down. For instance, an
auditor who does a very fast Goals Assessment and an auditor who does a very slow one, there's a difference between these two auditors. It is not the difference of the pc. And one, the auditor who is getting a slow Goals Assessment will get slow on some people, fast on some people. In other words, he'll get the Goals Assessment at the exact rate that the pc he has at the moment is willing to have a Goals Assessment run, don't you see. He'll always get it at that rate.

And then you have the other auditor who beats the game, you see? Then he changes this rate by some adroit line of questioning. He smells something is wrong here and he goes in with a circuitous roundup and he decides he'd better fix this up. He asks the pc a dozen questions and he says, "Well, what would you like to have been in life?" and "Do you have any ambitions or goals of any kind?" And the person says, "Well." [sighs] Well, right there, you know. He'd say, "Well, what have we got to clean up here before we get a Goals Assessment?" You know, you hardly even ask any questions at all. You just see it written on the wall that this one is now going to run to some vast number of apathies. It's not going to be done by hours, it's going to be done by apathies. And we say to this – another person, we say – well to such a person, why, then we might say, "Well now, who didn't measure up to your expectations in life?"

"Oh, well, my son, my daughter, my wife, my mother, my father, my grandfather, my teachers, the postman, uh..." And he could almost do a Goals Assessment on this basis alone.

"Well, what should your mother have been?"

"Oh, well, that's different, now." I mean it gets real live, you know. "Well, she should have a this and a that and the other thing, and so on and so on and so on and so on."

"What's your father been?"

"Well, he should have been a this or that or the other thing and so on bom, bom, bom, bom."

"And what should your son have been?"

"Well, I kept telling him just time after time, I mean day after day after day for just – well I just wore myself out. I told him the only thing he could possibly amount to in life would be a plumber and he just never seems to have realized it and so forth. And he just goes on with this silly artist business all the time out in Chelsea and so on. But he would have made a good plumber and I just kept telling him and telling him and telling him", and he's got real interest, see.

You watch it. You just – it's all in the way you handle the cookie, how fast it crumbles.

You get this individual saying, "Well, I was a this and I was a that and I was the other thing and I had a goal to do this and that and the other thing and so on and so on and so on. You want any more?"

"Yes, I..."

"All right. And I..." [laughter]
I call that "pretended goalingness."

Yeah, there's a lot of – lot of different attitudes, but as long as you ... If you're trying to get a pc to do something or give you something or get something over the bumps, you've got to handle what's sitting in front of you. No system under the sun will handle it wholly for you. You yourself have got to do some observation.

The first and foremost rule in any processing is if you can just parallel – find out and parallel what the mind is doing – it goes \textit{phloof} and you take it apart in any of its difficulties.

Like psychosomatic illness. You could probably set up shop. We've had several things you could set up a shop with. You could probably put a great big shingle hanging out flying in the wind on security checking psychosomatic ill parts of the body. Just that. And you get adroit at this and you get practiced at this one way or the other. And you just hang your shingle out and say, "Spines adjusted, skulls..." [laughter] "skulls reformed, your beauty restored in twelve easy treatments." You could make it cook, too, if you worked at it straight way. You'd just do nothing but security checking.

"What skull do you think should be hidden?" you know?
"What zorch are you trying to hide?"
"What have you done to livers?"
"What have you done to a liver that nobody should know about?" "Oh, that."

Because in any – in any cluster of wrongness, you have a great deal of not-knowingness and therefore ignorant societies which uniformly specialize in wrongnesses up – in ignorance – wind up specializing in wrongnesses. I probably very often stand people's hair on end talking about religion and I'm – I can't really say with sincerity I'm sorry for it. But I will say this. I will say this. That any zone which is a zone of pretence – it's pretending to do one thing and it's actually dedicated to doing something entirely different and so forth – I'm afraid I'm liable to laugh at. Not necessarily attack it, but I've certainly reserved the right to laugh. Hope I never lose it.

All right. Well, one more question before we close this up. One more question. Yes?

\textit{Male voice: Is a Book One Clear a MEST Clear, Ron?}

Yes, very definitely.

\textit{Male voice: Thank you. And also, are the South African Clears MEST Clears?}

Yes.

\textit{Male voice: Thank you.}

There's only one person around in Los Angeles we're talking about as a Theta Clear at the present time whose status is in question with regard to this. It's quite goofy, you know. A theta beingness is actually very, very dominant and quite visible by the time you've made a MEST Clear, so people are apt to get quite confused about all this. And they also think a meter should sit there and never say anything after a person is Clear at all but it should sit there totally idly.
There's a point of clarification on this. If the person you've got on the meter is Clear, this condition will occur: That if the person isn't doing anything actively and knowingly – isn't doing anything, you're not going to have any needle reaction. It's going to sit there just square at Clear read and all is going to be well if the person isn't doing anything. Got the idea?

But they know they're doing something or not doing something. Now, you ask this person to do something, you're going to get needle disturbance and you're apt to get tone arm disturbance, too, because they can change the mass of the body and they do it rather easily.

Evidently, on one report on a South African case, you got an inch-wide theta bop or thereabouts every time the preclear moved in and out – or the Clear moved in and out of her body. Every time she moved out of her body or back into her body again, you got a big, wide, inch-wide theta bop.

Well, naturally – naturally, because the electrical phenomena of the body was being considerably disturbed and you got the reading of the thetan moving out and the thetan moving in.

Well, that is quite different than a not-knowingness condition whereby a theta bop, you know, where does that come from? You know? A person says, 'Well, I'm not quite sure where I am. I'm back of my body or I'm in my body, one or the other", and you're getting a theta bop. Well, that is not the reaction I'm talking about.

The reaction I'm talking about is you ask the person, "Well, are you in your body?"

And they say, "Yes. You want me to move out?"

And you get an inch-wide theta bop, see? And then it stops. And you say, "Okay. Well, move back in again." You get an inch-wide theta bop and then that stops. Got the idea?

In other words, it's – the difference of course, the key difference – is predictable behavior of the meter. Now, trying to clear up something on one of these people – because, of course, they're living in the MEST universe, you see? And a Clear walks out into an oddity here. He's perfectly cheerful. He's perfectly able to do things and he's able to get a show on the road and that sort of thing.

We've been so carefully sold on the idea of Buddhist serenity as a token of altitude and high state. A high state is a still state. And boy, that has been very far from the case in every single one of these Clears, you see?

They just depart wildly from this particular lineup because they go into motion and they – they go around doing things and tearing things, and they get impatient with things. And they go up and down the Tone Scale very volatilley and they're quite alive and everybody gets the idea: Clear, Buddha. Well, you see, he's supposed to be sitting there and legs crossed, naked, loin cloth, regarding his navel, you see. That's what he's supposed to be doing. If he's really Clear, he's sitting up there doing that, you know. A bright shade of yellow.

And instead of that, you find this person tearing around, straightening up this and straightening up that and doing this and getting very impatient running into a barrier, you see,
and saying *whoooooa*, barriers shouldn't be and *rhaa-rhaa-rhaa-raaah* and so on and then getting that done and fixed up, you see.

It doesn't present the same picture. It presents a picture of action. It presents a picture of effectiveness. Well, similarly, the E-Meter presents this same thing, but now the E-Meter is a problem when used anywhere in the vicinity of a Clear because as long as the Clear's sitting there doing nothing, you're going to get a perfectly idle, swinging arm, just you know, textbook and the person will be sitting on their sex' Clear read and everything will be just dandy. See this?

Now, they do something and you don't have that condition because they can very definitely disturb the masses of the body with the greatest of ease, don't you see and it goes flying off. But, of course, they know what they're doing and you know what they're doing, too. There's no mystery on your part as to what they're doing. They're not sitting there influencing the needle with a thought, you know. They're moving around. They're kicking the body in the back of the head, you know. And thinking big thoughts and mocking up a ridge and throwing it away and doing things like this and this all influences the meter, of course.

So when one of these people has a present time problem – and they can have present time problems – and you decide to audit this person on a present time problem, you are now going to have a picnic. Because one, you can't get the registry of the problem unless you're quicker than greased lightning.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" And as the needle coasts across the dial, you see. You have to notice this momentary little flick, you see, as it went by and you say "Well now, what problem is that?" And actually, you're trying to audit below the level of knowingness into the reactive area, you see, and they're responding simultaneously on the analytical level.

They say, "Yes, I have a present time problem. Yes, I know about the present time problem."

And you say, "Well, we'll try to isolate it a little better."

And they'll say, "Well, that's good. I'd like to inspect it and I'd like to confront it a little better."

And trying to isolate though what they're doing on the needle and get the needle to coordinate with the questions you're asking and the responses and what they're doing, of course is all haywire because the needle is – the E-Meter is totally rigged to respond on the reactive mind and doesn't register on the reactive mind. It just registers on electronic ridges and things of this character now which comprise, actually, what the body is built out of.

All right. What's the next thing then that we've got to have? Well, we've got to have a Clear meter, you see. We've got to have a meter that'll register this sort of thing and we've already had some despairing wails on this subject of people trying to audit Clears. Sounds funny, auditing a Clear, you see, but he's still got Theta Clear and still got OT to go, you know.
And we're trying to get a clue what they're doing, you know and trying to read a registry and it just doesn't read anymore. The sensitivity is all gone. The needle is floating clear across, back and forth across the dial and you ask for a withhold. "Do you have a withhold?"

Do you think offhand, if the person were Clear – the girl were Clear sitting here at 2.0 and you said, "Do you have a withhold?" that the person would move the tone arm maybe a tiny, little bit, but then move the needle a little bit. Now, that's what you're accustomed to and that isn't what a Clear does at all. The technical facts I'm giving you now are of observed material. You say, "Do you have a withhold?"

The Clear says, "Yes. Five."

You say, "What is it?"

And they say, "Well, I had an unkind thought about you last night, and it was so-and-so", and there it goes – Bang! Which is quite goofy, man. It clears up instantly on the whole read. It goes right back to where it was.

It wasn't there to begin with, don't you see. And it's only there as long as they didn't tell you. And then the second they tell you, it drops right straight back to the Clear read. Quite interesting. They're very easy to security check. But the meter can still be used on security checking a Clear. But it of course blows up for any practical purpose on auditing, and therefore we have got this other project of research well underway. As a matter of fact, more or less got it licked. I think it's quite amusing myself.

Of course, you get these ideas about what a Clear should be and they're actually based on what you have been told a Clear should be. And that basing is back at five, four, three B.C. Gautama Siddhartha rewritten. And naturally, the way you would pin down a whole race would be to take them out of motion so that they made the ideal, a person who was in no motion of any kind whatsoever. That was the ideal. And now if somebody was going to feel good and be able and so on, you naturally would have to take him out of the category that absolutely mauled a complete race, see?

Psychologist today is cooperating in this. Don't think that this is a stray datum that only a person in the field of theosophy or something would know. It isn't. Psychology dramatizes this a hundred percent today. They even wrote in civil defense – their additions for civil defense. The only condition under which they're going to incarcerate somebody during a civil defense disaster is if the person is in motion. If they find a person going around trying to organize things, they are supposed to put him at once in an institution. I read this carefully. I got their definitions for it. I couldn't believe it.

In other words, if anybody's going to do anything about the disaster that just occurred at all, why he's by definition – not by any stretch of the imagination, you know, I mean not me making too much out of a definition.

"Well, yeah, yeah. Well, who's supposed to do something then?" you say.

"Well, the civil defense workers, you see and the government workers are supposed to do something."

And you say, "Well, what if they were all in the wrong building?"
"Oh, well, that's a chance you'd have to take."

Well, man, you can take that chance, but after this ruddy country's blown off the face of the Earth by atomic bombs, I can tell you the first thing that will be apparent, is that it has no government. Now, what are you going to do? Well, you depend on the civil defense workers. Ah ... [laughter]

Of course, I'm not now talking about a field I don't know anything about. I'm talking about a field I know a great deal about. And the only people – the only time some order comes out of chaos is with – some guys get together and decide to put it right. And they'll be the guys on the ground, not the guys with the badges, you see? They've had nothing to do with that. And this is any time anything works or works out and so forth. It's because the people are there who are trying to do something. And you get all of these areas where just the guys with the badges can operate and only the guy with the badge can operate and under no circumstances can anybody else operate and you have the present Arab situation.

You know, these Arabs who were driven out of Palestine and you know they're there yet. You know? They're just a mob. And they just won't do anything and they won't lift their finger and they're just in complete apathy and there's never been any recovery of that particular group of people. And they've evidently followed out some kind of a basis that if any one of them got up and said, "All right, the rest of you guys, now let's go out here and carve up a few acres, and let's raise some khatinkas", or whatever they raise, "and cabbages."

They apparently said, "Well, that man is being too active, you know. He's trying to do something." So doingness has been divorced from being Clear. I want to make that very, very, very clear there. It's a booby trap, see. That's the basic and primary booby trap of Buddhism. That's the basic – that if you're in good shape, you'll be sitting still. Mmm-mmm. If you're in good shape, you can sit still.

I used to upset people no end by going out and sitting under a tree. And they'd say, "Where's the book?", you know, "What are you going to do?"

And I'd say, "Nothing."

It'd drive them nuts, you know. Just sit there and do nothing for an hour or two. They'd go bezeeeh. How could you possibly do that? Well, a person wouldn't be able to do that.

At the same time, I'd get the same objections from a person, "You know, I think you're working too hard. You know. Don't you think you ought to take a rest? You know, you really ought to take a rest. I think you're working much too hard." Although you couldn't confront somebody being totally motionless, they at the same time couldn't confront.

But that's the basic tenet and one that we must be very careful of in Scientology that we don't give this thing much credence because apparently every Clear we have made to date has all of a sudden gotten busy and that is without exception. They've gotten busy. And they don't believe in being MEST.

They're very alive. And they get in people's hair. People get upset about them, you know? And they sometimes have opinions that are not true but they have them just because
they believe them. And they argue and they're not necessarily totally a hundred percent right every five minutes, you know? They make mistakes, you know? But boy they sure make them on a grand scale. One has to give them 100 for trying. But they're in motion and they do get things done. And a Homo sap alongside of a Clear looks like a snail crawling along the road, you know. That's the way he looks to a Clear, too, apparently. From their viewpoint, you know?

They say, "Why don't you people get moving?" You know. "What's the matter with you people?"

And "Moving? Well, we're just hurrying as fast as we can.", you see?

They don't believe it. Speed ratio has changed on them. Idea of what fast motion is has changed on them. Idea of what work is changed on them. Idea of what is worth doing has changed. You see, all these things have shifted and I'd make this very thorough, solid recommendation. That we take a look at the people who have been cleared and then we watch what they're doing to find out what a Clear does. That's – that's snidely put. I mean it's a very sound thing. Because it's out of the area of theory, you see. It's long been out of that area. But it's out of this area of theory. It's a fact. All right.

Now, there is something to be observed about it. And there are people who are Clear and if you put them on a meter as an auditor, you would see at once there was something drastically wrong with this person. They weren't reading on a meter. The arm was coasting around and you were trying to run processes on them and you weren't getting anyplace processing them and you couldn't get any meter reactions and they blew things by inspection and all kinds of things like this and that's the way they behave as a pc, which is about – be the most reliable test of a Clear.

Now watch what those people are doing. Watch how they react and take that as your index, rather than Book One. Just take that as your index. This is what a Clear does. Well, this is what a Clear is doing. What is a Clear doing? And of course, there are an awful lot of people totally sold on Buddhism that will suddenly decide having observed that, that this is not a desirable state. Because the person now doesn't go and sit on the temple steps, you know? There's this fellow down in the marts and businesses of life, you see. And saying, "Come on, get this show on the road, get that done. Let's do this." And "Let's go here. And I think it ought to look very nice and I've got some long term goals for this country – ", and so on. "And I think we ought to be getting at it in this particular line."

And then instead of sitting back at it like the usual fellow with the ideas is concerned, the person gets in and works three times as hard, you see, as anybody else involved in the project.

A Clear in Johannesburg wore out the whole staff. Everybody was utterly panting and their tongues out. This person was teaching about nine hours a day and auditing a pc or two and answering all of the organization's backlog of letters in her spare time.

And things work out right for these people, you see. Because they've got more velocity on the thing and their postulates stick harder and they have a very clear idea of where they're going. They have no held down fives telling them they ought to be doing something else.
But there is our best zone of information and at the present instant, we really aren't using it. I try to publish little scraps and stuff that come along, but I ought to get it more thoroughly done. Of course, I also have the idea I shouldn't invade their privacy or invalidate their states.

Okay? Well, that's enough. That's enough for now. That's enough. You've had it.

Okay. Good night.

Thank you.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS ASSESSMENT, BEHAVIOR OF PC

A lecture given on 10 August 1961

Thank you.

Okay. This is the 10th of August 1961.

"If a pc dopes consistently throughout the Goals Assessment, not getting a lot together but running a list by repeater technique, does one keep on bringing him up to present time?" I should say not. "Or does one go on repeating goals because one is addressing the reactive rather than the analytical mind?" Very interesting. Probably requires an orientation on the – what you're doing. I probably ought to sit somebody down and take a piece of his goals list and show you how you run it. I mean that would be about the most satisfactory answer to this. Runs like this.

Pcs audit, whether they're asleep or awake, and you'd expect no response from a pc of any kind whatsoever while you were doing a Goals Assessment on the pc after you've gotten the goals. He doesn't have to say anything. Nothing in the Auditor's Code that says he has to say anything. There is no pc's code. You can tear that out of Book One. I didn't write it in the first place. Written by John W. "Astounding" Campbell [laughter], Jr. who, the older he gets the more astonishing he is. And so on.

There is no pc code. The pc doesn't have to behave. There is no behavior factor involved. And you ask this pc for some goals. Well, he's supposed to come up with some goals, and if he doesn't come up with some goals, you hit him or kick him or do something with him and make him come up with some goals. You understand?

Pc has no responsibility for the conduct of a session. That's it. And don't expect that a pc does have any responsibility for the conduct of a session because he doesn't. You're the auditor. You're supposed to know what you're doing. You're supposed to know what he's doing. So you get the session going and you get him to run some goals. And as soon as you get the goals on a list, you null them. Well, he doesn't have to say a thing. He just doesn't have to say a thing. I read them over about three times and they look like they're dying out and so forth. I read them about two more times and they're dead. Another goal, I read it about three times; it looks like it's getting tougher, I just skip it. Put it in as still there. Got the idea? Don't try to do anything else with that goal. It looks like it's going to stay, so I just let it stay. And I won't read a goal more than about five, six times anyhow. If it doesn't null in that long a period or that short a period and so forth, leave it. You're in no rush.
There is no anxiety about getting these goals erased. Actually, it's quite invalidative to the pc for you to be in an anxiety about it.

And I think basically, probably what you're trying to do in running goals, is you're probably trying to get rid of the goal rather than just inspect the goal. You expect the pc possibly to answer up or think about the goal or pay some attention to the goal while you are reading it. Any one of these things could be part of this same situation, you see. Or you're running the Goals assessment with the rudiments out, which is highly probable, or you don't pick up the ARC breaks during the session.

You know, there's something called interim rudiments. You know, pcs an get present time problems and things of that character while a session is in progress. And... you see an ARC break come up with a pc – well, let's not fool around, because I can tell you, absolutely guarantee, that a small flub on an auditor's part will blow up to become an ARC break within a half, to one and one-half hours. You may not see it at the time it happens. You may not see it explode but it will come up later. Oh, you didn't know that, huh. Ha-ha. I can see an ARC break in a session coming, oh, my God, ages before the pc blows up. I've listened to them over speaker systems and things like that, you know. And I look at my watch and I say, "Well, one-half hour to an explosion."

Well, the explosions actually aren't necessary. You get an ARC break and you don't handle it, or the pc gives you an origin or you don't handle it, or something goes wrong with your TRs and then it's not handled by some rudiments process, you see, and you can count on an explosion of some kind or another occurring sometime later, but it's the most interesting thing. I mean it will be half an hour to an hour and a half, and there it goes.

Well, see, there goes a TR or there goes a rudiment of some kind or another. And then we say, "Well, it didn't affect him and nothing happened to him", see. So we don't pay much attention to it, and then a half an hour to an hour and a half later, all of a sudden we get an explosion on some entirely disrelated and apparently quite different thing. Worth knowing, isn't it?

Now, the safe way to audit is to patch up the pc's ARC breaks whether they exist or not. Got that? Let's just make a rule. Patch them up whether they exist or not. And you all of a sudden won't have a pc going this far out. When you think that the pc looks restive because you have flubbed an acknowledgement or something like that, well, just go ahead and insist that you have, you see, and take the thing up. Get it? That's you, then, taking responsibility. Otherwise, the pc is forced into taking responsibility for the session. And of course, the moment he takes responsibility for the session, he goes out of session.

So that if you insist on your rudiments being in, you can make a frightful bore out of yourself and still be quite right, you know. The direction to err on the TRs is to insist that they are out, and the direction to err on the rudiments is to insist that they've got to be patched up. That's the direction to err. If you're going to make mistakes, make mistakes in that direction. You can become pitifully boring as an auditor, apparently. Somebody else listening to the session would say, "Oh, my God!" You know? "How horrible." You know, it's like this.

The pc says, "Well, uh, I did have a goal. Uh, yeah, I had a goal like that once. Uh, a goal to sell curtain rods."
And you say, "Okay." And he looks at you a little bit oddly. And you say, "Well now, do you know I acknowledged that?"

And he says, "Well, I uh, uh ..."

And you say, "Well, all right. Now what was that about curtain rods again?"

And he says, "Well, I think I had a goal once. I'm not quite sure, to have curtain rods – to sell curtain rods I think it was, and so forth."

And you say, "Well, all right. Sell curtain rods, all right. Sell curtain rods. That's good. All right. Good."

And he says, "What was that all about", you know? But he won't cause an upset.

Now, this will cause an upset. He says, "Well, I had a goal once to sell curtain rods."

And you say, "Good." And he looks at you kind of odd. And you say, "All right. What's another goal?", taking a goals list. Actually, you don't know and sometimes he doesn't know whether he's had an upset or not. But he might have thought that you didn't adequately acknowledge this goal "to have curtain rods", you see.

All right. Well, this is going to build up, and this is going to build up. There's a possibility that this will build up through the minutes, through the tens of minutes, and another little one hits, you see. And another little one hits. All of a sudden, on some disrelated subject, he suddenly has a present time problem about his car parking or something, you see. This has flown in, and before you have a chance to handle it, he insists that you didn't.

Well, the whole argument is based on this oddity about the mind: the things that go wrong are not things that are known. The known things don't go wrong. It's the unknowns. And if you're looking for the source of an ARC break, you must look for an unknown area. If you're looking for a breakdown of a session, you must look for something that both you and the pc have overlooked. You got that? If you want to waste time take up those things you already know about.

All right. I'll show you a very fast way here to patch up an ARC break of some kind or another. The pc says, "Well, I had a goal to sell curtain rods."

And you say, "Mm-hm."

And the pc says, "Did you get that?"

You say, "Mm-mm."

And the pc says, "Well, sell curtain rods, you know, sell curtain rods."

"All right."

Now, on the face of it – now, on the face of this situation – it appears that your lack of acknowledgement at that point upset the pc. This is the way it appears. And remember, this is a universe of appearances. And if all the appearances weren't somewhat fallacious, the universe wouldn't be here. See, there's little curves on these lines. So you assume at once that it wasn't that acknowledgement – yourself privately. You can pay token to the fact that well, you didn't acknowledge and weren't terribly enthused about this horrendous goal that was
going to wreck the whole universe about selling curtain rods. But you plunge at once on the basis of "Was there an earlier goal I didn't acknowledge? Was there an earlier one I didn't acknowledge?"

And he says, "Mmmmmmm ..." He'll always find one.

You get what I'm talking about? You give a cheery "aye-aye" to what he just said, and you think that's okay, and you do acknowledge, and you do handle that situation. And then you go back and handle the underpinning which might have caused this later upset.

You assume that any time a pc is upset, there's been an earlier upset he hasn't demonstrated. You got that? It's an unreasonable assumption perhaps, but you will always find that he will find it. It is an amazing mechanism. The pc has an ARC break about the fact that the window dropped. By all means, listen to the ARC break about the window dropping, but find the ARC break that happened earlier. And you'll always find the earlier one, and for some reason or other, it'll always blow out the window dropping. And that makes for awfully fast auditing. Terribly fast auditing.

An auditor who is continuously involved in patching up ARC breaks and patching up present time problems has just not been alert earlier in the session. You see that? Just hasn't been alert. That's all. The auditor is the doped-off one. He hasn't been alert.

The auditor who's continuously involved, and having to rerun rudiments and patch up those ARC breaks and patch up those present time problems that occur during the session, and that sort of thing, there were lots of them that went by that he didn't notice, and they finally culminated into an upset which interrupted the session.

You see what the mechanism really is here. It's those little first unknown upsets, the not-recognized, the not-seen upsets, which then build up into the visual ones. The hidden upset is what you're really looking for. So if you go and spend three-quarters of an hour now on running the ARC break about the window dropping or the lack of an acknowledgement or something like that, you're being utterly foolish because it hasn't anything to do with it. That was merely the one where it got so bad that the pc went out of session.

Well, where did he start out of session? Pcs never go at right angles out of session. It would have to be really horrendous to get a pc to go right angles out of session. They drift off at about an angle of about twenty degrees to the session line. You got the idea? They're a little bit out, and then a little time goes on, and they're a little bit out, and then there's a little bit more out, and then a little bit more out, a little bit more out, and a little bit more out, and all of a sudden it becomes noticeable. But they've been drifting out at a twenty degree divergence from the course of the session here for maybe a half an hour to an hour and a half, before they really went out. You got it?

Now, if this happens early in the session – you just start the session, the pc goes out at right angles, apparently – oh, well, it was your session yesterday, and you didn't pick it up. Got the idea?

This actually puts you in a rather comfortable frame of mind. It puts you as cause over the actual situation because you're not now in a bad condition of thinking that you consistently do things that are bad as an auditor that causes the pc to get this upset. And you can get
yourself pretty upset as an auditor, as a matter of fact, if you think that these things are actually what is upsetting the pc, you see. Because you are going along the line of attributing the cause of your upset as an auditor to the wrong target, see. You're saying, "Well, my auditing incompetence is demonstrated by the fact that I didn't prevent the window from dropping suddenly." You know? "I didn't protect this pc one way or the other." Well, the actuality is – is that the pc suddenly was that nervy and went out that suddenly, and so forth. Your incompetence as an auditor is actually demonstrated by not picking up the little ones. Those little departures from the course of session way back, you see.

It's quite interesting to take a pc – and you should actually run a pc this way once, severely, to get the point very well subjectively. But pc has an ARC break. Pc dopes off. Pc goes any which direction but being interested in own case and in the session. You know, pc does anything. Instantly assume there was something happened an hour and a half to a half an hour ago, or in the former session. You see? The second you see this "out of sessionness", you just make the assumption, true or not, that something went wrong yesterday or earlier in the session today. You got it? And you just go ahead and look for it. And take them all up, you see, one right after the other. Go down the line exhaustively. Find out which rudiment and which where and... "When I was auditing you yesterday, did you have a present time problem?" See, running rudiments for yesterday. "Did you have a present time problem while I was auditing you yesterday?"

"Well, no. No, not really."

"Did you have an ARC break with me yesterday?"

"Oh, no, no, no, no, no. Oh, no. I had no ARC break with you."

The needle drops. You say, "Well, what was the ARC break that you had with me yesterday?"

"Well, I thought actually that you began the session rather abruptly."

Well, boy, that is a session and a half ago, don't you see. Now, if you just, as an exercise and to give yourself a good reality on this thing, if you start picking up "out of sessionness", which includes dope-off, see – dope-off is just another variety of going out of session. Flying out of the chair, throwing down the cans, or walking out of the room, or doping off – these are all methods of retreat, aren't they? See, they're methods of "get out of here." So, if this situation existed as it went along the line, certainly something must have steered it there. Now, the pc did want auditing, and actually it takes a considerable volume of reasons why he shouldn't have it. It takes a lot to push him out. Got the idea?

Just as an exercise, go back and track it arduously, painfully, painstakingly. Lose all the auditing time you want to lose doing it. Cause another upset with the pc as far as you're concerned, 'cause you're doing it. But if it's causing an auditing upset with the pc, I'll clue you: It's there. There is an earlier one. There are several earlier ones. If the pc is now upset that you are looking for them, it is simply the fact that he is being restimulated by your looking for them. And his restimulation is what you're getting the argument over. Got it?

So if you want to be a real smooth auditor and have your pc always in session and always winning and always gaining, stop concentrating on trying to be so alert and so much on
the qui vive and so interested in the pc's case. Stop worrying about that. Worry about your mechanics. Make those things real good, and assume that every time your pc departs from session either subjectively by doping off, boiling off, going unconscious, retreating in that direction, or attacking you as the auditor, or actually blowing the session or starting to blow session, just assume immediately that you are looking at a chain of things that have no foundation in the incident which seemed to bring them out. You got that? Now, just assume that and then go look for the chain. And maybe it makes it very explicable to you here if I say don't fixate on the effect end of the line.

You see, the pc's going out of session, retreating subjectively or objectively, either way – if you treat that as cause of the upset, of course, you're going to lose because you are looking at the effect of something. Well, what is it the effect of? It is actually the effect of a concatenation. And the least you'll get off the thing is a lot of unkind thoughts on the part of the pc, you see. Your pc's been doing something. You know, pc's had some disagreements here, and there are some backflashes as you slide back down the line and look for this.

Give you a very – example. Pc throws down the cans. This is pretty extreme, see. Pc throws down the cans and says, "Well, there's just no sense in telling you one more time because you just aren't listening to me."

Well now, there's no reason why you should at this point assume that this is factual. The pc said it, yes. The pc has become aware of it, yes. But your assumption at this moment should be that there's a chain. And that is the golden datum: that you are looking at a chain. And if you try to treat it as anything but a chain, you are not at cause.

A crude sort of an approach which is factual and not usable but very crude would be, "What was the first time you tried to – you thought you had better get out of this session?" That isn't a usable statement, but it is a summation of what you're trying to do. And you say, "What's the first time you tried to get out of this session?" In the first place, it's too accusative, in the first place. It's too this, it's too that, but that's what you're really trying to do.

Pc throws down the cans. You say, "What was the first time you tried to get out of this session?" "Have you tried to get out of any earlier session?" "Have you thought you should not be in any earlier session with me?" That's what you're actually trying to do, you see. And boy, that needle will start wiggling. You'll just be amazed. You say, "Well now, you were sitting here. Everything was running along fine, and look-a-here, all these ARC breaks were occurring, and I didn't even notice it." And then that'll learn you that when the pc suddenly goes, you know, at you, something like that, pick it up, you know, pick it up right now. And you say, "Well, was something wrong with that acknowledgement? Was something wrong with that situation there, just now?"

And the pc says, "Oh, no." (You notice your needle drop.)

Right away, same rule applies. You noticed it, so there must be a hidden one. And you say, "Well, is there any earlier time you disagreed with one of my acknowledgements?"

"Oh, yes. No, no. No, no, no, no, no, except, uh ..." Got the idea?
So if you always treat it as a chain on any rudiment or TR breakdown... For instance, I'd be – if – about the fifth time that a pc, or the third time a pc came into session with me and had a present time problem, I would ask this pc some sort of questioning like this.

You know, you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" And this is about the fifth time that this pc has had a fall on this rudiment. Every time the pc comes into session here lately apparently he has a PT problem. Well, now the PT problem is this: that the pc is having PT problems.

Now, there's several things that can be adjudicated. Theoretically and casewise, you could adjudicate a lot of things from this. And you could actually trace the type of problem. You could actually scout down his chain, you could scout down his terminal, you could scout down his goal, just by "What kind of present time problem do you have?" don't you see? I mean there's a lot of technical nonsense and foofaraw that you could go into like this. You could make this very significant.

We're not talking about that type of significance now. We're just talking about the fact that this is the fifth time I've noticed this pc have a PT problem. So I assume immediately that this pc has consistently been audited with PT problems in restimulation. Pretty good, huh? I just assume. Well, all right. This is the fifth time he's had one with me. How often has he had one with auditors? "Have you ever been audited", then I will say, "when you had a PT problem?" Doesn't make any sense to him, so I say, "Well, have you ever been audited and you didn't think you ought to be having an auditing session?"

Boom! "Well, when was that? Good. When was that? Good. When was that? Good. When was that one? All right. Good. When was that one? Good. When was that one? Oh, oh, yes. That one. Yeah, that one. That one." There are only eight thousand times.

So the pc has gotten up to a point of actually being audited when he shouldn't be audited. And he gets present time problems... There's a curious mechanism I ought to talk to you about.

Do you know that you can make somebody think they have done something by punishing them? You know that mechanism? Well, you can make reverses on all mechanisms work. If there are any mental mechanisms, you can pull the effect of a pc's action on the pc and make him wonder if he hadn't caused. You got the idea?

Because it's truth, you know, that he is at such cause over these things that those causes usually exist. But supposing we took somebody and we shook him suddenly, surprised him half out of his wits, you see – a schoolboy – and said, "Well, we're giving you a note to your parents for not having been in school yesterday." And then would say, "No, no, don't answer back. No arguments on your part now. No." And don't give him any chance to as-is it, you see. And within a half an hour, he'll wonder where he was yesterday. You got the idea? The other one is so grooved – the cause-effect of the person is so grooved – that when you do something to him, he thinks the cause existed. In other words, you can just give him the effect and the cause is apparent.

So you can override this asking for yesterday's PT problem to a point of where he's absolutely convinced, you see, that he must have been causing things in yesterday's session that
he doesn't remember now, and it'll cause a mystery. You get the idea? So you have to kind of play it in between. You don't want this other phenomenon occurring too thoroughly. So be reasonable about it and don't overwhelm him. Don't do this in an overwhelming fashion. Do it in rather quiet fashion. Don't jump him too hard about this sort of thing.

For instance, "Oh, haw!" he says. Something like this.

And you say, "Well, didn't you think I got that acknowledgement?"

And he said, "No, I don't think you did."

And/or "Don't you think I got that origin?"

"No, I don't think you did."

And you say, "Well, now, what did you say again?" And he tells you, and you say, "Well, good."

And now if you leveled a long, bony finger at him and you said, "You realize that you have not originated once and had it arrive with me?" The wrong thing to do, you see. The pc actually would kind of have a sneaking notion that this was true. So you have to approach it with the other angle, and you say, "Now, as unlikely as it may seem, have you originated anything else that I mightn't have gotten?"

"Yes. Yes. Oh, no, no, no, no. Uh, yes. Yea-... No."

He'll be just racing over these things one right after the other, and he'll finally pick one out. Now, you say, "Well, is there an earlier one than that?"

"Well."

And all of a sudden we will usually run into one that is nicely, deeply buried. And it's not now a mystery. You see, you can kind of insist too hard that one existed and get him to actually believe that one might have existed but then not be able to find it, you see. And he'd be left in the mystery that there probably was one there, but he couldn't find it, you know. So you mustn't be too forthright. You mustn't be too harsh. I don't mean forthright. Go ahead. Be forthright. But don't be harsh about existing, you see.

"Now, there certainly was one, you know. Yes, there was one. There was one yesterday. I know there must have been one because today, you see, you are ARC breaky. And there – so there must have been one yesterday, and Ron says so", you see. [laughter] And that kind of an attitude, and the guy says, "Was there one yesterday? Well, there probably wasn't one yesterday. I don't know whether there was one yesterday or not. Huhuhuhuhu! If he says so, it must be true", and so forth, "and therefore, there must have been one yesterday."

So it takes a rather clever attitude on the auditor's part. It takes a mild attitude. You have to play this thing in the middle of the path, you see. "Could there have been one yesterday?" You know, it's that type of approach which you want. "Could there have been an earlier one? Is there any possibility that this might have been the case, huh?"

"No. Oh, except, uh ...", you see, and one will turn up. Get how you do this?

All right. Down go the cans. You say, "What's the matter?"
Pc says, "I shouldn't be here."

You handle that. "Why shouldn't you be here?" Handle it very briefly. And "Have you had an earlier feeling that you shouldn't have been here in this session?"

"That I shouldn't have been here. That's an odd thing. I always feel like that, you know."

And the pc starts tracing it back and he gets interested in this, and so forth, and may hit the first time he was ever audited. And just before the session, he said, "Well, maybe I shouldn't let somebody fool with my mind", or something like that. And always since that time his auditing has all been balling up on this one little early point. His distrust in auditors. This sort of thing will tend to come up one way or the other, and then – you have actually then handled the situation, and so your auditing will now be much faster.

So the answer to this question – I didn't mean to go on like this at this length, but the answer to this question is, if a pc is doping off, you might be expecting too much of the pc, or you might be expecting the pc to answer or you might be expecting something or other to happen. But factually, the pc has had some impulse to leave session. So you better find it out, and you better trace it back. And look for a chain. Don't look for an incident. So you get way, way back and you find out the first time Goals Assessment came up, that he was very leery of telling anybody any of his goals.

And you get back to what I was talking to you yesterday. There are lots of reasons why people don't want to give you goals because people just step on goals and, you know, all kinds of things, and people insist you have goals. So unless you clear up that sort of thing, you're bound and determined to have somebody boil off, out of session, long goals lists, you know. These various other manifestations all occur from the same thing: A pc – a person has some feeling like he shouldn't be there. And of course, that's "out of sessionness." "Shouldn't be there" – "out of sessionness." "Interested in own case, willing to talk to the auditor." That's your technical observation of the person being in session. So the person is in-session. He is interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. The person is not in-session, then there's a feeling he shouldn't be there.

There isn't a feeling that he shouldn't be interested in own case and shouldn't talk to the auditor. You know, these are not two sides of a coin. On one side of the coin is "interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor." On the other side of the coin is this entirely different thing, which is "shouldn't be there." You get boil-off, dope-off, everything else. Something has happened to convince him he's in the wrong place. Only it might have been in earlier auditing sessions. It might have been with other auditors. It might go way on back, don't you see. It's a good thing to run them down. I don't care how much time you spend straightening out somebody or orienting somebody on the subject of auditing because it's all gain.

So you've asked me a question here – it's unsigned – but you've asked me a question here, which had an answer which you probably didn't suspect which is that all boil-off and all dope-off is blood brother to "walk out the door, throw down the cans, ARC break with the auditor." It's all blood brother, and it's "shouldn't be here", which is the reverse side of the coin of "interested in own case, willing to talk to the auditor." Come to think about it, we've
never defined "out of sessionness." And that is the definition of out of session. We define in-session, but define out of session and it might make your auditing much easier. The definition, of course, is "unwilling to be there." Simple as that.

Okay. Any other questions here today? ... Yes.

Male voice: Could you give us some hints about dealing with stuck and sticky needles in rudiments and elsewhere?

Dealing with stuck and sticky needles, rudiments and elsewhere.

Sticky needle means games condition. Person is in a state of denial, and so forth.

Needle stuck – person's stuck on the track. Always in a condition of "should be there-shouldn't be there", if we want to carry on the same thing we were talking about before. Only stuck on the track is a "should be there-shouldn't be there", all in the same breath. Why is he keeping it mocked up if he shouldn't be there? But nevertheless he shouldn't be there and he's keeping it mocked up because he should be there.

You could drive somebody stark, staring mad, you know, if there were a real, honest-to-goodness, observable emergency going on, such as a building being bombed, and telling him he ought to be inside rescuing the people, at the same time convince him that he had better be outside to take care of them when they're brought out. Well, you could go worse than this, and you should tell him the safest place is inside as long as he stays outside. [laughter] And a person would go kind of mad.

So a sticky needle is a sort of a "shouldn't be there-must be there" sort of a situation. And sticky needles are difficult to cure only to the degree that they betoken a certain amount of "out-of-sessionness." Just to that degree that the person is out of present time. It's not a very serious out of sessionness. It's just that the person is out of present time. He's listening to the arrows whistling on the walls of Acre, you see, and he should be listening to the auditor giving the next auditing command. And he gets distracted from what the auditor is doing and saying and to this degree – which goes on continuously in cases. There isn't anything you can do about that, except audit them. That's why you're auditing them. So you get a situation where the fellow's needle is badly stuck. He for sure would recover more slowly than if he were fully in-session. Don't you get the idea? So the more time you spend effectively in getting this individual in-session, the faster a sticky needle will loosen. Interesting? Actually, your effort to get him in-session gets him out of whatever he – where he's in on the track, you see. And it works very neatly.

I here s no worry about a sticky needle. So needles stick. So they loosen. It's when a needle is sticky and continues to be sticky and never loosensthat you start worrying. You never get a change of setting, and so forth, because it means there isn't much case gain going on here. A not-know type of Goals Assessment, you see – I mean a forgotten goals, goals that shouldn't be known ... And if you ask somebody, "Do you have any goals that shouldn't be generally known?" Cow-cow-cow-cow. You get a brand-new response on the thing. A type of goal of "Where would you like to be?" following this thing out. "Have you ever had any goals of being places? Have you ever had any goals of not being places?" And you can loosen up somebody's needle wham! wham! wham! wham! wham! wham! wham! See? Just run, "to be there-not to be
there" off as part and parcel of the Goals Assessment, and you'll get into some very interesting responses on a sticky needle.

Of course, if he's in a place he shouldn't be in then he doesn't have any havingness, is that right? And if he has no havingness, why then, of course, he's got a sticky needle and he's got lots of ridges, and so on.

If a person's needle was sticky on me – if I had a person whose needle was consistently sticky on me in an auditing session and I didn't seem to be able to do too much about it – I'm afraid I'd start plowing it to them on the subject of withholds, long duration present time problems, find those hidden standards and put them in the Security Check, and in doing a Goals Assessment, I would find "goals that had better not be known." You see, it's a whole class of goals that couldn't be accomplished if they were known. Do you realize that?

In the banking world – what do you think about the banking world? Supposing everybody knew the various goals of various financiers with regard to the swap and exchange of currencies, contracts, negotiable securities between here and Switzerland? Game would blow up in no time.

I'll tell you a symptom of that, by the way, that you might find quite amusing. Did you know that twenty-four hours before there is a change in the bank rate that you cannot get a call through to Switzerland? And that the telephone company always knows when there's going to be a change in the bank rate and the Exchequer is going to make an announcement, because twenty-four hours before they can't have a line to Switzerland. It's all jammed. It's jammed totally, straight across. And they say, "Well, there's going to be a change in the bank rate." [laughter] "Somebody's pals have been let in on it", you know. "Here we go." Interesting, huh?

So here's a whole bunch of hidden goals, you see, that would be knowingly hidden goals, you know, which these very fellows would tell you, "Well, it's the most practical thing in the world", you know. "What do you mean? That isn't reprehensible in any way. We wouldn't make any money if these weren't hidden. The goal is to sell so many securities before the thing falls, and if we let it out that we were going to sell the securities before we sold the securities, cow! Well, of course, this would wreck the whole lot, and our goal would be ruined, so therefore we must be very secretive about this whole object and our objectives and so forth."

Well, you, I imagine, find very many government-hired slaves – I mean scientists. The slave brains they call them these days. I imagine those boys are very difficult to audit. It's not whether or not they've got withholds of secret materials. It's what goals are they withholding that the government has. You see, what goals of the government are they part and parcel of that must not be known. And you take such a case and it'll go bang, bang, bang, bang. You ask them "What goals shouldn't be known?" Oh, man, they are legion. Well, naturally, a pc not in that dramatic atmosphere is going to have a similar difficulty. Goals that shouldn't be known. And then goals not to be there and goals to be there. Yeah, what kind of goals are those? Let's shake them down. And you will find, I think, that needle start loosening up like mad, very rapidly.
They've had a goal to be in school. They've had a goal not to be in school. They'll usually be flip-flops, you see. They've had a goal to go to southern France, and they've had a goal to stay in England. And they've had a goal to live in a big house, and they've had a goal to continue to live in the house they're in. And they've had a goal not to live in a big house, and they've had a goal not to live in the house they're in. And you watch these things. And they'll just be on both sides of the card. It's a deck of playing cards with kings and queens and aces, and so forth, printed on both sides. You can't turn these cards over without finding the same card on the other side, you see.

You say, "Have you had a goal to do anything?" Well, yes, they've had a goal to do that, and they've also had the goal not to do that. And it is just repetitive. You say, "Have you ever had a goal to own a boat?" "Yes, I've had a goal to own a boat." And they have also had a goal not to own a boat. And they will almost invariably add gratuitously, the negative goal. It occurs to them immediately afterwards, you see. So your plus and minus goals and, of course, your plus and minus locations – goals with regard to locations – are particularly pregnant with susceptibility. And you could move that sticky needle.

Routine 3, as you might have suspected, is your beefiest process. It is the strongest of all these processes. And the only thing that gets in the road of Routine 3 is a person isn't enough in-session to be assessed. That's the only thing that gets in the road of that. That's what we've been trying to solve, one way or the other.

But that is a sort of a self-defeating mechanism because this other thing is true. This other thing is gruesomely true: that the pc is in a valence which is denying help and everything else to the pc, and to whom the pc is denying help. And the computation is if the pc gets well, the valence will be helped. And, of course, the pc is going to stay as sick as he can get to make the valence sick. You got the idea?

So anything that is not directed immediately to the goal and the valence connected with this situation, is to a marked degree lost time. The isolation of that terminal isolates the biggest games condition the pc has. And up to that time, you are to a marked degree only auditing a terminal alien to the pc's better being. You see that? Until that terminal is isolated, nothing much is going to happen.

Now, I know how to scare such terminals into view more rapidly. I know how to do faster Goals Assessments, but your first law on that would be progress, and progress is measured by the change of meter. And if you're not getting any change of meter as you do an assessment, you must assume there is something real weird going on here which inhibits this thing from changing and that there's something very wrong with being assessed for goals. Goals must be not-known. You must assume that there's a great deal of mystery of location and whereabouts and other things of this character on this case. And you'll just go to the root of these things because as I say it is self-defeating because these things only are useful to the degree that they advance a Goals Assessment for the location of the eventual terminal of the pc. You follow that?

So you do anything in your power to get a goals assessment running well and smoothly. And there's a couple of mechanisms – I've already given you one of them, which is not-known goals; goals that are not known, goals that they've forgotten. "What goals have you
forgotten? What goals have you forgotten?" "What goals shouldn’t be known?" Any not-know – postulates one and three in order of line. First not – Native State, Not-Know, Know, Forget, Remember – postulates one and three. You work those things over one way or the other on the subject of goals backwards and forwards; on the subject of terminals, backwards and forwards.

And let me give you the other one here which is, I just said, terminals. Not-known terminals. When you're doing – finally get up to a person's Terminal Assessment, and so on, you can run "unknown people", "not-known people." "Who would you care not to know?" Interesting question, isn't it?

You could probably use variations of that to do a different type of clearing. Which is to say, you theoretically could blow all the valences the case was mixed up with by running nothing but generalities on beingnesses and terminals, don't you see? But that's only theoretical. And it's never been done. And the other is successful, so we'll let the other one ride until it gets up into an area of good practice where we know where it is. "Who would you rather not know?" "What sort of being shouldn't be known by anyone?" "Is there any being on the track that you regret you knew?" This type of interrogation would, of course, shake up the valence in which the pc was locked up. So remember there's that type of approach, completely aside from this assessment type of approach. Two different ways to go about the same breed of cat.

What you're trying to do is get the person's valence out into view because the person is at war with this valence, and this valence is the solution to a problem that the pc has never been able to confront. Right?

So anyway, any which, any way you work it out, you'll win as long as you can get the pc to sit still. The best way to keep a pc sitting still is to pick up all of his ARC breaks and so forth, and don't keep courting disaster on the thing. Anytime, by the way, you have a tumultuous pc, don't keep blaming it on the pc because it's ARC breaks, rudiments out earlier than the time they're occurring.

If you wanted to really set a pc up for auditing ... Let's say you were in San Diego and the pc came walking in, and they'd been audited by this one or that one down through the years, and so on, and they came in and the case didn't appear to be in very bad shape, and everything was going along fine. And you actually wanted to do the best possible thing for this pc. It would be to cover rudiments of all sessions the pc has ever had, including the time period before they decided to have their first session. Just – in other words, just set it up and go about it arduously on down the line.

Now, what gets in the road is the pc isn't going to sit still for all this. They're going to consider it a waste of time. It is a slow freight. There's all sorts of arguments of it. And your own impatience and anxiety to get the show on the road doesn't get you to set the case up so that it can be audited, and so mistakes can be made. And you very often – in the largest majority of cases you get away with it. So you can keep on doing it. But if you were just arduously to take the case and set it up on every rudiment for every session and every auditor and every session they have given – "Have you ever given a session while you had a present time problem?" You know? You get the idea? "When was that?" you know.
And just take all the rudiments and set them all up on the subject of auditing from the first instance, and spend fifty hours at it, clearing would be a hundred hours earlier. You see what I mean? You could speed it up by apparently taking a lot of time.

And anybody who had—who was making no gain or no progress, who had had auditing before, I would suspect there was something wrong with the auditing, and try to trace all this back and find out if there wasn't a hangfire or a failed help or find something else. You know, just look over this auditing. Let's set up this case. Let's look over the whole zone and area, and don't keep auditing at one little target when you've got all of life for a target as far as this pc is concerned.

Of course, we know the fast way to get about it. The fast way to do it is set the pc up so the pc will stay in-session so that you can do a good assessment on the pc for goals, get the goals—find the one goal that hangs up or, lucky you would be, no goal hangs up; they just go Clear. You see, that's possible, too, you know. If they just went Clear on goals, you've had it. You never get a chance to do a Terminal Assessment. [laughter]

But get the goal and then get terminals for that particular goal, and then give it some runs and flatten that, and do another assessment. Let's check over that goal and find out if it's flat. Maybe get another terminal for the same goal, or get a new goal. And they just keep on running, and they will go Clear. That's it. That is the way to clear them. There is no other known operation at this time, which auditors can and will do to clear people. That one will. But setting a person up for that and straightening them out and making them handle a great many things, getting all kinds of things out of the road in order to set a person up for the assessment, of course, is of interest, too. But the pc isn't much interested in it, and that's what gets in your road.

The pc is sort of hauled away from his central goal of getting a Goals Assessment done. You've all had that happen to you already. You'd much rather be assessed for goals. Much rather find your goal, not necessarily be assessed for goals. Would much rather find your goal and find your terminal and that's it. And any preliminary step to that finds you very impatient. "Oh, no. You haven't got a fall on a present time problem again? Oh, good heavens. That means you're going to burn up here a half an hour or so handling this present... oh, for heaven's sakes", you know. The guy's got a present time problem right now in having to handle a present time problem, don't you see.

Good way to handle it, however, if the pc will sit still, is let's just trace all the times they were audited while they had present time problems. A present present time problem will probably blow up. Did they ever have this particular type of present time problem before is the best entrance point for that kind of a search. Well, that's an interesting question.

The fellow says, "Well, I have a terrible present time problem. I've just received a letter from my solicitor, and I have to come up with eight billion pounds or drachma or something by two o'clock yesterday, you know." An interesting way to handle it—it has probably never been mentioned to you before, but an interesting way to handle it is say:

"Well, have you ever had this type of problem before?"
"Oh, well, now that you mention it. Come to think about it, I never have any other type of problem." [laughter]

"Oh, is that so?" And it goes insensitive as far as the session is concerned. Cognition of this as a continuous state of being. All of a sudden, "Well, let's get down to this, see. Why? Why do I always have this kind of a present time ... Why me?", you know. "How come?" You see. And the immediate existence of that specific present time problem has now broadened out, and you've actually cut the props from underneath the present time problem. And even though it took you a half an hour or forty-five minutes or an hour to bring about that cognition, you are not then going to have to handle present time problems afterwards to amount to anything. When they come up, you just refer to the same modus operandi. They know that worked earlier. They rip it all up again, and there goes the present time problem, see? You can get around it that way.

ARC break. "Do you have an ARC break with me?"

"Oh, yes."

"All right. Is this the same type of ARC break? You had this same type of ARC break before?" Brrrrroot, see. Rip them up. Otherwise, you're just going to keep getting ARC breaks, see. ARC breaks, add to the chain. ARC breaks, add to the chain. ARC breaks, add to the chain. You get the idea? So you're going to handle a late engram. You're going to be running late engrams all the time, huh? Hey! You can't erase them. So your pc, of course, is making no progress in assessment.

There is no substitute for setting a pc up to be audited. No substitute for it. There is no fast road for it either beyond some of the tips I could give you about the fact that ARC breaks go in chains. PT problems go in chains. The difficulties with auditing rooms go in chains. And you can handle them as a chain. And then you are saving time. And you are doing a better job of it. Any rudiment can be handled as a chain. And if you handle it expertly as a chain, particularly if you find basic-basic on that chain, the whole chain will tear up.

See, ARC breaks are basically resting on overts. And if ARC breaks are resting on overts, then an unkind thought regarding Book One Scientology may very well be something that sat at the basis of the chain. The person hadn't even read it, see, had never even seen it. We had a case that was always getting ARC breaky in sessions, and so forth, and they actually traced back on the basic-basic of the thing of having made an unkind remark to his father about – . Well, they picked it up. They read a chapter too carelessly. They gave each other a five-minute auditing session, and then they agreed it didn't work. [laughter] And you know that postulate hung fire with that same person for about seven years? It wasn't picked up until about 58. And all of a sudden the case just started to make very good gains in processing, and so forth. But up to that time, I was having a hell of a time with it because they ARC broke all the time in sessions. See they had an overt against the thing that was now supposed to help them. Interesting.

We had a case that was always getting ARC breaky in sessions, and so forth, and they actually traced back on the basic-basic of the thing of having made an unkind remark to his father about – . Well, they picked it up. They read a chapter too carelessly. They gave each other a five-minute auditing session, and then they agreed it didn't work. [laughter] And you know that postulate hung fire with that same person for about seven years? It wasn't picked up until about 58. And all of a sudden the case just started to make very good gains in processing, and so forth. But up to that time, I was having a hell of a time with it because they ARC broke all the time in sessions. See they had an overt against the thing that was now supposed to help them. Interesting.

So handle your rudiments in chains and you'll get along a lot faster. Handle all of these things. And if the case is hanging up, why, suspect that there's a great deal of not-know about it. It's just as – if it would take you a long time to clear up a rudiment, suspect that there is a
not-know about this rudiment. The basic not-know about a rudiment is that it happened be-
fore. And the ARC break that exists is not the ARC break you are trying to handle but an ear-
lier ARC break. You see, that's a not-know. So there's a not-know hanging back there on the
chain. The chain won't therefore pull up and the later incident won't erase. So the pc remains
slightly out of session even though you have handled the (quote) (unquote) "the ARC break."

And then with the generality of a case not making progress under a Goals Assessment
or not giving their goals properly, again, assume that a not-knowingness exists someplace in
that zone. You don't know what the pc's responses to goals is. You don't know what the pc's
response is and you keep asking him for goals, well, what's his response based on? Does he
say to himself privately, "Oh, for Christ's sakes", each time before he gives you a goal? Does
he? See. You wouldn't be making progress, but you wouldn't know what it was. And the thing
would not be running and it would be hidden.

So you say, "Well, do you have another goal? Or did you have another childhood
goal?"

And he says to himself privately, "Oh, for Christ's sakes." And he says aloud to you,
"Well, to be a railroad engineer", you see.

Well, how far do you think this number of overts can continue without suddenly blow-
ing up one into a storm or at least stalling the case just to a dead stop. So any time you're not
making progress with a case for any reason at all – this is just auditing in general – assume
the case is out of session. Definition of out of session is "don't want to be there." Why not?
Must have overts if they're trying to leave. All these various other laws apply, don't you see.
So trace them down.

And when you're handling rudiments and you keep finding rudiments out, find the
chain. And if the pc is getting upset in a session or restive or something of that sort, assume
that something happened much earlier, and find it and blow it. And all of a sudden your audit-
ing will become a very, very smooth activity. Won't have many bumps to it. Be a delight.
You're in for a surprise before I end this off. You're in for a surprise.

If a pc has a number of ARC breaks scattered up and down the auditing chain – of ses-
sions, you see – and ARC breaks unhandled exist broadly on this chain, then you're going to
find out that a pc, in the session you are running, is getting an ARC break about every third
auditing command. You're just going to be staggered at the number of actual ARC breaks that
you can find on this pc in the session you are running, you see? That's something you want to
notice on a pc that's getting lots of ARC breaks. So pick 'em all up. Pick 'em all up, all the
way back. Take up the whole history of auditing on this pc if it's getting that rampant.

But you're going to be utterly amazed. You're going to find out the more ARC breaks
there have been on the auditing track, the more ARC breaks occur on the auditing track. It's
sort of like the more you eat, the more you got, you know. And it's unreasonable but factual.

The more PT problems you find on a pc, the more PT problems have existed on this
pc, and if this pc is also an auditor, you're also going to run into the auditing chain of auditing
while having a PT problem. You know, got an appointment at three o'clock and the pc is now
getting at a quarter of three, and... That last fifteen minutes is audited with a PT problem.
Well, it's not very destructive and it doesn't do very much, but these things will come off as you run the thing. Okay?

Well, I'll probably give you a lecture tomorrow.

*Female voice:* Good.

Okay?

*Audience:* Thank you.

As far as your Goals Assessment is concerned, I hope you're having a little better luck. Did goals assessing speed up on you using some of this material or didn't it? Hm? Or is it going the same speed as before?

*Female voice:* Well, as a pc it certainly speeded up.

Hm?

*Female's voice:* As a pc it certainly speeded up for me.

Hm. Have you noticed any difference as an auditor using "not-know" on goals? Have you?

*Female voice:* Mm-hm.

All right. But not too much difference. Now, you notice this then – notice this then – how fast it speeds up if you really handle these out-rudiments in chains. Then you just find out how rapidly this thing goes.

And the only other hint I would give you is, don't be so anxious to erase them. Just establish whether or not they're going to stay or going to go. And if they're going to go, throw them away, you know. Just run them down if they're going to go. You can tell. And if they're going to stay, why, find out in about three questions. You say, "That's still alive." Ask three times. It's gone. Don't expect the pc to say a thing back. Don't expect the pc to contribute one blasted thing to the actual rundown and erasure of goals. The pc can sit there like a stump on the log, and the E-Meter will still react. The pc doesn't have to say aye, yes or no or spit. Nothing, and it'll still react. It's very amazing. The pc doesn't even have to have his (quote) attention (unquote) on the goal you just read to have it react if it's still alive. Did you know that? Quite amazing, isn't it?

And don't be so anxious to rub them out, you know. Leave them there for a while. Let him have them for a little while, you know. [laughter] You'll find they disappear faster because you're not spending so much time on one goal. It's actually a faster way to get rid of goals. Okay?

All right. Thank you.

*Audience:* Thank you.

[Applause]

Thank you.
Thank you. Thank you. Of course, that was Mary Sue's applause. [laughter] Ah-ha. Whose applause was it?

Audience: Mary Sue's. Yours ...

All right. That's it. All right. 11 Aug. 11. [laughter]

The subject of today's lecture – well, one could say this in a sad voice, one could say this in a happy voice, almost any kind of a voice – is auditing. [laughter]

I think a lot of auditors are doing something besides audit. I think they're trying to press through in addition to auditing. I think they are trying to introduce some additional factor that will make auditing work. I think they are – are pressing hard. They're putting something else in sessions.

The exact tools with which you're working, if you will just sit back half asleep and administer them, will clear people. You actually don't even have to be very alert.

Now, I myself am responsible to some degree by saying the auditor is making the auditing work and that sort of thing. But probably this advice has occasionally gotten a different reception than was intended. Yes, the auditor ought to be on the ball, he ought to be alert, he ought to be there, but the auditor shouldn't have to be doing something else beside auditing. A certain impatience for result or a certain apathy about result causing a sort of a grind atmosphere, you know. These two things alike would speed up or slow down, apparently, auditing. That is to say if you were pressing in there all the time, you see, and you say, "Well, that process isn't working. I think I'll change it." You know, "It isn't – hasn't – I've – I've run it for ten minutes", you know, "and it hasn't worked, so I'll change it", merely is expressing your desire to help, you see. It's an anxiety, you know. It's an anxiety. Or, contrarywise, "Well, this probably won't work, but I'm supposed to run it", you know, that sort of thing. "And so I'll just sit here and grind away on it", you know. "Well, what girl haven't you ever known? Yeah." [laughter]

Well, the pressure or the withdrawal of the auditor from the session, the impatience of the auditor, the feeling that the auditor has that it ought to all be different or ought to all be faster, alike get in the road of a smooth rendition of Model Session and a smooth application of processes.

I've been a long time at this business. I gave a session last night (oh, to Mary Sue, she had a bit of a headache) and it was, by standards, of course, would have been – seemed to you – a rather sloppy session. I'm sure you would have thought of this, "sloppy session." It started
without rudiments and it ended without rudiments, but it was an assist. And it started with "Is it all right if I give you an assist?"

"Yes", she says.

So I explore around and find out what I'm trying to assist. And then I move around and try to find out why she feels bad and then I take the basic technology of Scientology and put a process together that answers this. And then this ran scram-bang into an engram. And I knew confounded well that the process I was running might run into an engram, but it darned well wouldn't move through an engram, don't you see. So I thought we'd better clean up this engram with practically the same auditing command, but let's put "not know" in it, you know. Let's find out what she's not-knowing in this engram and get the thing blown out of the way so we can smooth out the track and get her into PT. Otherwise, I had a vision of her being parked down the track some place at the end of session, don't you see. Blew her through that, returned to the original process, smoothed – see, flattened the interim process, returned to the original process, moved her up to present time. Headache was gone; everything was fine. Checked through some – just the important things: "Do you have an ARC break? Was there anything I did wrong in the session?" You know, that sort of thing. "Are you upset about anything? That's it. End of session." See, "Is it all right with you if I end the session? Now, is there anything you care to say?" You know. Boom! "End of session".

Oh, I don't know, it took twenty minutes, something on this order. In that twenty minutes, took a chronic headache (which had apparently been cutting in and out for a long time) and a heavy engram (which had apparently been there for quite a while) and got rid of both of them. At the same time got rid of a present time difficulty. Twenty minutes, auditing.

All right. But there was no – no doubt in my mind about what I was doing or what my intentions were or what I was doing. Which is to say, I was there to give the pc an assist, wrap it up as fast as possible, effectively; not with superpressure or doubt or withdrawal. I was just there to help the pc, so I went right ahead factually and helped the pc and that was it.

And as I was doing this, I had a bit of a cognition about some other auditors' auditing. I – I suddenly sort of exteriorized from what I was doing and took a look at it and made a comparison and was suddenly struck by the fact that my auditing was very matter of fact, basically because there is no doubt in my mind but what I could help the pc. There's no doubt in my mind about the effectiveness of the process I'm going to run and there's no doubt in mind about the fact that the process is working and there it is. The thing that summed it up is matter-of-factness. You know, there's just an inevitability, matter-of-fact relaxedness about the thing that I haven't seen in other people's auditing and I just thought I'd better make up my mind on it, because we've still got this – well, it's a factor that measures five to one. I get auditing results with considerable speed and I suddenly realized I don't get in the road of my own results. You see, you get what I mean?

Well, it's just a matter-of-fact application. I – I know that this person has a – has a headache and a difficulty, is having a present time problem and it all lumps together in some peculiar fashion, so I just go to find out what this is; and then I know the mechanics of the mind and what the mechanics of the mind add up to in terms of a psychosomatic illness. So we just start getting rid of this whole thing and sure enough, run right into the engram. So we
hit a secondary, so we're going to run into the engram and that blew a little grief charge. Secondary. Must be an engram there. Got the idea? Old Book One. So – boom! Well, let's plow out the engram. Well, what was the biggest difficulty we've had with engrams – well, people not-know – don't want engrams known. There's something they're trying to hide about the thing or something, or it wouldn't be that – held in that close. Well, run the thing out, get rid of that thing, bring her back up. Let's make sure the original process is flat. That's it, man. Just checking with the pc all the time. How is it? You know? And where are we going and so forth. But it was all very matter-of-fact. I think you'll agree with that, that was ...

*Female voice: Good session, got rid of my headache.*

Well, it was a good – good session, see, that was just nothing to it.

But I thought I'd better remark on this. Not holding myself up as a vast paragon of virtue, but I do get auditing results and I don't have any difficulty with auditing.

You could say well, it's my subject. No, not necessarily my subject. I've known witch doctors and – and I've known birds that were pretty clever in my day. Pretty clever at getting some kind of result, very clever at handling people and so forth. My hat's off to them. I know – I'm no only one at this particular business, but I just suddenly realized, well, there's – there's no doubt about what I'm doing in me, you see. It's all matter-of-fact because it's just matter-of-fact. This is – this is sort of inevitable, and it's all going to come out all right. I – just auditing by the rules of the game. I wasn't departing in any particular direction on the thing.

And also some more data turned up that the reason an auditor wasn't flattening processes was because the auditor was anxious to get the job done. So he didn't flatten a process because it wasn't getting the job done, don't you see. But then the process never had a chance to get the job done. You got the idea? Terrific impatience has entered into the thing. Therefore, sort of an anxiety is communicated. Therefore, the pc gets pulled out of session all the time, so therefore there's ARC breaks, so there's all kinds of upsets, you know.

And I've often wondered how I could get away with the things I get away with in auditing, because I have to caution you all the time not to do some of the things I do in auditing. I don't evaluate for a pc. But I sure tell him what I think, you know. If they're struggling around and floundering around and – and they're avoiding auditing commands or something like this, why I'll just level with them, you know; I say something like, "Come on, come on, come on, come on, come on, come on, come on, come on. You want to get rid of this or don't you?" You know.

And the pc says, "Oh, yes, I want to get rid of it."

"Well, let's get down to business. Come on now."

It's sort of an odd approach, but it's – it is quite real in that I don't artificialize the way I feel about the pc particularly. When I – when I'm giving a session that I consider a successful session or it's a very happy circumstance of one kind or another, I'm perfectly happy to give a session and so forth. As long as I keep it real. As long as I'm not on a big artificiality, and auditing sounds kind of artificial to me here and there when I hear it, you know. It sounds like the auditor's being very artificial about it. He's not really being very matter-of-fact about what he's doing. He – he's sort of being stilted madly, so his intention, of course, is not too
well defined. But even so, if he just sat there and did Model Session right according to the
rote without pressing it, you know, without being impatient about it and without pulling off
and just being exhausted about it – it he just was sort of matter-of-fact and did Model Session
and did the process he was supposed to do and the assessments he was supposed to do, I'll tell
you, the pcs would come out the other end feeling wonderful.

And I've looked in vain for any other bug factor in auditing now and I don't find any
bug factors in auditing. I just don't find any additional bugs that we might have overlooked
and so forth. I've been looking for this for a long time. I've been looking for maybe, oh, I don't
know, two or three years and I haven't found anything we've missed.

Since I put the Model Session together – I put the Model Session together last year,
actually, and put it together because I was perfectly convinced that it was time for an auditor
to memorize a session form, because we had a session form, you see. It had been on there and
it had been working for a long time. Well, let's standardize it and there'd be a lot of use in
standardizing it.

Basically, in my matter-of-fact session, I did not particularly depart from a Model Ses-
session form. I was running an assist, not a Model Session, but I was running the assist in Model
Session form. There was nothing strange there. You would have found all the words – all the
words and music would have been very familiar to you, but I think you would have found the
atmosphere different. That's what I think you would have found. The matter-of-factness of
which this thing was rolling off was ... I had to stand back and look at it myself. I said, "There
– there is a difference."

I actually was taught this many years ago by Ken and Steve and I found these guys
were listening to me audit to find out what I was doing that other people weren't doing and
they kept isolating factors and kept speeding up auditing; and the first of these was acknowl-
edgment. It had never been announced, you see. It had never been announced that you ever
acknowledged anybody and they discovered this as a fantastic discovery, that when a pc said
something, I answered them and that was a big, new thing. That was a fabulous discovery to
them.

So the only reason I bring this up and make this level of comparison is because they –
they were making such fabulous discoveries, and I suddenly awoke to the fact there was a lot
about auditing that hadn't been communicated and it's all been communicated so far as I'm
concerned now.

Now, an auditor who will sit there and turn in a good Model Session and run some-
thing that's real on a process, handle the exact pc that is in front of him, handle the exact run-
down, makes sure he flattens what he's running and so forth, within the realms of reality – oh,
man, he can't miss. I don't think he could miss. I think he'd just have to work day and night,
belong to the union, in order to miss. I can't understand how he'd miss. It's something to think
about.

But there is a difference which I have detected which might be of interest to you and
you might care to take that as a frame of mind.
Sit down, draw a long breath, relax, make up your mind you're trying to help the pc and then just go ahead and do so. Just go ahead and do so with no further nonsense about it, you see. Just run off your Model Session patter, but that's all just to assist you to help the pc, you see. And just go ahead and matter-of-factly help the pc and take care of what the pc's doing.

The pc's writhing around. You say, "What's – what's got into you, Mac?"

And the pc says – you say this because you want to know, you see, not because it's all written down someplace. And, "Oh, well, I've got this horrible pain in my umbekillus."

And, "When did that turn on?"

"Well ..."

"Did it turn on in the process we were running before this one? Oh, it did. Well, why didn't you tell me? All right. Here we go. I'm going to give you one more – two more commands of the process that we are now running and then we're going right back to the earlier one. Next time, sing out, man."

You know, just be effective at all times compared to what the case is. Don't be so hidebound that you won't do something.

You know, it's something on the order of walking a tightrope anyhow. The guy who walks tightropes best, of course, walks them and yawns at the middle of the tightrope and he's very familiar with tightropes and stands on his hands for a few minutes and finishes off and goes to the other end of the tightrope and he doesn't think anything about it.

Somebody else comes up and takes a look at the tightrope, and he says, "Uuuuuuuuuuuuhhh!" He'd fall 117 feet, point 5. He's worried about falling off the tightrope all the time. He's not worried about walking the tightrope. You got the idea?

And this is expressed I think, with this term matter-of-factness. It's just a matter-of-fact proposition. If you can turn in a sort of a matter-of-fact – nothing heroic about this sort of an auditing session, I think your pc would do an upsurge.

It isn't that you're doing badly or the cases are holding up or anything like that, but that addition by itself might speed it up for you. I'm only interested and have been interested all summer only in one thing: is just a faster result in the same unit of time with greater ease of auditing. That's all I've been interested in all this summer. I've had it taped since February. I've tried to clarify mistakes and bring people back on them again and I have taken the liberty of trying to set cases up a little bit better for assessment for you and so on; and find out if there's any great advantage to that, and so on. Feeling my way through here about what you can do with it. That's what I've been concentrated on.

Same time, we've made some interesting discoveries and rediscoveries. The practical application of "forget" and "not-know" are utterly fabulous. Turn back the clock to 1950. Any engram, any secondary you ran would have run on just "not-know". Any one of them would
have run from beginning to end on "not-know" and "forget" and, man, they would have run like startled deer.

You get this guy into this horrendous, cataclysmic, space opera God-'elp-us, you know and he's writhing around and so on and burning down cities and executing maidens and revolting against the captain; and all kinds of things going on in this particular engram. Well, we used to just agonize through it, and grind, grind, grind – grind, grind, grind, grind, and then grind, grind, grind. And then all of a sudden his perceptics, you know, would turn off and they would turn on, and we'd sweat to get these things on and we'd run him through it again, and so forth.

Well, I'm telling you it's very weird, but you could set a person down and you could run "not know" on an engram or "forget" on an engram in a command form which includes as many dynamics as necessary to resolve it. A command form must include dynamics. In other words, "not known", you could specialize it in, "Well, what would you rather not-know about this?", you see. Now, there's the first dynamic. "What would you rather your family would rather not know about this?" Or, "any children would rather not know about this?" you see. Or "What should be not known about this to children?" "What should children not know about this?" "What should be..." any kind of a way you want to use this thing, you see. "What should remain unknown about this incident to the public at large?", you see. "What should the government not know about it?", "What should your superiors not have known about your activities on planet Xerxes?" Bzzzzzzz! See, it's just all – occlusion just starts flying off in all directions.

Our enemy in 1950 was occlusion. We can say that the occlusion is selfmotivated in order to withhold; and that the hang-ups in any engram are from a desire to get these things unknown or on the third postulate, forgotten, or make somebody forget or use "forget" as an overt act. It'll be some combination of occlusion and you can play it directly. Play it instantly and directly.

You can ask somebody, "Now, if you forgot about that, who would really be messed up? Now, if you knew nothing about that whatsoever, would this – would this mean something else would happen someplace else?" You'd always get the answer, "Oh, yes." Forgetting is a sort of an overt act, you see.

And the forget and the withhold come together, and you've got the sum and substance of the reactive bank and the reactive bank is composed of engrams and secondaries, so if you use various versions of what we know now about not-knowing and what we know about forgetting, why of course, these component parts of the reactive bank known as engrams, secondaries, machines, anything else you want to say, will just start flying apart in all directions. Shades of 1950.

Wouldn't have mattered whether the fellow had sonic, visio or anything else. Man, he would have had sonic and visio on. The redbreeds' and the rebels' rifles alike would be knocking his eardrums in, don't you see, as he ran through the incident. Up to that time, it's all black and invisible, you know. "Well, I don't see anything here. You say there's some kind of an incident here, but I dza-za – don't see any incidents – dzaa-zza – eh incident. Yeah, I just had that one little flick. That one little flick there. You know, that picture of the corner of the
Tower. Just, ha-ha, that one picture of the corner of the Tower, and so forth. Yeah, and kind of the idea – kind of the idea that maybe I was beheaded at the Tower. Yeah, maybe, maybe; could have been, see. But of course now you're trying to force this incident off on me."

All of that's just occlusion – this unreality, this feeling of pretense, the feeling of... The pretension of knowing about it also blows on a not-know. This is, of course, the pretension of knowing about an incident – dub-in, in other words, simply blows up because that's another method of disguise. Boy, can you run incidents if you try that one. You ought to try that just for the hell of it to give yourself a good win somewhere along the line if you ever ran engrams. Just try it.

Just sit somebody down and say, "All right now. Go to the incident necessary to resolve your case", you know and they wind up *plank* in a prenatal or conception, sperm sequence or a beheading or planetary space opera or something of this sort. And now just run it on the basis that he is overtly not-knowing and forgetting various parts of it and just use any version of that command, or those commands, necessary to plow through it. And you'll find this thing going *boom, boom, thud, thud, boom, boom.*

All of this, of course, has as a prerequisite that the rudiments are in and that the individual is – is to some degree in-session, and therefore under the auditor's control so they will do what the auditor says. With those reservations, why, you really find the engrams flying.

Kind of fun running engrams and I don't know how much we've speeded up the run of an engram with this because I haven't made an actual measure, but I would say something on the order of about one-thousandth of the time. I mean it's a jump of that breadth. Take you about one-thousandth of the time to run an engram now.

Running engrams, by the way, should not be discounted in the benefit to the case because you're liable to do this. You're liable to clear somebody and you've got them more or less stabilized. This will be in the stabilization period which usually follows for three or four months. But they'll be Clear all right and the needle will be drifting around. Everything's fine and you'll have worked on them to stabilize them, and then they will defy you by all of a sudden being in an engram. See, here's an engram staring them in the face and so on, giving them symptoms of some kind or another.

Well, because they're Clear and able to take these things in their stride, it's not going to take very long to run this thing anyhow. It's going to take a very brief span of time to run it because they're Clear, don't you see – even if you ran through with old Dianetic techniques of 1950 and it'll blow up. But you want to clear up that particular thing. This guy has got – still got a piece of bank. All right. Clear up the bank. Bang!

We had a Clear down in South Africa had an appendectomy. They were going to rush her to the hospital. She was Clear. But the doctor said, "Oh, terrible. You have all the symptoms", so forth. She went around and saw the auditor. The auditor had a hell of a time because he couldn't read the E-Meter on it and gradually was able to read the E-Meter on it, cleaned up the incident, *zuuup-booop-zzzt, bong, thud, crash.* That was the end of the appendectomy.

But – so this tool is not – not to be despised at this time. It isn't just nostalgic value. You'll have something like this. During a stabilization period, while a person is coming out of
it and unsnarling track and that sort of thing after... they're as-ising – still as-ising things and so on, they'll still run into things, you see. Now, you've got to give them a hand as they come along and then all of a sudden it'll all blow Clear.

If you can run an incident with even greater speed than a Clear can run them, it's practically at a glance. You know, just – it's almost at a glance. A Clear running an engram runs them almost at a glance, you see.

"Well, it's so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so; and it's so-and-so and so-and-so-and-so and then I so-and-so; and then they said so-and-so. And oh, there's the overt. Oh, well, that's it." Bang, it's gone. [laughs]

Well, that's – that's fast enough. Now, supposing you said, "Well, what are you trying to not-know about that?" or "What not-knowingness about that would do somebody in?" or any kind of a phraseology you'd care to apply using the not-know as an overt, using it as just a straight occlusion, so forth, why, the missing piece of it that is holding it there would blow – [snaps fingers] just like that. It wouldn't be da-da-da-da-da-da,da-da-da-da-da-da,da-da-da-da-da-da. It'd just be da-da – [snaps fingers] da! See, a difference of speed is – would even be apparent there. So this is a trick you'd better latch onto. Latch onto.

You're going to use this trick and I hope you are using this trick with some success right now in handling your Goals Assessments and Terminals Assessments, and handling what you run into in terms of getting the pc set up so they will give you some goals. Now, there's probably the most valuable application. Pc goes on to 2,975 goals and so forth and you haven't got a goal out of the pc yet. Well, what is this? What is this? You know something's wrong with the pc's giving of goals. It's – something wrong there? Are these the pc's goals or is the pc trying to please you or something of the sort? There is something disconnected here and before it went out that long, you had certainly better introduce into a Goals Assessment another type of questioning.

When you start up a Goals Assessment, it just could be that you should set up a pc to having a Goals Assessment and you should keep the pc set up for Goals Assessments with some kind of an additive question of more or less this character: "What sort of a person would get in the road of somebody having goals?" "Has anybody ever got in the road of your goals?" See? And "What are you not-knowing about goals in general?" And "What goals don't you want known?"

Of course, now when we say, "What goals shouldn't be known?" we're over into assessment, because that's a legitimate assessment question. But "Who's gotten in the road of your goals?" "What sort of a person would get in the road of your goals?" "If I were sitting here trying to make nothing out of your goals, what would my name be?" This kind of an approach, you see. "If I were here trying to pound you and hammer you and order you to get something done in life, who would I be?" It's, in other words, clearing the auditor to get the auditor disassociated from the personnel who has stamped on the person's goals. You get the idea?

So it's another – another string to the bow on the clarification of the identity of the auditor. It's a more modern version of "Who would I have to be to audit you?" You know? "Who would I have to be to make – to raise hell with your goals?" "Who would I have to be
to actually make hash out of you on the subject of goals?" "To what person could you best tell your most secret ambitions?" This type of questioning, you see. "Who would you leave totally in the dark with regard to your –" [laughter] "with regard to your goals?" "Who would you leave in the dark with regard to your goals?" "Who had you better not tell them to, man?"

And you'll get some kind of an interrogation line like this going and all of a sudden the pc will sort of loosen up and disassociate you from the barricades of progress toward their own ambitions. Got the idea? Because let me tell you, one of the most prevalent neuroses afloat ...

If goals can stand in the road of Clear – obviously they do because if you straighten out a person on goals, they get Clear – been demonstrated time and time again. Well, then you'd look around the society and you wouldn't find very many Clears. Then you must assume... You see, you look around the society, pre-Scientology society, and you find out there weren't many Clears present – none – [laughter] so, that you must then assume that it must be a fairly prevalent neurosis, psychosis or "batosis" to knock in the head other people's goals and ambitions. You must assume that there must have been some people around who were anxious to do this, see, by assumption.

And therefore, if you were having trouble with a pc in getting his goals, you then – by no great mathematical computation – should assume that he as been up against such a person and so therefore, a bit deranged and unwilling to communicate on the subject of goals. Do you follow out the reasoning there? Very elementary reasoning.

So I think that should be taken care of thoroughly at the beginning before you start a Goals Assessment on a pc. Just beat this to death. This one I know you can beat to death because it'll have the pc's interest, see. And just – just take a flail to it, and a morning star and a broad sword and a mace and then beat it for a while, you see, with a sjambok, and in other words, just knock this around something fierce and hammer and pound it; and all of a sudden you're liable to get your pc with a big cognition on the idea, just using these basic mechanics I've been talking about.

"Oh, oh, yes, well, as a matter of fact, you do look a little bit like my father. He's an ugly son of a ..." [laughter] And then he'd have a big cognition. Big cognition. "You are not my father", you know. "You know, my father use – used to sit there, day in, day out and he'd say, 'When are you going to amount to something?'" [laughter] "And I remember I was working at the bakery and I was making sixty-five quid a month and I was doing all right and I was buying new clothes. And my father would sit there and he'd put the paper down in the evening and he would look at me and he would sigh deeply. And then he'd pick up the paper again." [laughs, laughter] "Yeah, I remember in the army, the officers always used to keep telling me that if I just had a little ambition I could make something out of myself and so forth. I remember, just like my grandfather used to do", you know.

And then, of course, there's – be all mechanisms with regard to goals. There'd be coercing a person to have a goal and trapping him because he did. There would be the mechanism of making sure that any goal a person came up with was promptly stamped on and wiped out of existence. There would be the mechanism of demanding that a person had other goals than the person has. The person comes up and says, "I would certainly like to take a
nice photograph of that landscape out there." And then the mechanism "Well, it would look much nicer if it were painted. Instead of photography, actually your interest ought to be in the subject of oil painting. Oil painting, yes. You should go in for oil painting. Not – not photography. No, not – well, much better, much better, oil painting."

Now, what the person, who was standing there who had been talking about the landscape and photographing it, does not latch onto at that moment, is the other person's simply dramatizing a squash of goals. It has nothing to do with anything but a squash and if the person examining it had said, "Oh, I would certainly love to make an oil painting of this particular landscape", the other person would, of course, said immediately, "You don't want to take up oil painting. You should take up photography." See? But this is being helpful. This is normally branded as being helpful. Constructive criticism. Man even has various labels for it one way or the other.

But then parentally, children almost never are recognized as individuals by the parents. They are recognized, if at all, as an extension of the ambitions of the parent. And they're just all over the place, parents are busily trying to do a life continuum on their ambitions, you know and they take this poor, little, skinny runt, you know – this little runt of a kid – and Papa, who was a fairly broad bruiser in his day, you see. He wanted to be a star of the football team or something like this and nothing will do but what this poor little runt, you see, he's gotta get out there on the football field and get half killed, you see. The old man just never seems to notice that there's some stone difference between the two, you see. Never seems to take this out, you know.

The kid has the mathematical genius of being able to add up always two and two and get three, six, nine – any number, just think of a number. Oh, yes, he's got to be a mathematician because the old man wanted to be a mathematician, you see. Life continuums of various kinds and it's odd how many people are walking around right now who actually fell for it, went ahead and executed it and are being moderately unsuccessful, successful, and so forth, in some walk of life.

Well, I tell you the armed services in any war can be utterly counted on to just dramatize this just flat out with shown teeth. Fellow walks up, he says, "What have you been doing?"

He says, "I'm a garage mechanic."

He says – and the navy will say to him inevitably and invariably, "Deck force." You know? Or, "What you really want to be is a signalman. How about cook's school?"

And he walks up and he says, "Well", he says, "I've been a merchant sailor and a deck sailor for the last fifteen years and here are all of my tickets and that sort of thing."

"Very good. The very, very man we want. You're a yeoman." Instant and immediate response. I mean it's almost berserk. And then they give tests that can be thrown any way you want to throw a test, called aptitude tests.

And I had a lot of fun one time. I took a bunch of these tests. It was very nice of the government to give me these tests. I spent all one day in some little town in Pennsylvania, where my records happened to be at the moment, taking aptitude tests to find out how I
should be rehabilitated as a disabled veteran. It was utterly fascinating. They finally woke up at the other end that I ought to be playing an organ. [laughter] I never found out whether it was the hand-crank variety or the pipe variety. [laughter] As a matter of fact, it – was – what was baffling to them is anytime they gave me a test I showed aptitude, you see. So they just took the one I didn't really want, and that was – that settled it. But I malign them. Because they were very pleasant after the war and training up veterans and that sort of thing.

But anyway, even these tests are about the cloudiest things for vocation you ever want to have anything to do with. You look them over sometime. You notice we don't use them. We have them. We've got tons of them. I've investigated most of them.

Only one test out of the commercial tests I was terribly interested in. I was fascinated with this particular test because it was an anonymous test that employees could make out with regard to the management and their own bosses and so forth and you gave this test out to a roomful of employees and then they marked down all their nasty, unkind thoughts, you see; about the management, and then they turned it in; and management then knew what their employees thought of them.

I thought it was an awfully interesting test in that it was rather pointless. Management that is unimaginative enough to know what employees are thinking about it anyhow, shouldn't be managing. Obvious what this score is. Well, anyway, that test was very good. As a matter of fact, I figured out a way for – for them to booby-trap it and I've been very carefully not telling any psychologist how to booby-trap this test.

Well, you make it out, you see and you have a form number, tiny printed Figures – form number, you see. You just number the chairs of the room [laughter] and you have this form number of the test which goes undetected as different, but it's the number of each chair, you see and the fellow turns it in, and then you know who to fire. [laughter] You fire the fellow who says the kind things, naturally, from the psychologist's point of view. That's why I haven't released it.

They are now running all kinds of lie detector tests on employees. We actually have really started one in the US. We are being copied like mad in the US – just copied like mad. It's marvelous. Start worrying when nobody copies you. Don't worry about all the things they're grabbing that are ours, see. Start worrying when they don't do it and we're sure leading the van because apparently every detective agency, every employment agency and every psychologist has suddenly set himself up with battery E-Meters. They are lousy E-Meters and they mean nothing. But he's set himself up with them and they're giving lie detector tests to everybody. And it's getting to be quite a – quite a scandal, so that even in Australia they are publishing articles about how to ruin your home. Just bring in one of these things, you see.

So these are the earmarks of success. There's no greater – the greatest praise with which the public at large is capable, of course, is damning you thoroughly and if you want even greater praise, have them lie about you. But that's about as high as they come up the line, because they – they move off of this point, you see – they move off of this point – onto copying, imitating, and the duplication gets a little closer and a little closer and a little closer; and all of a sudden, why, there it is. It's nothing off – nothing to be worried about when you see that sort of thing. Of course, your hair kind of stands on end when you first see this. But any-
way, everybody is now doing this and they are only hiring – as I mentioned, they are only hiring those people, you see, who get no reaction on the machine of any kind whatsoever; [laughs loudly] and if this trend, of course, is followed, every able person in the country will be out of work. [laughter] Interesting, isn't it?

Ah, well, they'll discover the error of their ways sooner or later and come around to the old stand and ...

They covertly get on our bulletin lines, which is quite interesting. We have all sorts of Joe Doakeses and Bill Smykes – Sykeses and things like that in our mailing lists and so on in order to get bulletins and memberships, and so on. And these turn out to be the most interesting people when you run them down. They turn out to be the head of MIT or something like this, you know and the ... We've suddenly started selling books in the United States to the most unlikely areas. The Army Infantry School has just now officially put in orders for many Scientology and Dianetic books. One invoice was sent to me – maybe there was just one at the moment, but there'll be more. Loyola University, by the way, uses *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* as a textbook – the Catholic University that teaches priests. Interesting, huh? Well, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association spent rivers of money to get Loyola to study psychiatry and psychology. And after they succeeded in doing this and Loyola set up an actual department to do this, then the first book they ordered was *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*, which I thought was pretty good. They're doing a land-office business in book sales these days to unlikely areas. There's quite a few of them have come in lately.

*Female voice: American Tel. & Tel.*

*Mmm?*

*Female voice: American Tel. & Tel. have bought all of our books.*

Yeah. Yeah. They got them all.

So don't – don't worry about it. Dissemination goes out on a covert line when you're being successful broadly. It goes out on a covert, unlabeled, copyist line and then keep moving up and eventually they establish it. Because, of course, they'll – monkeying with this sort of thing, they'll get into so much trouble that they'll need help sooner or later. [laughter]

It's like two guys were found someplace or another who were auditing each other and they hadn't a clue. They had just heard it on a rumor line – this is back in 1950 – and they heard it on a rumor line, so they were auditing each other. And what they were doing – and somebody from 42 Aberdeen Road got ahold of them and spent all one night with them straightening them up, teaching them how to audit and went away and left them and never had another report on it.

But they were in plenty of trouble. They'd parked themselves all over the track and just messed themselves up gloriously. But they could be straightened out.

All right. Back on this other thing, the slam-bang attack that one's goals are up against, are not confined, of course, to an antagonistic personality. One himself has overts on the subject of other people's goals and you can straighten that out too, you see. One has run all kinds
of ambitions with regard to other people's ambitions. For instance, right now there's a tremendous ambition on the subject of Russia to covertly take over small nations, one after the other, or dominate their political scene, you see. Well, saying Russia shouldn't do this is actually invalidating Russia's goal to do this, don't you see. It's simple.

I've also watched with some amazement the United States getting itself whipped up to go into an atomic war. I think the deterrent factor has now been accepted by the public as the very best way to bruise off a war. The public attitude should now serve as a deterrent. Evidently, they've collectively sort of gotten the idea somehow or another that – that if the public is unwilling to go to war, therefore, they are not a deterrent. So all you have to say is you're willing to go to war and this is very deterrent, because Mr. Khrushchev counts totally on the decadent democracy – each war it's the decadent democracy, you know – the decadent democracy is not willing to engage in war, so therefore, of course, he can do what he pleases and apparently – this is all I read out of this. I don't read any war dangers to amount to anything or I'd be helping out the Washington organization to evacuate and so on, which I am not. Nothing's going to happen. It's just a deterrent. You're going to watch Khrushchev back down on this. He's going to back down fast and if that wins, you're going to have a nation of warmongers. They're going to say, "Look, we won." Of course, I will admit that it's mostly Texans that they've been interviewing. [laughter]

Anyway, on the subject of goals, the – there's an interplay of goals. And an individual who has countless, just countless overts on other people's goals – well, let's say a music critic. Let's take him as a profession. He comes and sits down in the auditing chair as – in the pc's chair and – and he's in an auditing session and his profession is a music critic and you start to do a Goals Assessment. Well, use your head, auditor. How many ambitions in the field of music do you suppose this boy has wrecked? Hm? So you could start in as well as finding out who has stopped the pc's goal lines – let's not go totally motivator about it – let's also find out a few of the goals that the pc has stopped, you know.

"What goals should be unknown?" Some broad question of this character.

"Other people's goals", he will say.

"Yes, yes. Well, which one should just be forgotten completely, you know, and just not known?"

Oh man, on some people, you'd get a roaring automaticity as a result of that question or that type of question. "Whose goals should never be valid?" "Whose goals should never take place or form up or become reality?" "What goals should be unknown", of course, tends to plow it out of the pc. His unknowingness-occlusion button is then set to work and he starts showing stuff to the light of day.

So there's numbers of things you can do. I'm just trying to show you, there's numbers of things you can do by being very matter-of-fact and very flat about the whole thing in looking at this pc. This pc is having trouble giving you goals. All right. Then you had better get down to a basic trouble with regard to goals. You just better ask for it right now.

All right. Now, let's take a Terminals Assessment. You see there's something wrong with a pc's goals. They give them to you slowly, or – or very, very slowly or poky or don't
seem to have many. They give you unlimited numbers – any one of these various things. Or they give you goals that they haven't themselves anything to do with. You could handle this by handling the factor of who has suppressed goals and whose goals that they have suppressed. You got the idea?

All right. Now, let's take terminals. That's slightly different and we get back to a lecture – a lecture back here in Camden of 1954, wasn't it, Suzie? Yeah, it was about 53. It was way late in the autumn of 53: Granting of Beingness. Most of you've heard this lecture. Well, you know how scarce it is, granting of beingness. The willingness to grant a beingness to somebody, that's pretty scarce. Oh, that tenet and that observation and so forth is still valid. Well, apply that tenet to – to assessment for terminals.

Let's look it over. If this person's very unwilling to grant beingness, ah-hah, then this person would be rather unwilling to remember beingness, you see. They squashed beingnesses, so that beingnesses must be on a scarcity. There's a misemotion here with regard to the subj – whole subject of beingness and therefore you're going to get terminals being out. Terminal lists then are hard to acquire or they're too numerous and so forth. You don't have as much trouble with terminals, however, as you do with goals. But, nevertheless, remember that you could remedy difficulties with getting a – getting a terminals list. You could remedy them rather rapidly.

You could ask the individual – ask the pc, "What type of beingness should remain unknown forever?" That's a good, broad statement. "What class – what general class of beingness should just be forgotten, not known, never heard of again, and so forth. What – what would be that?" Well, they start plowing up terminals for you, the like of which you haven't heard before. Don't you see? All of a sudden here're a lot of terminals.

Of course, you don't ask that in conjunction with the assessment itself. You just ask that in general, you know. Just two-way comm sort of a basis, you know. Let's get this out of the road. Let's see if we can start any roaring automaticities going here and of course, if an automaticity starts going, why, we continue to run what started it as a process until we get it slowed down; and all of a sudden, you'll have a pc who's assessing on terminals entirely differently. They'll assess entirely differently. Because "not granting of beingness" is an effort to suppress beingness, isn't it? And if this is fairly prevalent and your pc's having difficulty giving you terminals, then he must be having this trouble with beingness and he must be suppressing beingnesses, so when he tries to think of a terminal, his automatic suppressors on the subject of beingness will squash the terminal out of existence and he won't be able to give you a list. That's as simple as that. So you can take care of that.

Any – any type of question that says what beingnesses should be forgotten, unknown, skipped, never looked at – particularly what kind of beingness should just be ignored – various types of questions this way add us up to some of the most innocuous sounding questions you ever heard of, which add up mildly to the same thing, which is, "What sort of person shouldn't you associate with?"

That sounds like a perfectly reasonable, almost Freudian, sort of – you know, mild, psychotherapeutic, you know, sort of question. "Have your parents ever protested against certain types of association?" Or something like that. Well, you're asking them what beingness
should be unknown, not known, forgotten, gotten rid of, gotten away with, you know. "What type of personality is particularly detestable?" Now you're much further afield, but you'd still produce some kind of a result. You're getting away from the core of the matter, but it's still a – still a question that could be asked and you'd say, "Well now, if you were in the business of manufacturing people, what types would you keep off your list?" "Who would you never under any circumstances, list as 'to be manufactured'?"

Any – any such type of oddball questioning, of course, is just "not-know beingness" and you can take the formula "not-know beingness" and extrapolate from it day and night for a long time and still get material off the pc; and you can set a pc up for a fast Terminal Assessment. Of course, you could do the oddity of setting them up for Clear. You – the whole thing blows if you treat it in this particular line.

You know, don't you, that it isn't necessary to run the terminal to make Clears. You – you know that, don't you? I mean that you can assess a person through to Clear and it will happen. For some reason or other, you just never seem to find the goal and maybe you find the goal and you find a goal that sticks. And you say this is marvelous and then you assess the terminal and then you can't find any terminal and so forth; and go back and check the goal, and you can't find that goal anymore. And you say, "Well, where the devil have I wound up here?" You know? And now you go back all over it again and you've got to do another Goals Assessment. You see what I mean? And then you find a goal that hangs up for a whole session and then you start in looking for a terminal for the goal and it all goes into mush and it's nowhere. And you go back and check the goal, and it's gone now and you could keep doing this and run a person through to Clear. I mean it can happen. A remarkable number of cases will do this and this should change your attitude toward "you must find a goal that sticks."

Because this will occur that you will, every now and then, find a pc that's – not even rare, in fact quite ordinary – you'll find a pc who doesn't have any goals stick at all. They just goals assess to Clear. Pretty soon, why all of a sudden, the needle is splop, you know. Needle's coasting. You're not getting any registry and so forth. What do you do now? Well, you goals assess to stable Clear. That's what you do now. Got the idea?

And then another type, as I just said, you goals assess the case and find the goal. Hurrah! Hurrah! Hurrah! And we're all set now and all we've got to do now is find the terminal. You set the person up for terminals for that goal and you never find a terminal and you go back and you check the goal, and it's gone. Got the idea? Get off of your anxiety that you must, must, must find the pc's goal, see. What you're trying to do is clear the person by assessment. It's a different action.

Now, if their goals go too numerous and the needle is not getting loose and the tone arm is not getting better and so forth, now this is the case we were talking about where you have to do some work on the case to get this malfunction out of the road. The person hasn't given you any goals. The person's having great difficulty giving you goals. You get the idea? Well, that's a person who has such a heavy bug on goals that's sitting right there, that you just can't really get an assessment going.

If a person is assessing easily and you're doing a good job of assessment and your rudiments all stay in and so forth, you can assess a person straight through to Clear – just on
goals alone; never even get to a terminal. And you can assess a person through to a goal and
the goal hangs and you never get through with a terminal to run. You just never find a termi-
nal that fits the goal. You find a lot of terminals, but then you go back and check the goal and
you – you can't get anywhere with that line. That's it. You've run that one completely out.
Now, you've got to go back and find more goals.

And this is, on a gradient scale, the next step up from that is you find the goal and then
you find the terminal and then you assess the terminal on the Prehav Scale and that's it.
You've had it. You can't find any level for the terminal on the Prehav Scale. Well, then you go
back and check the terminal and you find out it no longer registers. Now, you go back and
check the goal. You find the goal registers a little bit so you'll find another terminal for that
goal, you see.

All right. Now, you've got that terminal and you get a terminal and you've got the ter-
minal all pegged and it's right there and you open your mouth to get it onto the Prehav Scale
and you don't make it; and then you run it back and you check for that goal and the goal is
now gone. Then you have nothing to do but to return to another Goals Assessment. You got
the idea?

You see, if you're trying to find something, if that is the basic goal of all of your as-
sessments, if you're – you've

have failed, if you've failed to find the pc's goal, you see, you're just going in the wrong direc-
tion entirely. That isn't – that isn't correct, you see.

What you're trying to do is clear a person. Well, clearing a person consists of getting
the stuck goals and stuck terminals off the case. You got the idea? So you're really taking the
goals and terminals off the case and if you have to take them off with – by finding a terminal
and then assessing the terminal on the Prehav Scale and then running the terminal on the Pre-
hav Scale, on and on and on, don't you see – that's the way you've got to go about it – and
then run it for a – lots of hours and so forth, to loosen it up; well, all right, that's how you had
to go about it. Don't worry about that.

But you see, that's why the fast, short assessment to find the goal and terminal so that
you can run it and run the person through to Clear is not a valid approach. It's not a valid
piece of thinkingness. That is that you've got to find the goal and then find the terminal and
then find it on the Prehav Scale and run it and that is the only way to make a Clear, you see.
That's not a valid approach. That would be the rougher Clear level, you see. You're going to
make it that way, but that's going to take longer. The approach is, you're trying to knock out
the stuck goals and the stuck terminals that have got this pc fixed in various game conditions
which prevent him from escaping into existence again. That's what you're trying to do, so if
you'll just change your level of orientation there and what you're trying to do, all of a sudden,
why you can draw a long breath, and you'll find your assessments are much smoother, much
happier, don't you see.

And if this pc doesn't seem to be getting any meter changes by reason of assessment –
you know, you're assessing the pc but you're getting no meter changes – then you can assume
that you have leaped off with a case that isn't going to give you any goals or there's something
wrong with goals at large or goals in general and you certainly better straighten this case up.
So just to be on the safe side, straighten all cases up on the subject of goals before you start to do a Goals Assessment – and every so often, during Goals Assessments – or reorient the person on the subject of goals. "What class of person is particularly hard on goals?" You know? "Give me a list of people that you wouldn't want to have have goals." "Give me a list of people whose goals are not very acceptable", and he comes back with gangsters, politicians, psychiatrists, you know and he comes down and he's thought each one of these over and he's decided their goals are not acceptable.

Well, you could take this list and run a different approach on the thing and that is you could ask him – one, two, three, ask him just this: "What goals of a psychiatrist have you combated?" You know, this is just a light run sort of a thing. This is not anything you would do as a profession for the next five hundred hours.

But this guy will come up with the fact, "Well, they just shouldn't hurt people and they shouldn't do this and they shouldn't do that and they shouldn't do something or other and they shouldn't accept people's money without giving them any benefit in return", and so on.

Well, you say, "Well, form these up into goals. I mean what are the goals?"

"Well, they don't have any goals."

"Well, they must have some kind of goal. All right. Well, what goals do you think they would have?" Do you see?

"Oh, well, they have this kind of a goal and that kind of a goal, and they have the goal to hurt people and they have the goal to do this and they have the goal to do that."

"All right. Now, have you been in combat with that type of goal?"

"Oh, yes. Yes, I have been."

"All right. Now, what are you – can you run back now and find exact times when you have actively combated those goals?"

"Oh, well, yeah... well, that's pretty hard to do", you know.

And then he spots one and he spots another and he spots another and he spots another and he spots another and he spots another; and you say, "Well, that's it." You're not getting much needle action now, so you say, "Well, that's it. We're not going to go any further along that line."

"All right. Now, let's take up this gangster. All right. What gangster goals – ." Well, this time he knows what you're talking about, so he's grooved in. "What gangster goals have you objected to?"

"Well, I haven't really objected to any gangster goals. As a matter of fact, I was a gangster in my last lifetime." [laughter] Something like that blows off. That sort of is out of the road now.

And now we take a politician. "What political goals?"

"Well, the goal of hiring young men at slave wages to go out and shoot other young men because they're wearing a different uniform. I – I think that's a bad goal."
"Well, now exactly what is that goal?"

And the guy will think for a long time. Then he'll decide, "Nationalism. Yes, nationalism is a bad goal. Yeah, they have the goal of nationalism. Yeah, their goal ..."

"Well, now have you ever actively combated such a goal?"

"Oh, yes, yes, yes. Oh, yes, yes. Used to make speeches and that sort of thing. Nationalism. Combed these goals."

"What other goals in that area were you combating?"

"Well, there's so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right. Okay. Okay. Well, now how about your immediate family? Any of them very hard on goals or any of them have goals?"

"Oh, well, my brother. My God, my brother. He always wanted to play the pianer."

"Was there something wrong with that?"

"Oh, yeah, he was just obsessed. All the time he wanted to play the pianer. Of course, he -- he's with Sammy Kaye now at -- and so forth, but gee, he always wanted to play the pianer all the time."

You'll notice this guy's kind of sighing. He's looking at a failed overt on goals. See, he didn't want his brother to play a pianer, but his brother went and played the pianer. And now his brother's being very successful, and he has Hollywood beauties standing ten deep around the -- the baby grand, you know. Big failed overt.

You can start sorting these things out and it isn't the aggregate of small things. What you are really looking for is some crashers. See, we're looking for the unknown people here. We're looking for the squelchers and so forth. We're looking for the incidents where one's goals really started to blow up in smoke, you know and just went blooey! Or when one really got to somebody else and blew all of his goals up -- blooey, see.

For instance, I know several people at the present moment that you undoubtedly couldn't goals assess. You just couldn't goals assess because every single ambition Dianetics and Scientology ever announcedly had, these people were violently against and they're just violently against them. So you're assessing them with the understood goal of freeing them. How are they going to make it? How are they going to make it? Well, the only way you could make them make it is they'd have to pick up all their overts and attitudes against Dianetics and Scientology and then they possibly could make it. But they've stood in the line of any goal that we had for man or anything else.

Now, handling a pc has a lot to do with it. Because you handle the pc you are auditing and when you get glib enough and smooth enough with your tools and you feel very sure of these tools, you can sound very matter-of-fact in the use of these tools. But let's put it another way. When you have had some wins, you will start getting very matter-of-fact. You see that? And you'll all of a sudden find that your tools are much easier to use. See, so it works both ways. And what you need are some wins, basically. And what you need is -- to get those wins
is a very relaxed attitude and – and just an application of exactly what you're doing in order to get that forward.

Now, I've shaken out of the hamper – for my money – anything that was wrong with goals assessing I think I've got taped now and it's all right with me if anybody anyplace in the world wants to run Goals Assessments. This is okay with me. They're not going to do anybody any damage.

But for heaven's sake, keep on assessing. I mean let's keep going here and let's not get some wild idea... This is what they were doing. Somebody would get some wild idea that this fellow's goal really is --. You know. They just make it up out of the blue, and foist this goal off on him and say, "That's it, isn't it?" Yeah, well, don't bother to look at the E-Meter, [laughter] and then get a terminal, you see, that fits the goal very nicely. That's all set. They're – very easy to do that; all they're reading is ARC break, you see. [laughter] And then they go tearing off on the Prehav Scale and they run this thing madly and they say well, we're going to make a Clear. Well, that's not so. Had to be much more skilled in assessment than that, believe me.

But keep assessing. Just go on assessing. If you just went on assessing and checking through, you'd sooner or later reach the stop point where it became obvious to one and all that you either weren't going to clear this case by just running out all goals and all terminals by assessments, you see, but that you had come to a total stuck. Yeah, a goal had stuck and there wasn't a single thing you could do to free that goal. That was it. That was there. And then, you pick up all the cause-effect – both ends of the goal, you know, the line of the goal; the person that wants to do it and the person it's to be done to or something like that. You pick up both ends of the goal and list those things and just keep listing them and listing them and listing them and going on and on and on until one sticks and if one doesn't stick, just keep on going and eventually you can get nothing to react in the way of terminals and so forth, go back and examine the goal and you'll find the goal has probably blown up at this point. You've run out all the beingnesses that had to do with that particular goal. Now, you've got to do a Goals Assessment all over the top, okay...

But the game is assessing. Assessing is clearing. If you want a Clear, do good assessment. This is what is emerging as people have gone ahead and done a lot of auditing and as a lot of results have emerged here and there. They have all emerged on assessment. The runs of the terminal, flattening that and then reassessing and all Clears have emerged on that pattern; and Clears have not emerged in any other pattern. The only other technique of clearing I know of is familiarizing the pc with the bank so expertly, that he no longer has any slightest qualms of facing even the most unknown portions of his bank and he will eventually blow Clear and it's done by gradient scales; and I've never been able to teach anybody to do it. This other one is a surefire. And auditors far away from supervision are making it with it and so forth. So you just have to say, well, that's the way to clear people.

Now, as far as preparatory steps are concerned, preparatory steps as contained in Routine 1 and Routine 2 and Routine 1A, that sort of thing – these preparatory steps are very valid and very valuable preparatory steps. But I wouldn't use them any longer than was necessary to put the pc in a shape to be assessed. How long do you use Routines 1, 2 or 1A? You
use them long enough to put the pc in shape where he can be assessed well and then you go to town on assessment. And there is a faster method of handling this and a better definition of how you go about it and I think your own experience so far tends to bear that out and you get a little bit more experience along this line of assessment and you are really going to see this thing borne out like mad.

So get to be demons on the subject of assessment. In the last two lectures, I've stressed nothing else but assessment. This requires, of course, pretty smooth, matter-of-fact auditing, no invalidation of the pc, just carrying on, putting them all down, doing a workmanlike job, knowing where you're going and knowing what you're doing. The pc communicates to him, he goes ahead and he gets in there and he saws on down the line, and his anxieties start coming off and he starts straightening up, and he gets more and more in-session. The more in-session he is, why of course, the faster he clears.

As running it is concerned, you don't need much experience or practice in running the thing because we've had lots of auditing on this. We need experience right now in assessing. How to set a case up for assessing. How to assess a case and what to expect from an assessment and then at the end of all of this, how to check and reassess; and all of those things are very skilled activities.

You can invalidate a pc out of existence, you know. I mean, you can – you can take a Goals Assessment, Terminal Assessment, you can just invalidate the pc down to a nothing. But you have to be pretty crude. You have to be actually kind of overtly snide about the whole thing or there has to be something in the attitude which is all wrong. Or you have to be doing it in some fashion which is totally, totally, totally contrary to in-sessionness or the Auditor's Code or something like that. The error has to be very gross to do a poor assessment.

And if your pc isn't progressing, I am charitable enough to assume it's because the pc has such a wide bug on just the subject of goals that you cannot penetrate that particular barrier without letting some sunshine in on the subject first, and on terminals, well, he has such a large bug on beingness that you cannot get anyplace with the beingness. So as a result, why you've got to do something desperate about beingnesses.

Well, right along with this emerges this brand-new tool which is the – an old tool in theory, but was never really applied successfully in practice because the whole ramifications of it – . You see, the O/W was missing on the early "not-know." We didn't have O/W when we were first using "not-know" and "forget." So therefore, it didn't have the horsepower to climb the hill and the O/W gives it the horsepower. "Who should be forgotten?" "If you forgot something, who or what would have been gotten even with?" "What forgettingness would get even with them?" Interesting question. "Who or what would be confused by your forgetting?" is enough question that on trying to answer at once, all the somatics a pc's got, could and have blown – in just trying to answer it once. Every somatic the pc had blew up. Of course, it was a half hour attempt to answer, but no answer was ever really given.

So you see, as soon as this is combined with O/W and as soon as it's combined with goals and as soon as it's combined with terminals – you make that various type of combination there – why, you should be able to straighten out any pc rapidly that is having a lot of difficulty trying to give you some goals, you see or is very afraid you will invalidate his goals.
or thinks the erasure of the goal or the testing of the goal is an invalidation of the goal, don't you see. You have to be very careful of that. Well, if a pc is getting all ARC broke on this subject, he must have a whole lot of bugs on the subject of goals. So let's take these up with him, you see. As a sort of a – of a necessary rudiment to Goals Assessment, hmmm?

And I want you to try that out in giving your sessions now and just try and find out how this pc of yours is oriented on the subject of goals. Are goals something one must never have? Are goals something one must make up? Are goals something one must stamp all over? What? What? What's the orientation?

You can get that orientation as I gave you earlier in the lecture by using "not-know", "forget", "people" – "What kind of person ...?" you know, that kind of thing – and smoke it out. You're liable to blow some secondaries. You're liable to get some action. You're liable to throw some engrams into view.

Of course, you understand that every execution is simply an invalidation of the goal of living. That's why the state does it. The most effective invalidation of life known, is to kill somebody and that's very successful. That's also the most equal thing there is: dead men. [laughter]

Now, I wasn't chipping away at the philosophy of equality in a democracy, because Thomas Jefferson was absolutely right: all men are born with equal rights under law. I notice though, he didn't at the same time say all men are equal and I notice that the democracies today have gotten this as – on the third string of their violin as the most monotonous chant that you ever heard: "All men are equal." Well, the inequalities of men start showing up in all directions. When you clear one, and one remains unclear, you've got an inequality like mad. It's – its an observable fact. It's contrary to life.

So we must assume then – I have just a little while ago figured out the most equal man I could think of, and of course, that's a dead man. All dead men are equal to all dead men, so now we know which way they're going. Snide remarks.

All right. Well, have a good auditing session tonight. And have a good weekend and I'll see you next week.

Thank you.
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: ANATOMY AND ASSESSMENT OF GOALS

A lecture given on 15 August 1961

Thank you!

Okay, this is the 16th, isn't it! 15th. boy, it's a lucky thing you people keep me on the time track. I haven't been reading any newspapers lately. Don't read Russian very well.


Male voice: Ron, could you put Pretended Knowingness on the Prehav Scale?

Would I put it on there? Yeah. It's probably – probably should be there. Yeah, it's a fairly vital button. The scale of knowingness goes from Not-Know and Pretended Know. Pretended Know could be said to be a harmonic or delusory state of Know. Be an even numbered postulate. I don't know, it must be down there somewhere around six, seven, eight – probably eight. It's probably something in between Remember. Probably six is something on the order of surmise or guess, or something like this. It's pretty late. And as a person comes off of a false knowingness, then they go into an insecurity about knowingness. This bird has studied, let us say, elementary physics, and he's got it all taped. And then he takes nuclear physics. And now he doesn't know whether he knows or not. He can't quite know nuclear physics, you see, and he doesn't dare revert to this. And this accounts for, by the way, the scientific fad and style today.

There's a fad. Science is a sort of a fad. And the fad is more or less this. It's interesting. There's a tone today that is associated with truth. The tone that is associated with truth by the politicians and the lay public. They call them the lay public, you see, because they just lay around, do nothing. [laughter] And this is a conventionalism. And that is, you must express enormous reservation and doubt. Every sentence must have a doubtful in it. And if you read the thing, it's a doubtful. And this, of course, is nothing but the sheerest of pomposity. They don't doubt.

I mean if you saw – if you are doing scientific observation of experiments and that sort of thing, you don't have to state your conclusion, but neither do you have to doubt your observation. And you dunk a four-foot piece of wood, which is marked in gradient scales of millimeters, into a solution or something of the sort with a lead weight on its end, and after the solution no longer is agitated, and it's no longer bobbing, you look at it, and it says 360, see. 360. And you'd make a record and said 360. You don't say, "according to observation, which
may of course be at fault, I might not have been there, so forth”, you see, and it's very, very amusing because more and more and more the hallmark of truth is doubt.

And if you get a real doubtful man, then the public falls for him as a real truthful man. And all this is, is two postulates going together. Know and Not-Know. And they have moved into an insane ridge. The guy doesn't know what he knows. He doesn't know what he not-knows. So his total expression is doubt. And occasionally, when societies go real buggy, and when they know nothing about the mind or anything else, and when they're just about three-quarters of the way around the bend, you get this emerging.

You have some great writer all of a sudden says, "Well, I say that man's greatest ability is the divine doubt." And they deify this thing called doubt. What do you mean doubt? Doubt at once says, "I am unable to find out, and I don't know, but actually I don't know that I don't know, and I guess that I might know, too, and somebody might know". You see, all of these things are combined in the same word. And somebody might know. And somebody might not-know. And I might know and I might not-know. But I am not going to make a what? Postulate. I am not going to make a postulate. So then therefore, we get the current scientific fad as being the fad of irresponsibility. And we look across the vast vista of confusion which science is calling itself right now – the dog's breakfast it's made out of civilization – and what do we find? What do we find? And we find out that their irresponsibility is very definitely being reflected.

There were just two or three guys left at the end of World War II who would uphold and try to continue responsibility for scientific creations. And the government got to them. Actually, there were sixty-four of them, and the government – US Government – shot them all down in flames. Oppenheimer, Condon, you can go off and list the whole list of them. They were found to be insecure. Well, those birds might occasionally have been talking with the divine doubt because it was the literary fad of the day. But nevertheless, those guys were pretty sure that you had to continue responsibility for your creations, and they were upset that they hadn't.

Nowadays, you get somebody, some working stiff scientist and so on, and the government says, "Put a fire engine in the beauty salon", and he does. You know. I mean, it doesn't matter to him, you know. You know. Make a weapon, make a weapon which will spread diphtheria only amongst children one and one-half years of age, you see. Some mad, some mad-screaming general, you know. He's utterly "Thuh, thuh, thuh", and he tells this fellow, and the fellow says, "Well, that's what I must do", you see. And when they get into a devout doubt, why, they are of course, then ruled by insanity.

Devout doubts can always be ruled by insanity. You get the doubt being ruled by the insane, because doubting and insane are practically synonymous. Doubting expresses the inability to find out. The fellow says, "I doubt it." Somebody says, "It's going to rain today", and the other fellow says, "I doubt it."

He doesn't say, "It is not going to rain." He doesn't say, "It is going to rain", you see. He's put himself on the hedge between Know and Not-Know, and this is pretty late on the postulate line. Because of the existence of this thing, which I am studying right now – pretended knowingness – I'm not quite sure where it goes on this Know-Not-Know Scale. But it's
probably late, probably late on the scale. Probably after the guy has doubted himself round the bend or something like this, why, then he'll pretend knowledge of some totally fallacious line – as you find most sciences doing today.

For instance, the science of marine propulsion. They think they got it taped. They think that a proper thing is this, and it's that, and it's the other thing. And you're supposed to do this and that, and engines should be so and-so.

They take atomic engines, and they take an 1860 steam engine, and they put an atomic boiler in it. And then they tell everybody they know what they're doing. No, they don't know what they're doing. They don't know anything about propulsion. You see, they've neglected the whole sphere and field.

They'll go over into pretended knowingness. Next thing you know you're going to get pronunciamentos, and you already have had them from leading scientists concerning the deity. And I – let me point out – I haven't been introducing you to any gods, large ones, small ones, green ones or pink ones. I haven't even been introducing you to the doubt of the situation. I don't think there's any doubt in your mind concerning my attitude toward this idea of deity. I think you're fairly sure that I think it's for the birds. But nevertheless, you're going to get a pomposity going here, and you'll get – a scientific religion will be the next one around the corner. This will be a real one. This will be a **wowzy** one. Space opera societies usually go in this direction one or the other. Religion is where you find that sort of a thing. But finding it in a test tube is really marvelous.

And there'll be some vast, pretended knowingness arise out of this. It's quite interesting. It's quite interesting, this whole field. I do want to say something here about this particular knowingness scale. Of course, it goes, as you know. Native state. Not-Know. See, native state – potential knowingness. And then it goes number one, Not-Know; number two, Know; number three, of course, is Forget; number four is Remember. Now we know exactly where we are up to there.

Now, we go down, and it'd be the – the factuals would be the even numbers. You know, I mean the grasping of the fact and so forth. That would be the even numbers. And the dismissal or not-ising of the facts would, of course, be odd numbers as you went on down and completed the rest of the scale. But it gets so mishmashy after a while that you're not quite sure whether they're doing which or what, and it's probably – doubt is down there somewhere or another, and it would have to be probably two numbers of the scale. You see, because it's neither Know nor Not-Know, or Forget or Remember or anything else. It's a hang-up between the two. It's the stuff that's gone into a ball.

But then, from doubt, we get a total avoidance. A total avoidance of factualness and get into pretended knowingness. See, the guy not only will pretend the knowingness but he'll also pretend the facts that back up the knowingness.

One of the things which you have to safeguard yourself against all the time in research. There's no pretended knowingness in there. Somebody's overtly making a pretence of having known something, and he has written down as having observed it, like there – oh we saw eighteen monsters in Loch Ness or something of this sort, you see. And then, therefore,
we base a whole science on this, and we develop a whole science called "Sea Monsters: Their
Habitats and Behaviors."

But this is quite important to an auditor. And actually, by the way, it is important to a
pc. As he unravels his bank, he runs back up this scale, and somewhere along the line, if on
some subjects – as of course, inevitably any reactive mind is – he runs up through doubt. And
when he hits this doubt, then of course he doubts everything, and one of the rough things to
do is he would go across that barrier. If he were going across it so hard that it pervaded his
entire existence, of course, he also would be brought into a point of doubting Scientology, of
doubting auditing, of doubting everything that's going on, and would stop sessions.

And, of course, he's in the fellow who is walking across the middle of the chasm, and
he's right there in the middle of the chasm, you see. He isn't on an even numbered postulate or
an odd numbered one, and he has been left exactly nowhere. And he goes off into a sort of a
fog about the whole thing. And you can expect a pc who has had a rough time or is being au-
dited on a rather low scale terminal, either way, to come up through these bands. And you
really don't want to pay too much attention to a pc when he says well, he doesn't think Scienc-
tology works, you know. Two weeks ago it healed a broken leg for him or something like
this, but it doesn't work, you see, and he doesn't know whether it's true, and so forth. Don't
pay too much attention to that sort of thing. Recognize it for what it is.

Now, probably he had a pretended knowingness on some subject. And then when he
moved off this pretended knowingness, he moved up scale. He is inevitably going to go past
doubt. He doubts something else.

A medical doctor is pretending to know something about healing. We don't doubt that
a medical doctor knows something about the mechanics of the body. We don't doubt that he
knows something about the mechanics of the endocrines and functional systems of the body.
They fought that up the hard way. Like plumbers know about pipes, they know about bodies.
And pretty good in this particular line. A lot of them are very clever. They get somebody on
the operating table gasping under the ether, and they can tie bowlines on the bight and double
carrick bends in their intestines and fallopian tubes, and things like this. And they're neat. And
some of their obstetrical activities, the better ones – the more impatient ones don't have this
skill – but some of the better ones in their obstetrical activities are actually very clever with
their hands, very clever with their knowledge about all of this. There are very few of these
fellows.

Now you lower the boom on this fellow, and his pretended field of knowingness is
healing. He pretends to know what will make the body well. Of course he's always missing on
this. He's always missing because he says structure, of course, monitors function, so he can't
help but miss because he's got it exactly backwards. He says he fixes up somebody's broken
leg, you'll make him happy, you see. Or he fixes up somebody's broken leg, he'll walk. If he
just sets the leg right, you see, and it's all neat, then the guy will walk again. Well, it happens,
and it happens, and he keeps seeing this happen, and then one day the fellow doesn't walk.
Well, then he gets curious and he'll repeat the operation, you see. And they rebreak the leg
and they go in there, and they look at all the nerve fibers, and so on. And then they put it all
together again, and neat it all up, and when it comes out of the cast again they say, "Walk,
you ...bum." [laughter] And the guy doesn't walk. And they say look, perfectly all right. The muscles are all right. The leg is all right. The nerve sensors are all right. The guides are all right. Everything is apparently all right, but the guy won't walk.

He never admits to himself that he really doesn't know what the score is until he's had quite a few of these. And then all of a sudden he either goes in two directions. He says there's something called religion. Qs-and-As with another sphere of pretended knowingness – how many angels can stand on the head of a pin, that sort of a thing, you know. Or he says there must be something to the mind. And by the mind he means the brain. And there must be something to the mind. And the mind must have something to do with all this, by which he means the brain. And then without any proof at all that the mind has anything to do about it, he invents a whole science. They've invented two or three of them since about 1894. And they haven't done anything with that either. That's another sphere of pretended knowingness.

So you start getting compartmented, built-up sciences which consist of pretended knowingness out here, see. Nobody's making a breakthrough. Now you invalidate these things by demonstration. You bring him back through. There's only one thing you can do is bring him all the way through the band of doubt, because he's going to drive you half out of your mind, as an auditor, as you bring him up the line, because it's all going to shed off as doubt.

And the hallmark of the case is doubt. He isn't going to know whether he's in the auditing chair. He doubts whether you were doing it. He doubts, doubts, doubts, doubts, doubts, you see. He doubts whether it's working. He doubts the result he got yesterday existed yesterday, although he thought yesterday it did exist, but today he doubts that yesterday existed. You get the idea.

So he comes up through all of these bands of doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, and he'll eventually come up topside to some kind of a certainty of his own observed certainty. But he has a longer way to go.

And you could say the more pretended knowingness which an individual has, the more doubt he'll encounter on his road out of it. You see, because he's got an awful lot of not-ised facts in there. See, he's got a lot of not-ised observations, you see, and he had to sort of shut his eyes to get into that kind of a pretended knowingness, you know. He's led some kind of a life, like his mother beat him every day, and wouldn't let him have anything to eat, and ran down the old man to him, and made sure the old man was a drunkard, and he's got a fixed datum: "Mothers are angels." See? And his existing observation in this particular lifetime is – just totally violates this basic postulate – "Mothers are angels", you know.

And it's the most pathetic thing, and I've seen this happen with both children and adults, you know: "Well, my mother was just an angel. She was just a darling. She was nice to everybody." And you get into this, and you say what is this other character that is rushing around in this fellow's case, you see.

And then they'll go the reverse. And they'll have the idea that all women are no good. Stable datum, you see: All women are no good, particularly mothers. Mothers are no good. So all right, you look around all over this case one side of it, up side of it, down side of it, examine it, turn it over. You cannot find a single incident where his mother did anything to him,
you know, but try to treat him decently and bring him up. He's gotten this datum in a long, backtrack lifetime, sometime or another, you see, and he's just clung onto it as a datum.

So, this guy is in a real fog because his experiential track leading up to this lifetime now does not permit him to predict anything in this lifetime. Nothing in this lifetime is predictable, so he's in a chronic state of nowhere. Now he will eventually go over this boundary because he doesn't like to be nowhere, and get himself a pretended somewhere. A thetan does this with the greatest of ease – pretends he is somewhere. This is very comical.

You know, the whole source of a dream is an effort to orient. There is nothing else to a dream. Take my word for it. Someday you'll get a good subjective reality on this thing. A dream does not forecast. A dream doesn't do anything else except tries to orient.

The fellow is asleep in a skull and some squishy stuff and the body is insensitive and insensible, and he hasn't got his communication lines out, so he can't feel the bed, and he can't perceive anything. He wakes up neglecting to get the body awakened, you see, and he is suddenly terrified at being no place. There's just a little flick there, you see. And he's just a little bit terrified of being nowhere, so he immediately creates himself a lot of somewhere. And he will create himself one of the wildest somewheres you ever saw in your life sometimes. He gets Washington, DC all mixed up with London, you know. And then this is somehow or another in the South Seas, and so on. But it's a frantic effort to orient. Just to locate himself so that he can feel secure. That's what a dream is, and a dream, of course, is pretended knowingness because he is in none of these places. If you try to run out somebody's dream, you'll go through a band of doubt.

He doubts he dreamt it. That is one of the first things you run into as you start to erase a dream. He'll doubt this. He'll doubt that. Well, he's not sure – he's not sure of what time of the night it was. He's not sure of this. He's not sure of that. You get the idea? Well, what he's really hitting at, he was not sure where he was.

If you have somebody who has chronic nightmares, you can actually cure their chronic nightmares by getting them to orient themselves consistently, something like TR 10, something like this. Any orienting havingness process will cure nightmares. Interesting. After you've run it for a little while, and run it a bit flat, and got the guy a little bit more oriented, he won't have nightmares anymore.

The other way of handling nightmares is to give somebody B1. Guy's having a lot of nightmares, give him B1. Evidently, B1 molecules have compasses in them. [laughter]

But now, when we're talking about things like this, of course, I'm just talking to you about practical observation, the practical observation, that's all. A guy who's having trouble with nightmares, I found out what it was, or I was having nightmares and got an orientation slant on it, and looked around and examined it someplace else and tried to find out if this was the fact of the case of the nightmare. Yeah, this is the fact of the case of the nightmare. All right. That compares with the observation, so to that degree it is knowingness. Simple.

We have a very simple rationale. It's much too simple for modern science. We don't have all the frills of modern science. All of the conventionals. And these conventionals are so darned unwieldy that it's a wonder they ever get anyplace. You know, you're supposed to
make a record of everything you do in modern science. Well, that's the most wonderful way of slowing somebody down I ever heard of. Just think of what I would have done, or the research I would not have gotten done, if I had made a complete and detailed record of every observation and every action that I had observed that led to any type of a conclusion, since when you're handling something on the order and zone and width and dimension and height of life, you, of course, do nothing but observe.

Now, if you observed only for the record, and then if you filed the records and then took only the conclusions which the records gave you, you of course would have made a job which would have lasted over five or six hundred lifetimes. So, of course, the job couldn't have been done. And yet we do have quite a lot of records of one kind or another, but we don't have a large impractical record. Someday somebody's going to curse me for not having done this.

That I'm sure of. They'll curse me for it. But then that's a kind of pretended knowingness too, you know. You know things because you have 8,692 million Library cases full of paper. That's not true. You don't, you know. That's the Ford Foundation's motto. "We know as much as we have filing cases full of paper." And it never occurs to them "we can do as much as we have filing cases full of paper". That doesn't follow, does it?

So you had to have, in order to accomplish the job at all, a method of shorthanding recording, and of summarizing observation, to get out of this slough of pretended knowingness. Otherwise, we would have wound up pretending we knew a lot of things we didn't know just because they were written down on paper. Quite interesting, but the insane asylum records on cases give you inevitably and invariably the full engram the person is stuck in, word for word, line for line. Examine them sometime. It's fantastic.

How could these fellows actually have been sitting around recording this long without having come to this interesting conclusion that they were recording something. There must have been something there for them to record. You know? They never looked for anything there. They never looked for anything to be recorded, you see, in the patient. They just observed the patient and made a record of what the patient was doing. And then never found out that it was consistent or continual or repetitive, and never assumed that it must be coming from somewhere, and never tried to ask any patient where it was coming from or how they got that idea or anything else. And yet the records of insane asylums are full of the engrams in which their patients are stuck. You can actually pick up a lot of insane asylum records, go into the patient it refers to and get them to run the exact engram that is on the records, and the person will run on through it and be in another dramatization quicker than scat.

And then of course, you've changed the case all over the place so this becomes quite startling and everybody goes into awe and propitiation. I've done this a few times. That is why psychiatrists only have one thing against me, personally, is I'm trying to show other people how to handle the mind. And this is a betrayal. They have no slightest doubt in their own mind but what I know all about the mind. They think I'm a pretty able boy. But they sure hate this idea of developing competition. And it's just results of doing things like this, you know, of looking for pretended knowingness.
So there can be knowingness which is not observed knowingness, and that hangs around in that band someplace. You see, that's also got to be oriented on the track. You keep observing this woman drinking Haig & Haig, and she drinks it in the morning when she gets up, and she drinks it for lunch, and she drinks it for supper, and she never draws a sober breath, and you never file the fact that she is a drunkard. This is omitted from the knowingness. Get the idea? We never say, well, this woman is a drunkard. We're liable to say, well, she has trouble with her husband. That has nothing to do with it. It has nothing to do with the observation. We may or may not have observed that she had trouble with her husband.

So you get then also a lot of devious observations of knowingness. Motorcycle breaks down. We take a look at the motorcycle. We say, well, the owner doesn't live right. It's not what we're observing. Don't you see? So it's a misobservation. That the owner lived right or didn't live right or that the owner is messed up mentally or not messed up mentally has nothing to do with the immediate observation that the motorcycle is broken down. You see? And as a matter of fact, the owner might be in very good condition but just bought it from somebody else, and our observation would be for the birds. The worst this would say is that the owner is a careless purchaser. Or it might say that motorcycles are scarce, and it might say a lot of other things but it's a nonobserved datum that is recorded. In other words, one looks at the evidence and then records something he didn't observe. And you'll see this in auditing.

A person will run an engram and then tell you something as pc that he hasn't seen in the engram. Very often it adds up to you as, it isn't a cognition, but it's a type of cognition. It's a very low order of cognition. He runs this engram through, and somebody's being beaten up, and he all of a sudden announces all lumberjacks wear boots, you see, but there aren't any lumberjacks in the engram. And you wonder what the hell all this came from. Where did we find this one?

Well, now you're introducing via knowingness, you know, or guessing by evidence. There's something else. There's so many stratas of this I – all I'm trying to do is show you there are so darn many stratas of this that I'm a little bit chary of putting them all down on the Prehav Scale because it's its own scale. But some of them are going to appear on the Prehav Scale. Probably Doubt should be on the Prehav Scale and Pretended Knowingness probably should be on the Prehav Scale. Ah... Guess should be on the Prehav Scale. There are quite a few of these should be, but I don't have the whole Knowingness Scale yet. I only got a few steps of it. I'll have it all taped one of these days.

Okay. Enough of that. Anybody got any more questions that won't lead to so much randomness on knowingness.

Female voice: Yes, I have. I think I've missed some data here. When running Goals Assessment by a repeater technique, I think one should put an acknowledgment after each repetition. Am I correct?

Mmm-hm. Always, whether the pc said anything or not.

Female voice: Mistake then. I didn't.

Ahh, well, that would slow you down.

Female voice: Mm-hmm.
You say "To fly to the moon." Pc doesn't say a word. You say, "Thank you."

Female voice: Mmm.

"To fly to the moon. Thank you. To fly to the moon. Thank you. All right. That's all of that. Okay. Now, here's the next one. To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you. This one is disappearing, so we say, "To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you." Okay. We cross it out, and we say, "All right, here's the next one." And so on. The pc hasn't said anything this whole time. Pc can sit there in the finest, most gorgeous state of irresponsibility you ever heard of and still have a Goals Assessment work like mad. He doesn't even have to have his mind on the goals you're reading, actually. It's a communication straight between the auditor and the reactive bank. Bang! Bang!

So, thank you for bringing up the point, Madge. There's always an acknowledgment every time you read a goal or a terminal.

Female voice: Okay. Another question on that ...

That isn't true of the Prehav Scale. Assessment on the Prehav Scale, you don't. You say "TR 10." [laughter] Is that it, Madge?

Female voice: No. The other question was, when it was nulled out, is it all right to say to the pc, "Well, that's out"?

I don't care what you say.

Female voice: Okay. Thanks.

It all depends on how good the communication is. The pc is liable to start getting very restive. I'm liable to ask him something, "Is it all right that that one went?" And he says, "Well, no, really, because that was my favorite goal.", and you say, "Well, what was your favorite goal?" And he said, "Well, it wasn't exactly that." And we got another goal out of him. [laughter] Any other questions?

Male voice: Did I understand, Ron, that you said that we don't acknowledge on assessing on the Prehav?

You understand right when I said you don't acknowledge on assessing on the Prehav Scale. You just fire, and you just go right on down the line, Rackety-rackety-rackety-rackety-rackety-rack. The proper assessment on a Prehav Scale I'll review for you. You simply – you – let's say you're assessing generally, you simply read the levels, and you start at number sixty-four, and you carry right on straight up the scale; and you make a dot or some such mark at every reaction you get, reading each level just once. Now having arrived at somewhere toward the top of the scale, you turn around then and you start down the scale, and because you start down the scale, you don't go down the whole scale, you only go down those that have – you have put a dot after.

And when these react on one reading again, you put a second dot. And now you'll find out that you normally wind up with two or three with two dots. So now you read the two or three with the two dots up, and then you read them down, and you'll be left with one with
three dots. And it's a very rapid action, but there's no acknowledgment done. There's nothing said at all.

If you're assessing with a terminal, you announce the terminal each time, and if you're very clever, you'll flip-flop it. In other words, it will be the terminal doing something to you, you see. You doing something to the terminal, for the next line. For the next level, the terminal's doing something to you, and the next line, why, it's you doing something to the terminal. You get the idea? It's just to keep the flow from sticking on the assessment. One way – one way, and one way the next level. It doesn't matter which.

Because you've always got one run out of it. And you're trying to solve the problem of too much outflow. And the problem you're trying to solve, is you don't want the pc to sit there on the whole Prehav Scale from beginning to top, outflowing toward the terminal. Nor do you want the pc to be sitting there with the terminal outflowing toward the pc. So you just keep the flow going by doing a flip-flop up the line. Pc to the terminal. Terminal to the pc. Again, no acknowledgment. Nothing. Just read it one time each. Bang! Bang! Bang! Bang! Very simple operation. It's almost so simple that you could overlook it very easily. But, no acknowledgment is necessary. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right. Any other questions? Yes.

Male voice: I have one that's not concerning the kind of rundown – it's this: That you laid a lot of stress on Presession 1 at one time, and then all of a sudden there it was gone, and we're not using Presession 1 now. Can you clarify this, or the difference how the pcs go into session now?

All right. We had a ... we had a lot of emphasis on Presession – Presession 1?

Male voice: Yes.

Oh. Way back. And then we didn't do Presession 1, and now your question exactly is?

Male voice: Well, we – at one time you said that it – or said words to the effect, I think, that it wasn't possible to get a pc into session until they had a free needle on help and control and communication.

Hmmm. Well, that is degree of "in-session." You understand? There are degrees of going into session. And that would be a pc fully in-session. I'm not trying to worm out of this. I'm trying to show you something here. You've got another problem involved here. And it's a good thing to call this to attention. You get raw meat straight off the street, and you don't clear up any part of Presession 1, or you don't attack the opening guns with anything like Presession 1, and he's usually in a fog because he's stuck on all of these buttons.

It doesn't take too long to orient this sort of thing. Now, this is all under the heading of HGC stuff of taking a raw pc who has never had any auditing before and getting that pc into session. Now, as the pc comes into session, you'll find out it will be because he has a freer attitude toward these various things. Actually, two-way comm on them, discussion with them, that sort of thing, tends to get the pc much closer to being in-session. But something else has happened since, something else has happened.
We have cracked a fast way to get a pc into session. And the fastest way in the world to get a pc into session known to man or beast is Routine 3. The person who is not interested and who becomes unwilling to talk, well, Routine 3 – I mean it takes it. The fellow will talk about his goals. The fellow is interested in his goals. He then is interested in his own case, which is definition of "in-sessionness".

He'll jump over all of these earlier concerns. Don't you see? He just goes right over the top of these things and he's off to the races. Now, you've got another part of Routine 3, which is the – you're actually hitting at why we're using this type of approach now. Routine 3 also includes a Security Check. And this makes the fellow – this solves all the reasons he is not talking to the auditor. So Routine 3 contains those two elements, which keep a pc most from being in-session – which is, of course, interest in own case and willingness to talk to the auditor. Security Check handles willingness to talk to the auditor, and of course the Goals Assessment handles interest in own case.

And it's overwhelming if you're doing at all a smooth, technical job, that in fact it is nearly impossible to get a pc out of session.

Male voice: Yes.

And that is why you see so little emphasis these days on Presession 1. Does that answer the question?

Male voice: Yes, it does. Thank you.

You bet. Technology has handled the problem even more aptly. Okay?

Male voice: Yep.

Right. Okay? Any more questions? Yes.

Female voice: Can one ask the preclear a questions – the two questions of in-sessionness? Whether he's willing to talk to the auditor or whether he's interested in his own case?

Ummmm.

Female voice: on the meter...

I wouldn't say offhand that it was a very good approach because it's liable to sound accusative to a Scientologist. [laughter] I'd say – I'd say – it's a good thing you bring this up. I'd say no. One shouldn't do this. We shouldn't want to ask the pc if he's interested in his own case and is willing to talk to the auditor. You can, of course, always ask somebody, "Are you willing to talk to me?" and clear it on the needle. It's perfectly valid. But "Are you interested in your own case?" No, I'd omit that. [laughter] So one of them is quite valid, and the other is quite invalid.

Female voice: I was just wondering about the needle read ...

Mmm.

Female voice: ..."not interested", what the needle would read. Would probably be a drop: "not interested."
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No. Now listen, honey, you're assessing the Prehav Scale at the level of Interest, and that's all you'd get a reaction on. If the fellow was sitting on Interest as a hot button, you'd get a response. And if he wasn't sitting on Interest, you wouldn't get any response. And after you ask the question, you would know exactly nothing. [laughter] That's why. You got it?

Female voice: Right.

Now, don't you feel bad about asking a question. Perfectly all right. Okay. Any other question?

Male voice: Yes.

Yes.

Male voice: In Terminals Assessment, would you keep on repeating these terminals that sends the pc into whole track and gets them a bit mucked up? Do you stop to do anything about it or do you press through on the assessment?

All right, if you're doing a Terminals Assessment and you keep repeating the terminal and the pc goes through into whole track and gets a bit mucked up, why, do you do anything about it or continue with the assessment? And the answer to that is a very difficult one to make because it's a matter of an adjudicative sort of thing which is not actually based on anything but giving you a guide.

Because a pc being assessed is a pc being assessed. And it is that pc that's being assessed. And you take pc one and you start taking up anything he's going into on the whole track one way or the other, and he has gone up to the seventy-five-foot high-dive tower and in he goes, and this is a wonderful opportunity to just never get anywhere, don't you see? He's just got brakes on from there on out. So, if you do it, if you start taking it up with this particular pc, why, you're in trouble from there on out.

Another pc, he accidentally gets into something of the sort on one terminal. Repeater Technique is nothing to be running this one terminal on, particularly, and he's going down track and up track, and it's not something that is happening chronically, something like that. You decide, well, I better do something about this, so you take it up with two-way comm or something like this, and you pull a little bit of the charge off the thing. The best thing to do that with would be Not-Know or Forget or something like that.

The guy started charging backtrack, you say, "Dentist. Dentist. Dentist. Dentist." And then he's going bzzz, and he's backtrack. Bzzz bzzz, and he's backtrack. Bzzz bzzz. And then you say, "Dentist. Dentist." And it's getting hotter and hotter and hotter. Well, in the first place, let's ask this question: What are you doing repeating a terminal too many times, that is getting hotter and hotter? See? There would be mistake one. This is how you can keep out of that kind of trouble and not have to confront this problem.

Why worry about it? In the first place, if you just read a terminal without any bric-a-brac, just read a level – just read a terminal three times to a person, and it is still reacting on the needle, it's not going to erase, that's for sure, without some ardure. So, the best program is to leave it alone. Don't score it out. Skip it. In other words, you take terminals off in layers. You don't take them off by the terminal. You take them off in classes of terminal. You got the
idea? You finish up reading a whole list of terminals, and you're left there with fifty percent of the terminals still alive. I'd say that was pretty good. Seventy-five percent of the terminals still alive. You only got rid of twenty-five percent of the terminals on the whole list. I'd say that was pretty good. But remember you would have done it very rapidly.

Now you go back over it again. You go back over the remaining seventy-five percent, and you'll find out that only ten of them disappear on this read. And then you go back over it again, this whole list which is now getting to be a minor list indeed. It's only got thirty on it, or something like this. And you go over this list, and all of a sudden they all scrub. You watch this phenomenon. You practically just read them once, and they're gone, except one. And boy, that's good and solid. You apparently have got something there.

So we ask him for some more terminals, and the second we've got more terminals, we go back over them, and we pick up this one that was red-hot, and we all of a sudden find out it's flatter than a flounder. We read it once, it's gone.

And I would say the only way that a person would get too messed up on the whole track – the only way that this could occur or would occur, is where the auditor is trying to scrub terminals that aren't going to scrub very easily. And that you shouldn't be so arduously trying to scrub terminals, and I'd say that if you had this rule – it's just a rule of the thumb, you know – you read the thing three times and it's still alive, leave it. That's a light look, but after you've read it three times, on the third time it didn't react – you know, one, two, three, third time it didn't react – go ahead and scrub it. Read it four or five more times, and it'll scrub. But after you've read it four or five more times and it's still get – it still seems to be very alive, don't get hectic about erasing it. Just leave it. You made a mistake.

But you should be able to adjudicate on the first three reads of a goal or a terminal, whether or not that thing is going to go or remain. And if you get very good at it, you will be able to make that adjudication in the first three reads, and if it's there, it's there. Don't feel defeated because it's still there. That's fine. So it's still there. But if you are trying to erase a terminal or a goal, which after three reads looked like it was going to stay there, and you now read it twelve more times, and it's still going to stay there, but it seems to be less. So you press on and read it eight or nine or ten more times, and now it disappears, you're liable to find the fellow has been pressed onto the whole track. You get how this would happen?

He'll only go on the whole track with terminals or goals which are extremely alive and are usually interdependent on other terminals, classes and goals, you see. So if you want to keep your pc off the whole track – not that that is vital either – but if you want to keep him off the whole track in a Goals or Terminals Assessment, why, you'll follow this three read rule.

You know, it looks like it's going to stay after three reads. Well, let it stay. Looks like it's going to go after three reads, well, take four or five more and see if it's going to disappear. And if you follow that, you'll get very minimal whole track proposition.

Now a pc that is having trouble going up and down the whole track is probably being assessed out of PT with the rudiments out. A person will more greatly tend to go onto the whole track if the rudiments are out than if the rudiments are in. So I'd say if the pc was plunging around, I wouldn't take up these things that put him on the whole track. I would leave them alone, very severely, and I would move off at once, off my assessment. I would
end the session with end rudiments. I would start another session with beginning rudiments with a break between. And now I would proceed along the line of read them lightly. If they look like they're still going to be there, leave them. That is the way I would handle that situation.

It is very true that a person can be plowed all over the track, all over the track with goals, reads, and repeater, and that sort of thing, but ordinarily it is done with the rudiments out, and they'll go all over the track, or one is trying to erase things that are trying to stay. And one is in a kind of a games condition with the pc.

He's saying, "Well, here's a goal."

And you say, "No. You haven't got that goal", you see. And that kind of a games condition develops, of course he's going to go all over the whole track.

I would say that rudiments – the cure for that is get the rudiments in, and read them more lightly, and be quicker. Be very quick on adjudication as to whether they're going to stay in or go. After all, you're trying to find the fellow's goal rather than get rid of the fellow's goals. You're trying to find a goal that is all up and down the thing.

Now at the same time, this must go along with a Goals Assessment, since a Goals Assessment itself is not just a pre-therapy action, but is an action which is right part and parcel of auditing. It is auditing.

So the individual gets into some kind of a goal area that needs considerable discussion, needs considerable elucidation or something of this sort. And he's into some kind of a snarled up package of goals one way or the other, and he can't make head nor tail out of it. I would just patiently have him list all the goals he could think of out of there and use a lot of Not-Know in trying to get the patches of goals out of there. I'd settle right down in the middle of the list to get some more goals out of this thing if he's so snarled up. You get the idea?

He says – oh, I'll give you an example. He says, "Well", he says, "I want to burn down the town", he said. This has obviously been a goal of longstanding – burning down a town. "And I want to burn down this town. I want to burn down this to..." But that's just really not the goal. It's quite an ordinary situation in Goals Assessment. "Well", he says, "it's really not the goal. It's really not burning down a town."

Well, now if you want to take it the long, arduous, involved, and upsetting way, if you want to take it the long way and the wrong way, go into "towns he has burned down". [laughter] See, this is the wrong way to.

Now, the right way to take it up is to find out how many other goals are buried in that immediate vicinity. And you'd run a Not-Know on the situation, you see.

"Well, could there be any goals you have forgotten like that?"

And he'd think it over and all of a sudden, why, two or three more goals pop up, and suddenly this thing will clarify for him. And he'll say, "Well, it's not to burn down a town. It's to singe people. Come to think about it, when I was a little boy, yeah, that's right. Oohhh-ohhh-ohhh, wait a minute, man." You know. "I was always throwing firecrackers under peo-
people's feet and sticking burning matches, and so forth, around them and yeah, it's 'to singe people'. That was the goal."

Yeah, now he's happy about the whole thing, and you go on with your assessment. But you assist the pc to clarify his goals, not assist the pc to clarify his track. Best way to do it is Not-Know, Forget, other things of that character because obviously if he's mixed up, it's because he's forgotten something. Ergo. Does that answer your question, John?

**Male voice:** Yes, that does.

Okay. All right. Any other questions? Yes.

**Female voice:** Yes. I'd like to know what it is that happens to a goal that just seems to seep away. I can see what happens to a goal when it comes at the end of a chain you say, "Oh, well, that's it. That's fine. I get the whole picture now." But sometimes they just die on you.

Yeah. All right. Well, you want to know what happens to a goal that just dies. Well, actually, you move the fellow. It's the degree that you move him out – the velocity with which you move him out of the zone he had this goal.

First place, we have to take an anatomy of goals. A goal is a not-hereness. See, it's a not-hereness. It's a non-existence state. This fellow's on this desert island, and he looks around, and he says, "I would really like to build this place up." Well, that's a mild one, you see.

Well, he's already expressed dissatisfaction with havingness. He's expressed the dissatisfaction of the desert island. He can't have a desert island, you see. This is probably why he was forced into this goal. He can have the desert island and decide to build it up, too. Well, that goal is not very upsetting on the track, believe me. There's nothing to that. That probably won't even come up.

But there's another one, see. That he's standing in the middle of this desert island he says, "The hell with this place", he says, "There's no water. There's no blondes. There's practically no modern conveniences of any character." And he says, "That's it." And he says, "I'm just going to have to build this place up." He says, "I've got to. I've got to build this place up because there's just nothing here, and there's nothing doing, and you couldn't live on it, and so on, so I got to." So he sweats himself half to death and he goes in a heroic cataclysms of one character or another, and he's got this big goal to build up this desert island, and here he goes, you see. And so help me Pete, you find a desert island sitting on the track.

Well, what takes him off of this desert island? Is the fact that he had a goal not to have a desert island, didn't he? He said, "I've got to build up this desert island." Now he's immediately got the obverse goal understood in it not to have a desert island. So of course, he's stuck with a desert island. You see, he couldn't have the desert island by postulate. But he could have the other situation.

All right. You run into something like that, and you run into consistent goal of that type, and you get a whole chain of goals of this particular type, and you get this whole long line of can't-haves of great violence. Well, man, that will be one of these goals that – that's it!
Well, supposing he was just standing there and every time he got on a desert island he got into wars, you see, and that sort of thing, and he kept being shot down on desert islands and that sort of thing. And he says, "Oh, ho-hum." He said, "I will have to fix up the place a bit, you know." And he doesn't make much of a postulate not being able to have it. But this has been a consistent practice of his, you see. He's going to fix up this desert island. And the importance of it is not very great. You repeat it, it just seeps away. It's the relative importance of the goal and the relative importance of the goal is the relative can't-havingness of the goal.

In other words, all mass transfers from the existing environment to the goal, so the goal becomes mass, and the environment becomes no mass. Importance is mass. In thinkingness, when you say importance, you mean mass. Well, if there isn't much mass attached to this goal, and there isn't much can't-have on the mass he did have, why then, it'll just fritter away. There won't be very much charge on it. It'll just disappear.

But if the reverse is true, if the reverse is true, well, you get this: He could have the desert island. He thinks desert islands are fine, so he's going to fix it up. And you strike that, and you don't even get charge on it. There's not even enough charge on it to put it down.

Why isn't there enough charge on it? Because the individual could have what he was changing. Now, the reverse and the most charged goal is inevitably the degree of can't-have that he ran on his surroundings while formulating the goal.

He sees this marvelous army, and it's arrayed in battle array. And it is about to attack the army which he is heading, you see. And he sees this marvelous army, and he says, "That must cease and desist. We must triumph over the Franks. We must smash'em. We must turn their country into a shambles and ruin. We must really wreck this outfit", he says, and then lays on Macduff and really wrecks the outfit, don't you see? Ka-wham, wham, wham. Don't be surprised in his next life if he becomes a Frank. Why? What happened?

Well, he couldn't have, he couldn't have the Franks. He couldn't have their army. He couldn't have any part of them, and yet this is a very violent, capable-of-motion, important unit. And so he's saying can't-have on a very important have, don't you see. And he runs can't-have with violence and therefore he can't have the property of the Franks or anything about the Franks and so forth, and his goal is then expressed to you, as to be Emperor of the French. You see, this is what he expresses it as – to be Emperor of the French. This is his goal. He decides this is the case.

Of course, that's a Johnny-come-lately goal. There's some earlier goal actually which amounts to this. To smash that whole, con-blam, cotton-picking army. The whole ruddy works, you see. And this is a failure. And then he walks up to a new failure. And he finally gets up on top of this thing, and he says, "Well, the only way I could have the French and so on because I can't have the French and uh..." There we go. You see. And he's all into confusion about it.

All right. You knock out the goal, and he – even for an instant, you see – perceives the havingness as a result of... you know, he's now not making the postulate of the can't-have. So all of a sudden he can have, so all of a sudden it blows. It's a very, very rapid mechanism. You hardly see the thing happen, it's so quick. And you're restoring havingness up and down the track like mad. And you get – you get this fellow – his goals are all can't-haves. His goals
are all escapes that you register, but it isn't true that every goal he's ever had is an escape goal. See, all of his goals aren't based on can't-have. To some slight degree, the fact that he changes an environment, of course, deprives him of the old environment, but if this is not very important, you get no registry.

You get the conduct, by the way, of the West End kid. Just measure this up. Here's the West End kid in New York, you know. He's down around the docks, and he's — boy, he hates the tenement, he hates the drunken father, he hates the this, he hates the that, you see. And he hates the public school. And he doesn't want to do this, and he doesn't want that, and so on. And he has this tremendous goal to become a rich and powerful beer baron or something. That's the thing to be, you know, and here's this goal to be a beer baron, and the more beer baron he gets, why, the more he stinks of onions and flats.

And you get this boy after he's moved up in life. You say, well, anybody moving through various stratas of culture certainly will pick up some of the culture. How come the West End kid, notoriously by reputation, never picks up culture when he moves upstairs? 'Cause he's got himself pinned in the tremendous can't-have of a culture which has overwhelmed him already. And he can't get rid of that culture.

And it doesn't matter how many yachts and butlers and anything else he gets as he goes on up the line, he winds up at the top stinking of onions. You got the idea? He's still got the environment because he couldn't have the environment.

All right. You audit him. And you run across the goal — he's got to be a beer baron. And all of a sudden something happens because simultaneous with it went "can't have the West End", you see. And that is the obverse, so it tends to blow. And he'll understand this.

Now a pc being audited on goals who isn't permitted to inspect this, every now and then, or who doesn't see any part of this or doesn't inspect any part of this, is going to make a slow freight.

Got something going on here that we can't quite put our finger on. So it must be that the goals are pretended goals or it must be the goals are just made up to satisfy you or he isn't telling you all of his goals, or there's something wrong with the Goals Assessment. There's something wrong there. There's something wrong with the type of goal he's giving you.

And of course, his can't-have on environments is so great, the goals themselves stand independent of and disassociated from the can't-haves. You got the idea?

The second he gets in the middle of a desert island, why, he wouldn't say "I've got to build this place up". He wouldn't say, "I've got to get out of here." "If I live through this, I'll have to own some Brown Derbys in Hollywood." You know. Now he's getting a little bit dis-associated, see. He's on a desert island, and his goal on this desert island is not even to live through it, you see, but not to have it happen again, see. So his answer to that is to own a Brown Derby in Hollywood. And this is totally disrelated. How come? You run across this goal, it just doesn't make much sense. What does it go back to?

And your pc will also be rather bemused sometimes about this thing. And he says, "Well, to own a chain of Brown Derbys in Hollywood." He's on desert island, you know. This isn't Hollywood, see. When he says, "Brown Derbys in Hollywood", he expects to get a pic-
ture of Hollywood, you know, and funny looking, very gilded, polished-up drive-ins – which is all they are, actually. And – he expects that, you know, and he doesn't get that, he gets this desert island. And it leaves him in a "What the hell is this?" you know.

And your pc starts bugging on this sort of thing. Recognize you're looking on a disre-late. It's a disassociation. In other words, the can't-have is not associated with the goal. "To become a great restauranteur." And he's in the middle of an island in the South Pacific. Well, you can connect that, you see.

But how about this? "To sell fountain pens." And he gets a picture of a desert island. This doesn't make a bit of sense, see. It doesn't make any sense to him either. Because he doesn't remember this, and he can't even quite figure out how it was. And there's some devious methodology by which he has been on a desert island, and he couldn't write to anybody or he could have written to somebody, don't you see, if he had just had a bottle and some ink, you see, and he figures out this is his only method of getting out of this and can't-have the desert island, you see. And this is totally stopped because he can't figure out any way to make any ink, and he gets the idea, if I only had a fountain pen. The best way to have fountain pens, of course, in abundance, would be to sell fountain pens. And he goes kind of buggy, you see. And he says, "Well, I think I'd love to sell fountain pens." And he says, "Sell fountain pens", he gets a picture of a desert island. See, the can't-have of fountain pens is a desert island. And that doesn't make any sense to anybody.

So he gets pretty confused. Well, what is there, there? There's a not-know there, isn't there? There's not only a can't-have, but there's a big forgot, and a big Not-Know, and a big Disconnect, and something of that character. And you're totally within your rights to work over something like that. Just because a guy was cruising around on the track, I wouldn't try to help him out much. So he's cruising around on the track. It won't kill him. These conducted or nonconducted tours. Sell him a season ticket to his own bank. [laughter] Don't do anything drastic about that, but the bird's saying, "Sell fountain pens? Yeah, well, I had a goal to sell fountain pens, all right. Yeah. I – I – I did. Yeah."

Well, if you're just sitting there grind, grind, grind and you don't understand the mechanism of what he's going through, you never ask him burning questions such as "what desert island are you sitting on", you know. In other words, "what are you looking at?"

He appears to be quite mystified by his own goals. He's got a disassociate or he goes over into Pretended Knowingness, you know. He knows what his goals are, but they had nothing to do with anything. And you say, "What are you looking at?"

The guy says, "Well, I want to own the Brown Derby in Hollywood and start a whole chain of Brown Derbys."

You say, "What are you looking at?"

He says, "I'm looking at a desert island."

You say, "You remember when you had that goal?"

"No."

"Well, what's unknown about it?"
"Ha-ha-ha. Oh, well, I remember that. Yeah, was ha-ha-ha. Yeah. Yeah. I was on this desert island, see. And I all of a sudden realized there was no food in the joint. And about the best way you could have food, you know. And when I finally got out of this thing, I figured out well, that's it. Yeah. Hey! What do you know. Hey! That was some island."

Well, he's actually removed himself from the desert island, you see, forevermore. You can kick that just like that if you know these mechanisms. You can make the associate happen. And your long, arduous, apparently disassociated goals list that had stemmed from that particular source will, of course, all of a sudden connect and start blowing like mad, because you're making the guy connect. Now you can get down and make somebody connect any way you want to now that you've got Not-Know and Forget and so on.

What would be unknown about making that postulate? What would be unknown about having that goal? What would be unknown about such a goal? Where would one not want to be when one made that goal? That, of course, would be an unusable but a very involved question, but a very factual one. Where would one not want to be when he made that goal? Or what would one not want to know about while he was making that goal? And that, of course, is a very workable one. What would one not want to know about while he was making that goal? And of course, the guy's bank is liable to do a 3D shift. And it's not all disrelated.

You know, there are people walking around all the time whose pictures don't associate with their existence? Of course, they're very baffled by this. Electronics engineer, wouldn't you know it, he's -- was up in my office one day. I said, "What are you looking at?"

And the fellow says ... Well, I says, "Come on. What are you looking at? What are you looking at? Do you look at something all the time?"

"Well, yes."

"Well, what!"

"Well, it's a window."

"What window is it?"

"Well, it's just a window."

He had been sitting looking at this window for seven trillions of years. Place got atom bombed while he was standing there at the observation post. I ran him a little while on the responsibility for the window, and for the incident. I've told you about this before, and he actually went outside in his engrams, you see, and got in a car and got the full kinetic of a space car, you see, pulling up a hill and going over the top of the hill with the hoomph! you know. He got the full kinetic of it, you know. He's been just over the top of the hill ever since, sitting right there, but... [laughter] I didn't take it any further than that. But he's a man who was over the hill anyhow.

But now, that fellow, of course, must have been every now and then pretty mystified. What was he doing with a picture of this picture, you know? "What's this window? It must have some religious significance. Maybe it's the window of light. Yes. Maybe it's the window of the soul." [laughter] Somebody says, "The window of the soul." you know. If he'd become
a poet, he could have become allegorically lyrical, Miltonishly *blah* on the whole subject of the window. "Window, window, endure, endure. Prehav, Prehav, Prehav."

And you find him worshiping window or something of this sort. You'll find him never able to go by an arched window. So go bing! bing!

Well, now look. In order to have that stuck picture, he had to make a can't-have on the window. It was a can't-have there. And he had to have a goal there. And he had to say something else, you see. He said an *I've got to be*: *I've got to be elsewhere* or *I've got to be a...*, or *I've got to do forth*. And maybe there were a lot of them all occurring at that.

Now, instead of taking it apart with responsibility these days, I'd ask him about "What about the window had he forgotten", or "might he forget" or "was forgettable about the window." And having asked him that a couple of times, I'd ask him "What else would one – what would one really want to be doing while one was looking at a window like that?" And probably the basic goals of this lifetime would have just come off *brrrrrrrr*, you see.

He must have made a whole lot of very, very tough postulates, and the whole environment overwhelmed him at the same time. And a whole lot of not-there sort of postulates, you know, of be elsewhere. And no as-is of this, and no acceptance of this in order to stick himself that thoroughly. It must have been a very complex situation, but expressed in terms of goals, he was postulating elsewherewheres while being thereness. While thereness was occurring, he was postulating elsewherewheres, you see. While he was in one being, probably he says, "Never again shall I be an officer of the Upper 3D Galactic Space Ranger Empire. This is it, man." And he expresses that by saying, "I think I'll be a janitor in my next life." See, his be-ingness is invalidated.

Possibly, you could romance as to what was behind this exact picture, but the very great possibility, which he didn't admit to, was the possibility he was actually, probably, responsible for safeguarding this particular zone, civilization, or area. You see. He was probably the boy who had said, "Well, now, I'm the boy who's supposed to safeguard all this and I'm taking care of it." And probably it was being done with a huge number of electronic mechanisms of some kind or another, you see, or something like that. And his postulates made then are carrying forward now. And he's in electronics, and he's trying to build a what? He doesn't know. So very often he feels very pointless, you know. He builds something and it goes into a little box and it makes a whistling sound, you see. And that's great, but that isn't it.

And everybody says, "But that is it. That unlocks the door, you see. I mean when you press this button, the whistle resonates, and it locks and unlocks the door, and it does it." "And *well-ell*, I don't know, I'm not satisfied with it", you know. And he gets a reputation as being a perfectionist. Actually, he's no perfectionist at all. He's a not-thereness case because that isn't what he had to invent to prevent the destruction of the city. See, he had to invent a gadget to prevent the destruction of the city, but he never formulated it. So he's still trying to formulate the gadget for the destruction of the city.

In other words, he's got a game going here, and the game is simply the formulation of gadgets which prevent the destruction of cities. And we run a can't-have on destruction of cities on other people by the formulation of gadgets. And you'll find out this'll slop over into
his life. It regulates his whole life. It's just like he's in an Iron Maiden of "I-am-supposed-to's", you see.

He goes down the street and he finds that the people emptying the wastepaper – litter baskets, you see, they bang the cans back and very often dent them, you know. Or they bung up the sidewalk or something like this, and he feels very something or other about that, you know. He's quite emotional about it. He writes letters to the *times* and does all kinds of things. He's very upset about this. The preservation of these litter baskets and so on, you see. It's all just a tiny little gradient of the destruction of the city, don't you see.

And he's very preservative in this particular line. And he sees somebody tearing a building down to build a skyscraper, and he says, "Oh, no. No, no, no, no, no, no. That shouldn't be. Hm-mm. Hm-mm."

Shouldn't be. Somebody is moving a brick in this city, you see. That's the basic thing, is somebody is changing something slightly about this city that looks like it might possibly be a destruction. And he can't even analyze that it's a betterment of it, see. And he gets this instantaneous emotional response that he himself can't analyze. And it'll all be pinned up on that series of goals which are right there, looking at this window.

You see how the mechanism of Goals Processing works? If you understand the exact mechanism of why it works, you can make this thing fly. And nobody's going to tell you, you shouldn't make it fly, either.

There's ways of making Goals Processes fly like mad. You – pc says... "Well, have you got a – what goals have you had?"

"Well, I've had a goal to keep my job and wash my teeth every morning and – um – make a fair salary, and I've had a goal of being not too observed in life. And I've had a goal of, well, I've had a goal of just doing my job. And that's it. That's it. That's right. That's it."

"Well, do you have any more goals?"

"No, no. I told you, I told you. That's it."

Well, now from this point on, don't you see, you always get to this point with a pc whether or not he's given you a hundred and thirty or three. That point occurs when he's telling you that's it and there are no more. When you've just about at that point begun to knock on this door, see, of the E-Meter and you're saying, [knocks on the table] "Hey! Hey! Open up and show us the stuck picture, huh?" *Uhh-uhh.* Be painful. The thing is an overwhelming situation.

Now if you led in on a gradient scale like this, and he gave you "to have a job" and so forth, and you say, "Good. All right." And you write it down.

And you got this list, and now you go back over the first one of these things, "to have a job." And you say, "Well, all right. That's fine. All right. I'm going to read this goal to you. To have a job. To have a job. Well, what picture do you have?"

"Well", he says, "it's this big granary. And there's these huge machines, and so on. Well, I've never seen that picture before much except it's there all the time." [laughter]
"Well, that's fine. Let's see what this is all about." See.

But we can go on and say "To have a job, to have a job", and it disappears, and we say, "You got the picture now?"

"No."

We didn't learn anything more about it. We didn't have to. All right. And "To brush my teeth every morning", and you say, "To brush my teeth every morning. To brush my teeth every morning." This thing is increasing. "All right. Let's go to the next one." And so forth. And we read that one off and we get that one erased. And we get back to this "brush my teeth every morning." We say, "To brush my teeth every morning." And it's increasing.

"What picture you got there?"

"Oh, it's a seascape."

This is pretty wild, isn't it? Brush his teeth – seascape. Well, at least there's water in both of them. [laughter] And you say, "Well, tell me some more about that picture."

"Well, there isn't anything more to tell you about the picture. It's just a seascape", and so forth.

And you say, "Well, is there anything you've forgotten about that picture? Anything you'd rather not-know about that picture? Anything you don't know about that picture?"

"Anything I don't know? There is everything I don't know about the picture. I don't know what sea it is. I don't know where it is. I don't know where it's located. I don't know anything connected with it, so forth. Don't know this. Don't know that. Don't know the other thing, and so on."

And you say, "Well now, what do you know about it?"

"Oh, well, I can tell you a little more about it now", and so forth.

And all of a sudden he says, "You know, that's funny, I'd forgotten all about that, but in World War II, I was a scuba diver. And we used to have to go in, you know, locate these mines and stuff under the water all the time. I was only on that duty a few months. Funny, I'd forgotten all about it, you know. And it's the taste of this god damned oil. This god damned oil, you know. I can taste it now.", you know. [laughter]

And you say, "Well, what do you think a fellow chewing on oil like that would think he ought to be doing?"

Well, he says, "He ought to be brushing his teeth every morning!" [laughter]

That's the end of that goal. See how you could knock them out? You could just knock them out by the count if they didn't go very easily or something of this sort.

And then you eventually will get onto a goal line on the bulk of cases which is "every time they're in a tight spot they say 'I should be a schoolteacher'" Doesn't matter what's happening to them. They're running a P-99 Interceptor, and they just shot down their hundred and
fifteenth enemy plane, and at that moment the instrument panel disintegrates in front of them, and they say, "I should be a schoolteacher." You see.

Or they're a clerk, and they're selling bolt goods in a store, you know. And they keep selling these bolts goods and so forth, and people keep saying take down another one. Take down another one. And the whole store is at last nothing but bolts of cloth, all unstrung, and the lady says, "No, I just don't see what I want." And they say at that moment, inevitably, "I should be a schoolteacher." You see? And it's just the goal which, for some peculiar reason, it is so asinine, it doesn't connect with anything, and they never do become a schoolteacher except this lifetime. And now by accident they became a schoolteacher. And being a schoolteacher, of course, puts all of these things into restim.

And they're having a hell of a time in life, because, you see, they're shooting down their hundred and fifty-fifth aircraft with a P-99 Fighter and so forth. They're teaching the little kids, you know: say your A's, say your B's, say your C's – and these guns are going off, [laughter] here's the pilot, you know. And then they finally say, "Well, I guess I must be a nervous type." You see what's happening. God help somebody who has actually realized his chief goal on the whole track. [laughs]

You see what – you see the words and music that would go on as he started to run it out. So that is what goals are all about. But you could actually sit there and take apart any goal that was sticking. You could take it apart similarly if you ... You should investigate the mechanism, you should get a subjective and objective reality on some of these mechanisms and see exactly how they look to you. And you could play it by ear. You won't be sitting there slavishly, you know, saying "Well, Ron said read it three times, and I don't know why I'm reading it three times."

Of course, you're in a game situation, too, because you're sitting there reading it three times and you're liable to say to yourself, "Well, I wish I was a, a..." [laughs, laughter] There goes your old games condition. You get into a games condition on the subject of a goals condition. And you see how easily that could happen?

So what you should do is observe. I'll tell you a fundamental auditor error. Do you want to hear the fundamental auditor error? A fundamental auditor error is to fail to discover what the pc is doing with the auditing command and what the pc is looking at. All summed up under what the pc is doing – subheads, observing, thinking, feeling, any other subhead you want – but all summed up under: What is the pc doing? What's the pc looking at? What's the pc involved with now? Does the pc all of a sudden run into a problem here? The pc's aspect changes, any way, better or worse and you don't find out about it – oh, what the hell! What are you doing? Flying on instruments in the fog and rain in northern England? What is this all about? Why should you do that? There's no point in it.

The pc's sitting there. Now the pc is supposed to be in communication with you, but how about you being in communication with the pc? See, that's the other side of the coin. And let me tell you, you'll fold up someday if you don't keep the other side of the coin bright.

Pc in communication with you. That's supposed to be in the rules, but how about you staying in communication with the pc? And that is all under the heading of "Just what's the pc doing?" You know? What's going on? What's cooking, good looking, you know. That sort of
Q & A PERIOD, ANATOMY AND ASSESSMENT OF GOALS

a thing, you know. What's happening here? And you should make it a point, even though it makes your auditing terribly arduous and is very clumsy at first and seems to extend it out ad nauseam and puts hours in on – on a result length from your viewpoint, you know.

It wouldn't matter. This wouldn't matter. Just every time the pc does something different or every time the tone arm goes to a new high or a new low, you know. Not each time it flicks, between, you know – while it's rising. But it finally gets up to 4. It's been going from 3 and a quarter on up, and it gets up to 4. And it seems to be hanging there at 4. Say, "What's happening?" You know? "What's happening?" You know? It means something. Pc twitches. Pc does something else. Pc coughs, sneezes, seems to get his eyes watering.

Change has occurred. Investigate the points of change. No change is occurring. Investigate the points of no change. Find out what the pc is doing. And the pc very seldom resents this. It's a primary failure in auditing. Has been the primary failure since 1950. It's a failure to discover what the pc is doing. What's going on? Now when I tell you that every time you've got a goal that was sticky on the pc, the pc had a picture, how many of you have asked and found this out as a personal observation. And how many of you have found out that it's always a disrelated picture. If it's really stuck, it's quite disrelated.

Brush your teeth; he's got a seascape. Got the idea? Every time you say brush your teeth, he's got a seascape. What's this? Your curiosity should be aroused about that point; you should find out why. It's an interesting thing.

Now, wrong thing to do is go chasing all over the bank and chasing seascapes all over the bank, and trying to run engrams all over the bank, and that sort of thing while doing a Goals Assessment, and just restimulating everything in sight, and so forth. That's not what I'm asking you to do. I'm just asking you to find out what's there and get the pc to look at what's there. Because the more you make a pc look, the more the pc's going to as-is, and the more the pc's going to understand. And that's for sure. That's a cardinal law.

And the auditor who won't make a pc look, the auditor who is not himself curious about what's going on with the pc, presents to the pc an attitude of disinterest. And if you feel your auditor is disinterested, just attribute it to one thing: He's probably just going over the methods by rule of thumb, and he's not asking you what you're doing.

Now on the auditor's side of it, you would present the same aspect, if you never asked. And the way to present an interested face is just be snoopy. The way to convince a pc that you're terribly interested is not protest and demonstrate you're doing your job right and all of this sort of thing. That is not the way to go about it.

The way to go about it is simply to be snoopy. "What are you doing? What are you looking at? What's been happening?" You get the idea? And you get some kind of a brief answer, and it doesn't seem to be leading anyplace. And it doesn't mean very much. Well, you say, "All right, all right, all right." And you're liable to find out that this is the reason ARC breaks are being caused with the pc, is you're just not being snoopy enough.

Now, that's a hard thing to teach to people who have been educated into "the invasion of privacy is bad." But in this particular case, the invasion of privacy is absolutely necessary. You've got to find out what's going on. The pc's eyes go shut on you. The pc's been sitting
there brightly alert, and all of a sudden goes blooong, and so forth. Well, the second it happens, don't jump him. Don't be so quivery. Look at him for a command or two. Now say, "Now, what's going on?" The pc's surprised enough at first, you see, without you surprising him too. [laughter]

But, let him have it for a couple of more commands, and then say, "What went on?" But maybe a couple of more commands, his eyes opened up, and he was bright. And he's all cheerful. And again you say, "What happened?" You know? I don't care how you say it. You don't have to say "What happened?" or something like this, see. You say, "Hey! What happened?"

"Oh, wow!"

You know? He's liable to give you some kind of a stuff like this, and he's never had anything much to say to you before, you see. And he's saying, "You see, all these dark octopuses came swimming up out of this particular area. What do you think that has to do with getting my watch fixed?"

That's fantastic, you know. What's it got to do with it, you know? And you found a heck of a big not-know on the thing. Well, help him out. Say, "Well, what have you forgotten about octopuses?"

"Huh, they're timely." I'm sure it's something like that. "That isn't right. No. No. That isn't right. I don't know. What have I forgotten about octopuses? Forgotten about – never knew any octopuses. I never met any personally. What's it got to do with getting my watch fixed?"

You say, "What have you forgotten about watches?"

"I don't know. I haven't forgotten anything about watches, except I'm always forgetting the t – I always forget my watch every morning. I always forget my watch every morning. Oh, I know. I know. My first wife, ah, yeah, I got it. She ought to say, 'If I had as many arms as an octopus and carried a watch on each one of them, I still wouldn't know ...' " [laughs, laughter]

So what he's got. He's all – you're all ready, you see, for a whole track exposé, you see, and you get something totally different. That's it.

Now, I want you to get snoopy and you'll see this goals mechanism. The not-is of where he is and the elsewhereness of where he is, then inhibits the where he is, so of course this sticks the whole bank and gives him a whole bank and gives him his reactive mind.

The primary source of the reactive mind is not hidden creativeness. It's hidden elsewhereness. The guy wants to be elsewhere all the time. Well, if he wants to be elsewhere all the time and he creates where he is, he never as-ises it, and he winds up with a whole kit and caboodle, doesn't he? Which, I suppose, at some time on the track, he considered a nice trick in order to accumulate havingness, but he has since found that it was more of a curse than a trick. You see what that is?

So the creation of the reactive mind depends on elsewhereness. Elsewhereness is best expressed by a goal. All goals, of course, run back to an area which is not-ised, or which he
didn't want to have anything to do with. I want you to look at this mechanism while you're assessing, and also in using your Security Checks, run Not-Know on the incident that turns up. This is the Goals Assessment I've been talking about in this lecture, so I don't want you to get disoriented here. The question has to do with rape. You say, "What's not-known about rape? What have you forgotten about rape? Is there any rapes that you've forgotten about?" Some such question. "What shouldn't be known on the subject of rape?" Anything like this. Bang! You start to get reactions all over the place, and he's in the middle of a heck of a great big incident of some kind or another. Well, don't expect some automaticity's going to erase the incident. Ask him what he could not-know about that incident. What's unknown about that incident? What's he forgotten about that incident. You got the idea?

Flatten the incident. Get the needle action off of the incident. And then get the needle action off of the question again. In other words, when you're taking a security question and running Security Checks by Know and Not-Know, Forget, Remember, you know. When you're running them that way, take the needle action off the question, for sure, as your basic goal, as it always has been. But when incidents turn up, take the needle action off the incidents with Not-Know. It's a fast way and it'll run engrams very heavily. In other words, you're doing two things. You ask him Not-Know about rape, and he's all of a sudden stuck, for God's sakes, in the middle of something wild about rape.

Ask him what he can not-know about the incident, and ask him until that needle goes cool.

Okay? Right.

[end of lecture]
UNKNOWN – CYCLIC ASPECT OF GOALS

A lecture given on 16 August 1961

Thank you.

This is the 16th of August, AD 11, and the subject of today's lecture is "unknown". By the way, there's a letter up in Suzie's basket, and there's an unstamped letter up in there, both very important, so let's make sure we get them tonight in the mail. It's very important. One has to do with boats, and the other with photography. [laughs]

People get the idea that I don't do my job. Actually, they believe probably now that I'm never going to write this book about SOP Goals clearing. And you'll notice that I wanted the Prehav Scale complete before that, and I was not satisfied with our Prehav Scale. I didn't think it had completed its evolution. And sure enough, we have various levels on the Prehav Scale. Your Prehav Scale, actually, should have No Motion taken off of it and Problem put in its place. And all of the emotions which have ever been listed, any emotion which has ever been listed at any time, in any scale, any place, goes in the Prehav Scale, ending with Hide. Hide is an emotion. It's the bottom of the Prehav Scale. It isn't really the bottom of the Prehav Scale. Unconscious is below that – but try and run it.

So into your Prehav Scale, pour the whole Knowingness Scale which ends in Hide. Bottom of the Knowingness Scale is Hide. Bottom of the Emotional Scale is Hide. And these two things come down in a parallel and suddenly turn into a V at the bottom. Interesting, isn't it?

But there's where the Emotional Scale and the Knowledge Scale cross – at Hide. Knowledge becomes an emotion when one hides. If you don't believe it, watch somebody who knows something that somebody is after him to find out. He's actually not registering any other emotion than Hide, and it's a bad emotion. I mean it's uncomfortable. And that is why your Security Checks work so well.

All right. There's one more item here, and that is the organizations are about to get a Security Check, which is a Security Check, and I will go into this very rapidly.

It is Security Check Form 7A and Form 7B. HCO WW Security Form 7A and HCO WW Security Form 7B. And these are the pair which will be making their debut very shortly. And you should be aware of the fact that those two Security Checks now, all by themselves, are run without clearing. They have two different purposes. One is for employment with an organization, and that is 7A, and one is for the person who has been on staff for some time.

Yeah, that's right. That's – 7A is for the person who has been around for a long time. And 7B is for the one who is newly seeking employment with the organization.
Now, I'd better clear this up with you because you say, "Well, Ron never said anything about that", when you get home. And you'll have an argument of some kind or another, so I'd better clear it up right away. Those things are used just like the original Security Check was used.

We don't now have a valid security form which is used for its original intent and purpose or is used the same way. They've all moved over into processing. And you can clear any of them. So 7A and 7B – luck or unluck, the word seven; indivisible prime number – is an uncompromising check. It's easy to remember because seven is a sort of a nonmathematical, nonfactorable number – noncompromising.

It takes only about ten minutes to do one. It is very short. They have only about twenty questions. Those questions are all blood questions. They would be the kind of a thing that if the fellow did that kind of a thing, you wouldn't want him in the Central Organization. You got the idea? So you read it for instant read. And you just start at the top and you go to the bottom. And if the needle falls, he's failed it. The only other precaution you would take would be the compartmentation of the question. And if the needle is falling on it, obviously, not on some of its component parts, that's it. The Security Check is flunked. That's the original approach.

But now that you know about instant read and latent read on a Security Check, this makes all the difference. Now, it's only instant reads that flunk. This is not one of the questions, but "Do you make a habit of getting your fellow staff members fired by spreading tales about them?" or something like that? You see?

All right. Instant read. Bang! Happens right now. That's it. You don't clear it. You find out if the needle is falling on the question, but you don't clear the question. You don't want to know anything from the person you're administering that check to. You don't want to know a thing. It's just totally between you and the E-Meter. If it falls, that's it. He's had it.

It's a matter of "get audited!" It's a matter of this, a matter of that. But he has flunked a Security Check, and it's an insecure personnel. Now, remember, this check can only be that savage because it only has vital things which would get the organization or its staff members in trouble if this person were consistently doing them. You understand?

And so therefore, it hasn't any fog questions to it. So when doing this thing, don't go adding any variations to the questions. That's the other rule that goes with it. Don't go varying this thing around as though you were clearing the question, see? If it falls on that fact, that is it. And don't now ask parallel, rephrased questions of some kind or another in order to get a better read or something like that. Now, you can compartment the question. Now, you know what I mean by compartmenting the question. You read it phrase by phrase and find out that it's falling on beautiful women, you see. And it has nothing to do with the rest of the question. It just falls on beautiful women. See?

It falls on staff members, but it doesn't fall on "Do you make a habit of getting other staff members in trouble?" See. It doesn't fall on any parts of it except staff members. Staff members, falls. Well, it's not part of your security question, so you go on. He didn't flunk it. It didn't fall on the question. It fell on staff members only. You do that by reading the various phrases of the thing and finding out what part it falls on. Because it is true that if you read a
full question and get an instant reaction, bang! like that, immediately after you read the thing, that one of two conditions can obtain. And condition one is that the person is simply falling on the question. Meaning he has beaucoup withholds, himself, in person. Instant read, you see. Latent read. That's for somebody else, a closely associated question or something else. But you got – just your instant read falls on that, that's it. On number 7 that just flunks the person getting the Security Check. All right.

Now, the second way that this thing could fall, as you already know, is "Do you make – a habit – out of getting your fellow staff members – in trouble?" See, you watch that needle each time. Is it falling on one of those phrases independently? Well, if it's falling on a phrase independently, the next time you read the question as a whole, it'll fall on the question or not, as the case may be. Don't you see? You can clear that thing up, in other words. But it won't fall on the question of a whole, once you've compartmented it. So if it falls just on some part of the question and doesn't fall on the question as a whole, on the reread, of course that's not a flunk. Do you see how that is?

"Has the cat ever PD Hed you?" You see. That sort of thing. And you'll notice that after you've taken a question to pieces and asked its various parts, the person associates well enough on the question that it's only if the question itself is true as a whole that you'll get an instant read after reading it. You look a little fogged on it. How do you feel about that?

Audience: Okay.

Seem all right?

Audience: Hm-mm.

All right. Are there any questions about 7 – 7A, 7B? Yes?

Male voice: Just to clear it, Ron. You take the – once you've compartmented the question and you find it is coming – falling on the compartment, when you read the question again, it will then null if there is no fall on the question itself.

That's right.

Male voice: Thank you.

Okay. This 7A, 7B will be useful for organizations. And it would be – if you went security checking for an organization or something like this, you would use forms 7A, 7B. You wouldn't use any other form. You wouldn't use old Form 3 or something like that.

In other words, you could do a person in fifteen minutes. You can do one of these things almost as fast as you can read, because the instantaneous character of the reactive mind is not fully appreciated by you yet; not fully appreciated. It's quick – hah! It's quick. It's wrong, but it sure is quick.

Well, there's a basic definition of the purposes of the reactive mind in Book One. I've never had any reason to change that. It's a mind that acts without the person having to inspect, and so all of its content is uninspected. So the person has to, himself, have conceived that he himself is inadequate, before he develops a reactive mind.

Female voice: "I have a question. You said fall ..."
Hm?

*Female voice:* "You said if the question fell ..."

Reacted.

*Female voice:* "Reacted?"

Reacted.

*Female voice:* "Okay."

You're running into the colloquialism of you say a needle fall, you mean a motion. It's a carelessly used phrase, and it's just – it's just been too long that we only thought they fell. You see? I'm sorry. You shouldn't use fall. Don't do as I say, do as you're supposed to do. I say "fell" carelessly. Reacted. But let me tell you something. As far as this goes, you will only get falls. Fall is also correct.

When you've got a fellow who is guilty on the line, you won't find any theta bops or anything else on the thing. It goes *pow*! I don't care if he's security-checkable or not security-checkable or anything else. You ask it with good intention, and it hits right in the middle of the reactive bank. It'll restimulate. And it'll get a fall.

Now, there's a liability on all Security Checking. Person has to be up to having some responsibility of some character or another. Otherwise you don't get the thing falling as it clears from the reactive to the analytical mind. See, the reactive mind doesn't fall because it isn't alive. Your reactive mind is not alive. The reactive mind has to be energized. An automobile with no fuel in the gas tank goes nowhere. And the reactive mind without some energization, can't do anything.

Now, the fellow could be totally a reactive mind at which time he'd behave like an analytical mind, and you find them in institutions. You don't find them outside, believe it or not. I mean a person who isn't only capable of dramatizing one engram, of course, long since has either kicked the bucket or walked over the edge of the cliff or has been scooped up by the little boys in their white coats with their butterfly nets.

There has to be an energizing factor. Now, energy only exists where a person has a bit of responsibility. The thetan is putting out energy. Only a thetan can put out energy. Energy doesn't come from food. The thetan has to think the food has energized him, so he energizes it, see? Dead tissue is very amazing. Because you can feed it into motors and engines, you see, and because it then does something. Why people think that when they eat they get energy. That's quite interesting.

The body *is* a carbon-oxygen engine that runs at a temperature of 98.6, just like a Grey diesel runs at 185 F. You see? I mean it's the same deal. But the difference is that a diesel runs when the engineer has left the engine on, but a body doesn't. So it is not a total engine. See, this is actually a different kind of engine.

It requires somebody around at the crank, who is pretending the engine is running. And the fellow is around at the crank, and if he grinds the crank fast enough and doesn't notice that he's grinding the crank fast enough, then he thinks the engine is running. And he's very happy about it. But it's not really quite an engine. It follows all the rules of an engine,
you know. It requires fuel and it runs on heat, and it furnishes motive power, and everything is just fine, but it won't run after the engineer's left the engine room. It just goes goomp, fub.

You should see some of these big – great big steam generator plants that they – the wogs been building – the old days. Boy, they were Rube Goldbergian things to end them all, you know. Great big steam generators, triple-expansion Curtis steam turbines, you know. And, boy, they were running at a high scream. I don't know what they made, seventeen thousand rpm or something like this. And reduction gears went down, and it turned great big generators, and huge cables ran out to switchboard. Boy, they were marvelous. And more gimmicks and gadgets and levers you could pull.

And my strongest memory of one of these things is being gotten very cross at one time because I dared whistle in the place, you know. And obviously, obviously, the engines were supposed to make all the noise. No small boy was supposed to.

Anyway, you can walk out of the building, walk around the block, practically take off a weekend, and one of these automatic stoke – preferably an oil boiler sort of thing – just goes on running. You come back, it's running at the same rate of speed. Remarkable. You walk out of the place. You walk back in, take a look at it. Yeah, it's still running. Same rate of speed. You exteriorize from a body, go past Arcturus, and come back and pick it up, you'll find its temperature has dropped.

And it's very embarrassing, too. I remember down in Europe one time, I left the body at an inn, and went over and went through a couple of capers and did something of the sort, and came back to pick up this body, and by God, they'd buried it. [laughter] They just did it. And took all of its accouterments to pay for the funeral of course. Terrible. Ah, well, wogs. Anyway ...

Now, a perfectly good doll body won't do this. You won't get a doll body doing this. Doll bodies either run on power packs and switchboards – at which they are very close to robot bodies. You know, they're self-energized in some fashion or another, or they're hooked up in communications or something of the sort.

Or a true doll body – and a true doll body comes as close to this definition of "the engine that won't run without the engineer present" as you can possibly get. And a true doll body has absolutely no machinery in it of any kind whatsoever. It doesn't have a single cogwheel in it. It is simply a sheath. And you pick it up and make it walk around. And then you put it down and there it is. And of course, it's usually made by some of the better metal companies, and the thing doesn't rust or anything like that. And you can get it wet and get it dry, and get it ice-cold; it's usually quite impervious to temperature. And you can get it at 200 degrees centigrade, and it doesn't go to pieces. And you can get it up to 2 or 300 degrees – I mean, minus 200 degrees centigrade below the pressures when gasses turn into fluids. You can get it below that, and it still is all right. You get it above that a couple of hundred degrees, and it doesn't heat up or jam or anything. And that's a good doll body. That's a – that's a real doll.

Now, those that get energized and so on, have the little cogwheels and the "thingamabbits" and the thing where somehow or another you make its head turn, and it hits the button over here that makes it go nya, nya, nya, nya, and so on. That's getting in close to robot,
but it's a thetan motivated set of motors. And the thetan furnishes the energy which pours the current through. You get the idea? The thetan — he puts a little energy in, and then the motor puts a lot of energy in. That's helping you out real good, you see.

And now those things, because of their electrical connections and because electricity and so on, tends to have funny things happen to it. And it does have — electricity does have remarkable things happen to it as the result of temperature. And because it does have resistances and capacitors and things like this in it, it's narrowed the band, you see? It narrowed the band of tolerance, the temperature tolerance plus and minus is getting quite narrow.

And usually they'll build these things so that none of the cogwheels have to be greased or something like that, but nevertheless, expansion and contractions of metal may cause them to freeze and so on. And you start getting into trouble with this type of doll body. Move just a little bit further, and you've got a robot. And that is a body with no thetan in it. And you'll run into these types of bodies on the track.

A pc's sitting in them as valences and that sort of thing. You should have some kind of a grip on the variation of the things. There is the pure doll body which, of course, is no machinery, no connections, no nothing. I mean they just — when you get rid of a doll body, when you take a doll body off, you stand it in the corner, and of course it just goes into a bunch of metal. You know, it's just like taking off a dress. You just drop the dress and it goes crunch, and it's not even stiff. Then there's of course the one that has the machinery that helps you out and narrows the tolerances, and then, of course, there's the robot.

And then, of course, there's the biological body, and that is something that helps you out enormously. And it is a cousin to this middle type of body that's got the machinery in it and the "gimmagahooogits" and the "gilhoolies" and the junk. And its tolerance, because it's biological, is so narrow as to be frightening. It is fantastic! I mean, in its lack of tolerance of temperatures and lack of tolerance of velocities, lack of tolerance of impacts and so forth.

And you try to walk one of these bodies around at 20 degrees Fahrenheit plus, and it'd very shortly be in trouble. Unless it's assisted considerably, you see. And you try to walk it around very much at a 130 degrees Fahrenheit, and once more it is in trouble unless it is assisted enormously. And its band, you might say, is probably somewhere in the vicinity of about 100 degrees Fahrenheit, is about the only band you've got. Of course, that makes it totally unusable in space travel. Just totally useless. Man will never get off into space, into planets or anything else until he wakes up on this subject.

Now, the way they wake up might also be of interest to you, but they start artificializing bodies. They don't actually, suddenly realize that there are thetans and all this kind of thing. They start artificializing pieces of biological bodies. They've done it — doing it now. They put in a mechanical voice into somebody who has no voice. And they put in mechanical hearing and mechanical this and that. And pretty soon, some guy will make the Salk vaccine discovery of the century, which is television screen installed back of the eyelids to let the blind see. Oh, this would be marvelous. I can just see the scientists now. The marvels of modern science, and so forth.

Why don't they do it now? They need a small television camera and a knife and some aseptic surgery. But gradually, why, they displace various parts of the body. Then they go on
a very hectic got-to-survive! Got to survive! And they won't let anybody die. And they're right there right now. We're living right in the early beginnings of this thing. They must not die. Huuuuuuuuu!

And some bird – half his head's gone, his right leg's been torn off in the accident, and he's going to look like hamburger for the rest of his life, and so the medicos roll up their sleeves, you know, and they put in a silver skull, and they put in an artificial leg. And then they hook the thing up and connect it all up with the crisscrosses so he twitches the nerve someplace or another, and something else doesn't happen, you see. And they got it all taped, you see.

And, well, this is the artificialization process. And this will go on for some time, a century or two, and they'll gradually put more and more "gilhoolies" and "gimmagahoolits", and so forth, which are substitutes for the biological parts of the body. And what they're really doing is building this second class of body. Not a real doll body, but they're building this second class of body.

And eventually they'll get this guy totally rebuilt, you see, and he'll be hardly any biological parts, and then they'll realize that they - the printed circuit that they have put in it, you know, that is probably what's making it run. And it's very mysterious, but it's probably this. And there'll be some vast theories on it. One of these false sciences will come up on the thing, you know, about the very small energy wavelengths that "whirly-girg" around the "capacitugs." And you get this all mucked up one way or the other, but this guy is still operative, you see.

And he's moved out of the biological sphere, and they'll find his temperature tolerance is now wider. Ah, now somebody will brighten up and say, "Well now, if a person were fixed up like that, and this sort of a deterioration has gone on – we haven't let this fellow die through twenty-eight accidents, and so forth, and he's got no biological left, and he's all metal, and so help me Pete, this fellow really will do well in space." And so they fire him off to some planet. And they get up on the moon, and it's 200 degrees centigrade one way or the other way. And its – freezes up some of his parts, and they keep trying it again, you see, and they keep messing it up and trying it again and then they get very interested about the thing. And one day they build one of these things, and they omit the printed circuit – accidents, you know – and it functions. This guy still functions.

They didn't put the circuit inside the chest, you know? [laughter] And they still don't know anything about thetans, you see? And it functions without the printed circuit.

So they start fooling around and they start cutting down on the juice of one or something like this, you know, putting smaller and smaller batteries in it or something, to make the guy function. And then they find out there's no batteries much – and no printed circuit and no batteries much. And about this time they invent a new religion. [laughter]

It's really God doing all this, you see. Some god or another. And science moves straight over – right in that zone somewhere during those medical discoveries, science moves straight over into a wingding, religious, space opera type of existence. Nobody knows what cooks, what's happening or anything, but they've got it over in the banner – the borderline here.
And science is religion. And now you have to believe Newton's laws, and you have to believe this and that, you see. And you're liable to be charged for heresy in the midst of one of the finest chromium-plated courtrooms, you know, with everything going whir, clunk, you know, and teledisc typewriters that take down all of the thing, you know. This – the judge's speaking causes the machines to go, you know. And the sentence is carried out mechanically. The moment that they say guilty – the jury says guilty, why, big fingers pick up the fellow out of the – out of the box, you see, and put him on an endless vacuum hoisted express and land him up in a preservation body-in-pawn-type jail, you see. I mean it's all very modern, you know. Boy, have they got the scientific principles, but the charge will be heresy.

You see, they've gone the whole circle now. Science having escaped religion has arrived right back in the lap of it again, because they don't understand what's happening here; without the printed circuits, this guy operates – there's – must be something wrong here someplace. So anyhow ...

If they last long enough, if the society lasts long enough, they will eventually back out into real doll bodies with a sort of a quasi-religious sort of an atmosphere, you see.

Well, all the time they're going up the track of this – and sometimes it takes thousands of years to do this whole evolution – they get back up the track on this thing, and they've only been doing it to a few in the society. And what's this been doing to a handful of thetans? See? Not very many thetans. You know, a matter of hundreds, or something like this. Well, what's happening to these fellows?

Well, they're getting conditioned back into, getting familiar with once more, running a pure doll body. And they're developing this facility, and they don't do it by processing. They do it by familiarization. And they gradually get up into a point where they kind of know what they're doing. You see?

They're not very aware. Their ethical level is something that you would sniff at, you see. But here they are. And they can actually – just a handful of guys – and they can run real, honest doll bodies. Not only that. They can step out of one doll body which has been in a crash and pick up a new doll body on the assembly line. And they can operate it. And say, "Yeah, my name is John Jones, No. 780-Tk-Z-Thrip", and all of a sudden they are a caste. They are a hierarchy.

And this hierarchy of a few hundred will go along, and they'll actually run the whole cotton-picking shooting match, because what can anybody do to them? Nothing. Their doll bodies are made out of impervium, and they take a higher tolerance of impact than can be delivered by the normal bullet.

You've created a doll-body hierarchy. And this doll-body hierarchy then moves further and further, and then these fellows commit overts as dolls, and commit overts and commit overts. They still don't know really what they are or what they're doing. And they're all mixed up with God, too, remember. They think they're God's anointed or something And next thing you know they lose two or three of them, you see. And then they lose two or three more, and then in desperation the last five or six or seven or something like this, will gang up and say, "Well, they're not going to do away with us! We're not going to get lost", you see? And then they stand in, running some kind of a galactic empire of some kind or another, but they get
lost just like anybody else because their overts keep piling up on them, you see. And then they disappear into the track, and that'll be the end of one of these doll-body hierarchies.

Usually about that time, things have gone so bad, and the biologicals are all in a state of super-communist – excuse me, slavery – no, excuse me, communism. And everything is all supersocialized so that what's mine is yours, is the state's, and nothing is mine, and nothing is yours. And after a while nothing is the state's either, you see. Try to run a tractor that isn't owned by an individual, a company or a state. It won't run very long. And the thing comes about then – the final denouement of all of this is, of course, that this folds up by reason of law or lack of management, it's too involved, goes sploopy – bang! And you wind up with a disintegrated galactic society.

And then splinters of this society will start making it on their own. And they'll go on an independent evolutionary track.

And Earth isn't a splinter of such a group, by the way. Earth was a kind of a territory that was sitting out here, minding its own business. It was actually part of the Biological Survey Park Reserves. This had no more importance on the full track than that. That's right. And its current importance is that it might form a bridge into the basic galaxy on the rim of which it sits.

But anyway, then these splinters, they'll pick it up, and through the thousands of years and so on, they will gradually start this process once more of medical substitution, mental implantation, fixing up the mechanical voice box, and then somebody finally gets fission going, and then they decide they're going to fire one off into space. And then they find the biologicals can't stand it. And they keep nagging at this idea of getting man into space, sometimes for decades, sometimes for centuries. Then eventually they get a total semi-doll. You know, a doll robot. That sort of a combo, and they'll find out that that is a form which can go into space. And of course all these boys all get familiar again with space opera, high blast velocity weapons, everything else, the whole thing works out. You got a space opera society, you got a hierarchy. Your hierarchy, of course, dwindles down by overts. You got a few left, so you got an empire. And then your empire, the overts get to these last boys; they dissolve, bang! The thing splinters up. And that's the way it's been going. Might be interesting to you in investigating somebody's track.

That isn't the only type of evolution there is. But when Darwin was talking about evolution – the evolution which I have just said, is a far truer picture of actual evolution than, "Well, it was the vast sea, and it was an ammonia sea, and there was a little spontaneous combustion somewhere in it", [laughter] "and this spontaneous combustion was a cell. Now, isn't that cute, kiddies?"

And then with other fairy tales, we finally get this thing all built up. The actual facts behind this, you see, are so outrageously different that it makes it very, very funny, you know.

Here are a bunch of guys sweating like mad around drawing boards saying, "What is an optimum zebra", you know. "I don't like that. I don't like that design. He's not well camouflaged particularly. What particular type of continent is he fitting on?"

"Well, he's fitting on an X9 continent. Perfectly well designed for an X9 continent."
"Yes, I know. But an X9 continent doesn't have any red flora."

"Reds are – oh, well, that's true", see, "make them orange. Okay. That's nice looking zebra, so forth. And what's his habitats? And what's his various morale and what he's supposed to eat, and how's he supposed to congregate, and what's supposed to prey on him, and what's he supposed to keep down?" And get it all figured out. Great big computers going, you know. Make IBM down here look like a child's typewriting machine, you know.

And these things are going **whirr, whirr, clank.** And they finally get a bunch of thetans, and they say, "How would you like to be a zebra?" Ha-ha. [laughter] "Here are the advantages of being a zebra. Here's the list of now-I'm-supposed-to's." And we eventually see some thetans around, and they're getting all educated in various directions or another in being zebras. And they finally get so supereducated on the subject of zebras, they can do nothing but zebra.

And you got it all made. They got all the now-I'm-supposed-to's. They know exactly how to fire this one off, and so forth, and so they pack them up and ship them off to X9-type planet. You got zebras. [laughter]

And then somebody slips sooner or later. Somebody skids. Somebody's drawn this thing, and so forth, and he's drawn this body, you know, and got it all set. "What do you think about that, Joe?"

"Well, I don't like that very much."

"Well, what – what's the matter with it?"

"Well, it looks like us." [laughter]

"Yeah, well, I know, it's a biological; it isn't us. Biological."

"Oh, well, got to have a few wogs."

"There's this problem about what's to keep down lions. You realize that you got lions, and there's nothing keeping down lions at all."

"Well, all right. We'll put a few of them on. Make a few of them."

"All right. Okay."

Sent out this volunteer call, "Who would like to be this animal, man?"

Everybody says, "You know, that looks awfully like the gods and kings that are walking around here, you know?" Gods, kings and technicians and other priests.

And so they say, "Well, we have a few blue wogs, you know. We'll put a few wogs down on this X9-type planet, and that'll keep down the lions. And we'll give them a big fixation about lions. You know, they must kill lions. It's all right."

Only trouble is, this particular line is too inviting. So the boys, as they get knocked off in other actions and so forth, see these wogs walking down on an X9-type planet, and they pick them up. But you got an educated technician running the thing. And so he keeps your evolution going.
Homo sapiens. And every once in a while, why, one of these societies will get very excited about the idea, "Do you realize that that planet there has killed off not only all the lions, but now they're starting on the passenger pigeons, and they're starting on this and they're starting on that, and they're knocking off all the buffalo, and so forth. And do you realize that there's a virus there, called Homo sapiens? Do you realize that?"

"Oh, I guess you're right, Joe."

"I tell you, let's get a couple of fellows and let's gen them in real good on the subject of atomic fission."

"I see what you're hitting at." [laughter]

And there it goes. All kinds of weirdies like this go on. Space opera is actually incredible, but space opera is only one phase of civilization. And it's only one phase of the civilization processes. And of course, these types of bodies are only one small fragment of classes of bodies.

There have been bodies, of course, which are just simply spheres. Spheres which can levitate. There's bodies which are triangles, there's bodies in any geometric form. All of it based on the basis the fellow's being nice enough to put up a mock-up to show his location. And on that idea alone, you get the whole idea of bodies.

But of course, some fellow that's sitting around on the edge of a cloud and hasn't got a single thing to do and isn't even – well, just bored stiff, you know. Somebody comes along to him and says, "How would you like to run a grasshopper?"

"What's a grasshopper?"

He's had it. There's his C. There's his C, after it follows his D, and then comes his E, and then comes his I. Of course, they usually make a contract with a fellow like that. And they say well, after he'd been a grasshopper a few thousand years, well, we'll come down and set you free. Then they forget.

And you get a revolutionary spirit entering into all this. All the grasshoppers are mad because they've been forgotten.

All kinds of wild, oddball aspects to civilization, the making of life. All of it goes down to the basic activities of thetans. They forget things, they remember things, they re-familiarize themselves with things, they plot out vast and intricate civilizations and patterns, and so forth. The desire for complexity exceeds their desire for simplicity. And they get into trouble and then don't know where the hell they are, and don't know what they're doing. All kinds of odd circumstances. And out of this tremendous mishmash, why, you get such a thing as this universe and its functions and its distresses, and all that sort of thing.

But you should know, really, that there are various types of bodies of this kind or another.

And if you can find a pc, now, who has a vast allergy to some type of civilization, you've got it made. Got it absolutely made. Because he's got a large section of his track squashed into a not-is, and now you've got the ways and means of releasing a not-is. You've
got the not-know types of processes. And you can release tremendous not-is, off of this particular section of track. All right.

You find somebody – if you were assessing somebody in a calm sort of way, minding your own business sitting there – particularly minding your own business; not inquiring into his because that would be an invasion of privacy – you get your thetan that's sitting across from you, going along all right. And then he says, "Well, I'd always wanted to be a sailor." Yeah, that's a goal. A goal. Sailor. Sailor. Sailor. Now, I'm not telling you to do this, but if you were to say, "Well, what would that –." Because this would be a direct invalidation of his goal. But let's follow it there. Your questioning would be a little more circuitous.

But, "Where would somebody not want to be before he wanted to be a sailor?" – any type of things. And of course, he's got this – the Sahara Desert or something, you see, and he's – some opposite of some kind.

And he says, "Well, uuuaah, I haven't much to do with this."

"What's the matter with that?"

"Uhhh. Ahhhh. I don't know. It's these planets with no vegetation on them, you know, and that sort of thing."

And you say, "Well, what would make a planet with no vegetation on it?"

"Well", he says, "obviously an atomic physicist. But, ha-ha, an atomic physicist. I guess. I just sort of answered it. Yeah, that's right. A planet with no vegetation on it – an atomic physicist. Or – yeah, that's right. Atomic physicist. Well, you don't want to have much to do with that. Ha-ha. Well, let's get on to something else."

And you say, "Well, what about this atomic physicist?"

"Well", he says, "well, let's get on to something else. It's just not a subject that I have any interest in whatsoever."

Now, you run into an impasse like that with a pc, and of course, what have you got? You've got yourself a great big massive scrunch of not-is. And this goal, by the way, is liable to register highly agitatedly. To be atomic – an atomic physicist, of course, is lying behind that, but he can't reach it, you see. The goal is not to be an atomic physicist. And that's a nice, big, whopping, negative goal. Now, you start tearing this goal up, "Well, what could you not-know, you see, about this beingness? What could you not-know about blasted planets?" or something like this, and you just see track just suddenly fill in in all directions, you see.

And all of a sudden, the pc starts getting over his habitual habit patterns. I'm talking about the habit pattern – the pc – you know, he's – he hates to have headaches but somehow or another, even – no matter how much you audit him, he always manages to get a slight headache, you know. And he isn't leading too good a married life, and he – you audit him and it patches up his married life much better, but he's really not quite there.

It's all these not-quites, you see. And you'll find all those not-quites in that bundled piece of track. And it's scrunched right in there, see. If you want to change somebody's attitudes that he desperately wants to change, find out what he – under no circumstances, the goal
he doesn't want to have anything to do with, and then "not-know" that goal to kingdom come. And you all of a sudden will find yourself about the wildest, widest section of track. The fellow says, "Under no circumstances – an Indian society, ho-ho-haha-ha-ho-ho. Not an Indian society – I don't want anything to do with that."

And you say, "Well, an Indian society, you know. Indians and Indians, and they run around and shoot game and canoes, and that sort of thing."

"Yeah, he's – that – that's the kinds of things." He says, "Well, I don't want to do anything to that. Never had any interest in it in my whole life. Not only have I never had any interest in it, I don't want to have any interest and that's the point."

And you say, "Well, what part of it wouldn't you want to have any interest in at all?"

And he says, "Well, no part of it at all. And you're trying to lead me in, you're trying to trap me", and he'll – is liable to completely kind of lose his head at this point, you know, saying, "Whoa, whoa, whoa, wait a minute. Wait a minute. I'm an auditor, too. Now, you're not getting me into that, man." [laughter] "That's it."

Now, if you're lucky enough, and I do mean lucky enough, to have singled one of these areas of won't-go-into's as a class of civilization, behavior, activity, anything like that, if you're lucky enough to have stumbled into one of these things with a case or if you've wormed yourself into one of these things by your Goals Assessment, finding out also what he has never had a goal to be – he's liable to tell you with some violence what he's never had a goal to be, which is quite the reverse – you start handling that with Not-Know. Forget. Just crisscross that thing up and down, back and forth, and you will find that all of the pc's fixed behavior patterns, his detestations, his compulsions, his obsessions, the real deep ones, the ones that you're just spinning over the top of, all lie in that exact zone and area.

You may not get all of them, in one of them, you understand. There might be two or three more open up afterwards, but that first one will be a big payoff because it, of course, opens up other zones. And now that he's licked one zone, if you got him to do it well, with your Not-Know and Forget, and so forth, now he's got courage enough to tackle some of the others.

It's a very interesting case entrance, I assure you. It's something that – you're real lucky, if you get your hands on a – on one of these in a pc, very early in the auditing. Why, you'll save yourself an awful lot of auditing. Just tear it to ribbons, you know. And you're restoring knowledge, knowingness, whatnots, and recognitions, and so on.

Look. This is absolutely factual, as close to an absolute as you can get: That which is most aberrative is least known. See, that is true. That which is the most aberrative is least known. And if the pc knows something about what is giving him a lot of trouble, it isn't giving him any trouble at all. Now, how do you like that?

So much for the pc that comes in with eighteen pages of his aberrations – not his goals; that's all right. But he comes in with eighteen pages of his aberrations, telling you that all of his difficulties stem from his early life and his sexual relationships with his sister.
File it, man. File it with the greatest of care along with his case, file it. Thank him very much, because – you don't need to tell him what you're thanking him for, which is telling you completely and positively that he is now giving you a place where you don't have to look, even slightly. You can just avoid the whole subject from here on out. Obviously, if he knew this much about it and he's still looped, that isn't it. You see, that's the test. The test has been fulfilled. If he knew about it, there's something wrong. Got the idea?

If you actually were to twist a Goals Assessment around, just into the basis of finding vast zones where this guy doesn't want to go, doesn't want to have anything to do with or otherwise, and explored those zones, you would be doing such fantastic stunts with a case that you would look like a miracle worker. And it would be with speed. You wouldn't – you wouldn't be doing any grind on the thing.

It's rather amusing to watch the speed with which they will try to escape one of these particular areas and the artfulness with which they'll try to escape, all the time going slam-bang into the middle of the area. You can practically – practically the soles of their feet are smoking. They're being yanked back into the area so fast because it's the one place they postulated themselves out of, of course if it's the one place that is never as-ised.

So of course, it's the one place with the maximum call-back. And it's, of course, the one place that they will never confront. So it's the one place they know nothing about. All these things add up, you play this. You could actually do some fabulous things.

Fellow says, "Well, I had a goal to be a plumber, and I had a goal to be a fireman, and I had a goal to marry a rich widow. Yeah. I thought that would be a good idea. And I had a goal to do this and a goal to do that."

All right. Let him go on with his goals. Go right ahead and do your Goals Assessment. Nobody's telling you not to do Goals Assessment as per Routine 3. But he's got lots of goals, he's got lots of goals, he's got lots of goals, he's got lots of goals.

Next coordination: The more goals a pc comes up with, the more the pc has tried to escape. From what? And if you just add that little question mark into your auditing, your questioning, your handling of the particular case – yeah, what – from what?

"Now, what would a goal to be a plumber – what would that get you out of?"

"Well, that's an interesting idea. Well, it would get me out of having to pay plumbers to fix pipes."

No pay dirt there. "Well, now this goal to be a fireman. What would that get you out of?"

"Oh, that would – oa-oaaa. Ohhh. Oh, that's something else. Oh, yeah. Of course, you think it'd be to get me out of fires." Pc's face getting red, you see. "Well, yeah, as a matter of fact, that's right, too. Huh-huh, huh-huh. I'd completely forgotten about it. When I was two years old, the house burned down."

All right. So he's contacted an incident. You going to leave him hung up in this incident forever? Something like that? You've already, by offbeat questioning, got him into this incident. You've already asked him, what would be a fireman – what would that solve or what
would that get him out of? And he's handed up to you the confusion. Well, you can run it right out with "What could you not-know about that?", you know. And "What have you forgotten about that?", and crisscross it up. And you find out that if you're very good, it'll only take five or six questions to blow the whole thing. So it'd be actually stupid of you not to do so.

If you're doing a straight Goals Assessment and he goes into these things, skip them, see. But if you're actually the one who's putting him into these things, if you're shoving him into these things, and so forth, take them up. That was why I didn't particularly want to talk about that yesterday.

But you'll find out that there's very fruitful areas of auditing. This is the biggest "open sesame" to a whole track on a case that you ever want – you ever wanted to handle. So get so you can handle it.

There's another coordination. It's not necessarily the person who has lots of goals who's in bad shape, but the person who has had lots of goals has been trying to get out of a lot of things. That's for sure.

All right. Now, there's another one, is: That person whose memory is the closest to PT, with the rest of it shut off, is the worse-off person. You see, a person is as bad off as his memory is only close to PT. Got that as a coordination? It's a rule. That's a good rule of thumb with a case. Good case analysis. Person is as bad off as his memory is – only exists close to PT.

The reverse of that, of course, is the person is as bad off as he is occluded. This actually doesn't have too much coordination with ability, which is one of the odd things. A man can be overcoming by the grit of his teeth, a lot of this occlusion and that sort of thing, just by, you know, just sort of gritting his teeth and carrying on. But you can expect this fellow to fall on his face sooner or later. He's not going to be happy about it. He apparently has a considerable amount of ability, but with that ability you'll find a considerable amount of strain.

Now, if you suddenly start opening up the track on him and showing him the vast vistas that are closed out to his view and so on, for a little while his strain will decrease, and his doingness will decrease – this is only during auditing, you see. He'll start to say, "Oh, well, now I can sit back and relax. Now, I know what has been making me – it's just been my aberrations." See, he'll run into the same thing they ran into in psychology and psychoanalysis. "It's my aberrations which have been making me do – now I know. So I don't have to strive anymore", do you see? "It isn't necessary that I strive."

He will sort of start thinking this way and then thinking this over, and he'll look that over. Of course, that's specious. Utterly specious. He strives for an entirely different person – reason. He strives for interest. He strives to have something to do. He strives to have something to be interested in. He strives to have a game, for God's sake. That's the obviousness of it.

And you open up a few more spadefuls of track and the garden – it looks more or less like garden soil when you first pick it up off the case, by the way, you know – all balled up, and dark black and all tangled up with the roots of yesterday's roses. And you start straighten-
ing this out, and all of a sudden he starts saying, "Well", – in a very relaxed frame of mind – then he can go on and accomplish eight times as much.

Now, he becomes a dangerous man. A truly dangerous man right about this point because he – obviously, everybody will agree that he's very dangerous because he's in action. They will never assess the fact that he is getting things done, he's helping people, that things are going along fine, and so forth. The fact he's in motion will cause some of the people in his vicinity almost to fall flat on their backs. They will be upset. You can count on this. They will be upset.

Now, he therefore has to be in good enough shape so that he can go on doing and not minding all of this upset. So he has to be gotten over the approval button. Otherwise, he will slump as a case. The approval button is the makebreak point of that. And all of a sudden, why, he does, his control of the vicinity is so much better, his ability to get on in life is so much improved, his functional characteristics coupled with, of course, this control of the environment or his pervasion, you might say, of the environment, and all this damps out.

People take a few cracks at him, then they quit. Then they say, "Maybe we ought to take this up", you know. "Maybe something else ought to happen here", and you don't get the backflash.

But it all goes back to this idea that – of "know thyself". And this is one of the oldest wheezes in the field of philosophy. Philosophers have been standing around – you could always count on the fact that when a philosopher didn't have anything else to say, and he'd just received his gold piece or something at Delhi or Egypt or Upper Thebes or Lower Chicago or someplace like that, and he didn't have anything else to say, he could always reach out his hands, you know, and he'd say, "Well, son, 'know thyself'"

And of course, this poor guy goes out and struggles around. He's not only not got his gold piece, but he keeps trying to look into his bank and look into his life, and there's nobody to help him out. And of course the more furiously he knows, the more on automatic goes "not-know." And if these philosophers had just said to the boy, after they had gotten the gold piece, if they'd just said, "Well, son, 'not-know thyself'", [laughter] why, it would have been a wonderful world.

You see, the aberrated person, the truly aberrated person, is only really worried about one thing. He doesn't know what others are going to do. That is the beginnings. And when it reaches the end, he doesn't know what he is going to do, and that is what worries him. So he gets all kinds of restraints. He uses engrams almost consciously. He uses all kinds of mechanisms to prevent himself from doing things. He does anything he can think of to restrain himself. What is he restraining himself from doing? Well, that question he can't answer. But he can answer this question. That he should. He should.

And why should he? Well, because he doesn't know what he is going to do. He doesn't know what he's liable to do.

You'll see this in its crudest form maybe in battle. Men going to wars in earlier days always used to be tremendously concerned about what their behavior in battle might be. I don't know why they were this concerned. For the benefit of some cockeyed king with eight
mistresses and a crown cocked over his left eye, you were supposed to go out and open your
jerkin and let some farmer from over the hill someplace shove five or six inches of steel in
you. I don't quite see the logic of this, but they used to anyhow. And I've marshalled up lots of
them in line to do just that so – I should criticize!

Anyway, this bird – this bird, you see, his questions as he starts forming up, you know,
and he hears – it was a good idea to join the militia, you see. The girls all loved you and you
got this nice uniform. Used to have nice uniforms – don't anymore but – the girls loved you,
and you could strut around and make brassy sounds in the tavern.

And about that time, you see, you start into the battle. And the guy, "What am I going
to do?", you know. "What will I do?", you know? "What – what will I do? Will I get up there
to the line and instead of nicely unbuttoning my jerkin, will I turn and run?" You see? "And
will I defame myself in front of all of my friends, and will I turn out – am I a hero or am I a
ruddy coward?" You see. And this becomes very oppressive. Becomes very oppressive. "How
am I going to measure up?" Well, we can see that. I just give you that as a gross example. We
can see this big question mark coming up, and so forth. Well represented in Stephen Crane's
Red Badge of Courage.

But – there's another one. How about the guy that goes through life, not only knowing
is – this isn't the question – is he going to run or is he going to stand there. That isn't – that's
too clear-cut. But every day of his life he's not quite sure how he will behave, you see. He's
not quite sure whether he will toe the mark or not toe the mark or do his job or not do his job.
Or is he going to cut and run or is he just going to be sitting there at his desk and suddenly for
some peculiar reason just break down and start screaming? You know. Is he liable to do that?
Well, he is. Huh-huh-huh.

And it begins with the basis of not knowing what others are going to do, you see, and
it winds up that he finds out that he doesn't know what he's going to do. He just can't trust
himself. And in view of the fact that he can't trust himself, why, then of course he's sort of got
to retire from life. He's got to go further and further back. Further and further back. And he
can't go any further back after a while. He finds there's a wall there, you know, so he starts
bringing the bank in on him, you know, harder and harder. And of course, the more bank he
brings in, the more he's likely to do odd things, of course. And he finally winds up at a total
impasse.

Doesn't necessarily go mad, but he certainly becomes inactive. And he'll give you long
speeches of this character: "Well, when I was a young man, I used to have ideas about doing
this and that and getting everything done." And what – you've just announced to him the fact
that you're going to buy a new car or something, you know.

"When I was a young man, I used to do things like this. But when I got alder, I ceased
to be interested in these things." Or you're saying something about Russia shouldn't be build-
ing all these bombs or something of the sort, and he'd say, "Well, I myself, I'm – I'm – when I
was young I used to be interested in this, and as time has gone on – as time has gone on, I
found out that my goals are simply just to get along, you know, from day to day. And I can't
do anything about that sort of thing, and so I of course am not interested really in the scene,
you see, and so on. I don't know why you are, actually, either. I'm setting you a good example
by withholding myself utterly and never getting anything done and being a ruddy bore to everyone, so I don't see why you shouldn't be, too, because you probably can't trust yourself either." [laughs] You know, this kind of a rationale.

Well, you look over existence and you'll find out that it's studded with this type of person. Now, what do you think the actual doingness of that person is going to be? It's going to be very, very low.

Well, of course, now he has the basic goal of nirvana – of somehow or another mixing with a whole bunch of other identities or entities that will restrain him forevermore. And he won't have to restrain himself anymore, and he'll just sort of mix into this huge thetan stew-pot. You know? And there he is in nirvana and everything is fine.

So one of his ideas is that the highest peak of existence would be able to sit forever on some mountaintop getting frostbitten and not noticing it, and regarding one's navel. I don't know what the attraction of the navel is. [laughter] Probably has some vast umbilical connotation, but I'm not aware of that. But he does. He gets into this idea "A navel, that's the thing, you know." [laughter]

And, then of course if he's looking in at his navel, then he knows damn well he's not going to see anything else. So he now knows what he's going to do. He's got a stable datum. He's going to regard his navel, and that's it. That he's got as a stable datum. So of course, he no longer has to restrain himself, you see. So that's a Clear. You get how he gets to that step by step? Finally you get to a Clear. A Clear's totally inactive, totally serene, totally withheld and isn't any trouble to anybody. And that isn't what a Clear is.

And the horrible, glassy trick of the whole thing is, of course, a Clear, more and more able to trust others – partially because he can control them – and more and more able to trust himself, of course, goes into a higher and higher communication line. And then he's more and more positive about what he is doing. He's not always right, by the way, but he's certainly certain. And he's more right than he would have been before. But he goes further and further, he can reach further and further. And of course, he gets more and more done. He gets more and more active. He gets more and more enthused and excited. And he likes existence, and he goes into motion.

And then when he's gone through this band of motion, he can go out to the other side, and he either is in motion or is not in motion at his own choice, you see. And his motions are predictable even to himself, and so he's quite trustworthy as far as others are concerned. He's not going to do something weird as far as they're concerned. Then they gradually realize they can trust this fellow even though he's in motion, but it takes a little getting used to.

I've seen a whole staff go "mmmmrrrrrrrrrrrr" from a Clear, you know. "Ooooh, we don't know whether that's – that's – look at that person. He's doing as much work as five of us!", you know, that kind of a reaction. They're not quite sure that this is the right thing, because of this other idea that they can't trust themselves, so therefore they ought to be sitting further and further back doing less and less, until they get down to a total contemplation of the umbilical fragment. And that's it. You see how the goals diverge.
Now actually, probably only a Clear could sit on a mountaintop with the frostbite nibbling in all directions and actually sit there and mock up enough of an umbilical nub to contemplate. He's probably the only one who could actually do that, but this isn't all he does. You get the idea? How people's thinking narrow down on this sort of thing.

The ambition very often on the part of a pc, when you get a pc running through Goals Assessment, will be to become less and less active. You just read the goals to become less and less active. They announce active goals with regret or they belittle them – you know, not-is them. "Well, when I was – when I was four or five – ", you know, that's standard Anglo-Saxon belittling. You see, four or five, that's supposed to be stupid or something.

"And when I was four or five I had this goal to be a cowboy. Ha-ha-ha-haha. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha."

[laughter] "Goal to be a cowboy when I was four or five. Nonsense, you know." Try to flatten it. Cowboy, cowboy, cowboy.

I had one – I had one who had an offbeat goal when it was four or five. And I got to plunging into a little bit further and, boy, this was the goal. But at first, it was just, you know, make nothing out of it. But it was a goal of action. And they start by apologizing for these action goals and rather tending to deify the inaction goals. To be – to be calmly in control of myself in the face of any emergency. And they think doing anything about any emergency – the guy's going to be in control of himself while the emergency is knocking everybody else's head off.

But that will be a very laudable goal. Extremely laudable. That'll be a fine thing to do. You just listen to it sometime. Listen to somebody when he's giving you goals, and listen to his difference of regard for these goals as represented by his tone of voice. You'll learn quite a bit. If the fellow's stress is on goals of inaction, you've got immediate case gauge. See. If they're all inaction goals, if he's kidding all of the action goals or doesn't give you any action goals at all and he's tending to deify, you see, all of the inaction goals, why, you've got an idea of what you're bucking into here.

You're bucking into fantastic quantities of not-know. That's the first index you've got. And you also – if the person's total action goals were all excluded and he never gave you an action goal of any kind – not even the kid one, you know – well, don't turn in your thetan, but the sooner you start on this case with Not-Know, and Forget, and so forth... You can expect this case that from one day to the next will give you the same goals over again because he doesn't remember what goals he gave you yesterday, you know. Inaction, that is the thing.

The fellow is getting down to where he is one stable datum as an island in a total confusion. But the stable datum keeps occluding, so it leaves the island of confusion.

Now, there are two ways a person could get out of the porridge. And the first way he could get out of the porridge has been the only way he had. And that is kick up the bucket and put on another body. You see, that's how he got out of the porridge.

So you have enormous amounts of sickness around because sickness is a covert effort to die. And it is nothing else.
Now, death was an ultimate in inaction. And that is why the covert effort to die leads in that direction. So you got inaction. Inaction leads toward death. That is the destination of inaction.

All right. But he could die. So this was the solution. And his efforts to become less active would wind up in death.

Now, there was another part of this. If he could become familiar enough with any activity through the process of living, he would wind up with something resembling a rehabilitation of his action. The process of living could refamiliarize him with the zones of action, and so he himself would again go into action. And that process basically took place on the basis of a cycle which would be the matter of, oh, I don't know – doesn't matter. I can't tell you off-hand. From pc to pc, it probably varies wildly. But a cycle might be anything from fifty thousand years to two or three billion. You get the – you get the order? I'm just trying to give you the order of magnitude.

This fellow isn't trying to become familiar with action over a period of one lifetime. See? He's trying to become familiar with a pattern of action over a period of fifty thousand years, and then he feels he would be out of the soup at the end of that time. It's kind of a little planned action.

And you every once in a while will run into a pc who is telling you that it takes some livingness, too. Did you ever hear a pc say that? That's what he's talking about. He's talking about this cycle of action thing. Of course, he's talking – it doesn't take a little livingness, too, you see. That is not correct. Auditing is a total substitute. But he's got this other program so well aligned whereby a little more familiarization with action, a little more familiarization, and eventually he'll be back in the swing of it again. That's his hope and goal.

And that is over some vast period of time. It'll be, oh, vast. I hardly dare even make a guess at it from pc to pc, but take it anywhere between fifty thousand years and a billion, and he knows he'll make it sooner or later. He'll get back to those airplanes.

Now, when you've found a goal of this character that he's actually trying to execute over one of those long cycles, that is the goal that sticks and that you'll eventually find yourself running. That is the source of stick of a goal, is the person is trying to get back into action to achieve this particular goal, and you'll find it's a very uncertain progress in this particular direction, but a tremendously positive goal.

Well, it itself could, of course, be traced back to the exact activity he has left, which has become too much for him. In other words, he has – he has got a goal to be a flyer because he can't confront being a flyer, see. He cannot confront any part of being a flyer. He can't confront any part of the track when he was a flyer. He can confront none of the scenes in which he was a flyer, but he has the goal to be a flyer. That's one of these circular goals that comes right back to itself.

And he very often, if he has this very consistently, will be plotting it out across some vast section of time, some enormous section of time. And he'll tell you very often, "Well, it takes livingness, you know, and you'll have to do some livingness, too. And clearing, you
know, has to do also with livingness." And he'll give you big arguments along this particular line, you see. Because that's his program. That's a little, private program he has.

And you find yourself plowing into a goal like that, you'll trace it back to the very goal that it is, you see. And then, fall out of that, you'll find out what zone he was escaping from by becoming a flyer. And up until the time you've got the flyer out of the road, you don't get the bottom of the plane. See?

The reason he wanted to be a flyer is he was on this planet that was nothing but mud, you see. And it was mud from there on down is the original planet the Indian priests had lined up. And it's this mud planet, so he says, "Well, the only way you can get off the thing – you can become a flyer. You know? Everyplace you walk it goes squish between your claws. And every time you sit down, you're damp." [laughter]

And he says, "To hell with this racket", and he doesn't want anything to do with it, so he wanted to become a flyer. So after you've cleaned up this whole long-cycle goal, you see, by auditing, you wonder why this thing may be hanging up or sticking up, and you apparently have the goal flat but the person isn't Clear and you can't quite find any other goal – just look under it. "Well, why did you want to become a flyer?" That's the way you check out one of these goals that you've flattened with the Prehay Scale. If it stuck, that would be what you would do. See? You're not making much progress with this goal and yet the goal itself doesn't seem to be worrying him anymore.

Well, how come he went into this goal in the first place? And we'll find ourselves with a brand-new case on our hands. And we'll find ourselves with this vast area of occlusion suddenly laid to view. And you lay into that, Macduff, with Forget and Not-Know, and so on, and suddenly he comes up with a brand-new series of goals, and so on. Quite interesting. It's quite interesting to watch this cyclic behavior.

So that a case, you might say, goes in swoops. And the swoops are out of what they wouldn't confront. And you very often have to run the swoop itself. And having run the swoop, well, find out what they were swooping out of. Now, you'll find out you've got a brand-new strata of case. And you're liable to get into that particular strata with the protest I described earlier in the lecture, you know. "Well, I want nothing to do with that." This is why the case is grinding forever. He wants nothing to do with the basis that lies just under. He begins to feel that he's walking on quicksand. If he gets audited just one more session, perhaps, he might go through the volcanic crust into the ashes of the long dead yesterdays. That would be tragic. He'd get Clear. [laughter]

But do you know that you will also find pcs doing this and going into this sort of an activity. They will tell you very often, "I would rather not be Clear than have to face that. If it means that I have to run through that to be Clear, then I just won't be Clear. That's it." You can run into this.

And at this point, the auditor's horsepower has to be applied. Has to be applied. You're running on practically nothing but auditor determination because, of course, you've got the pc in an area of total no-determination as far as the pc is concerned. He just wants to escape. He hasn't escaped. He's sitting right in it. So you have to apply the horsepower at this point.
Now, anytime on the Prehav run of clearing that you find a person slogging – *slog, slog, slog, slog, slog, slog, slog, slog* – he is probably hovering over in small volplanes, hopefully that you won't notice, but if he lands, he'll go straight through the volcanic crust. Got the idea? He's sort of keeping it arduously in the air.

And I think grind in clearing, in auditing, the fact that the pc just keeps grind, you see, he just keeps grinding, and he keeps grinding, and so forth, and he goes on and on and doesn't seem to be getting anyplace, it means the fact that you are actually now running the escape. You're running nothing but the escape and you're running it for something else. And it's something else has vcome into view. And you haven't seen it yet. And it's been in view for some time.

And the pc had the goal to be a flyer. And he goes on running "be a flyer", and he runs it on the Prehav Scale, and it's getting less and less, and it's sort of grinding out, and isn't really getting anyplace, and the levels flatten off fairly easily and so on, but that's just – you just keep on running it and you keep on running it and you keep on running it. Well, good God, it's about time you did another assessment, isn't it. And find out that there's a whole mud planet sitting there.

The one thing he doesn't want to be is an inhabitant of a mud planet. Well, you've still got the mud planet when you clear off the top goal if you go on a grind with the pc. You got it?

And I think you will find that is more or less the basic anatomy that you're running into on long-term clearing. A fellow – you've gotten the swoop out of what he won't be in, and you're running the swoop. And you just keep running this and running this and running this and running this, and you never notice the mud planet. And of course the pc is actually only too willing to run the swoop. Only too willing, because right there just a hundred feet under the lowest part of the volplane, you see, is this unending sea of mud which squishes up between your claws and ruins you every time you sit down. [laughter]

All goals are an escape. All clearing depends on, not cutting off all escapes, but on re-familiarizing the person with those things from which he's trying to escape, and I think you'll find clearing goes faster if you apply that law. Refamiliarize the person with the areas from which he is seeking to escape.

Of course, for a little while you're liable to find this awful muddy. The pc can go in over his head on this rather easily and get very nervous about it all, and so forth.

But if in the assessment itself, you're lucky enough to find these areas from which they're trying to escape, you're going to wipe out all of the goals that the person has set up in front of you. The person has given you 396 goals, and you've been nulling them very easily, and you get down to goal 80, and this is the third time through, and you're at goal 80 on the third time through, and this suddenly strikes you one way or the other – this unlikely goal – and you say, "Well, what would that get a man out of?" You know? "What would that get a person out of one way or the other?"

And *Ho-ho-ho-ho, that's easy, but of course you're not going to get me into that!*
You get this kind of a reaction of that character, cut it to pieces because you'll find your 386 goals or 83 goals all blowing up in your face. You've got a brand-new case. As soon as you've handled the zone. Got it?

Goals are the mechanism of escape. The looking at the invisibilities and hope of the future and never regarding any part of the liabilities of the present or the horrors of the past.

And of course, you can Q-and-A with this 100 percent. You can only let the pc look at the beauties of the future. Only the beauties of the future. And of course, they don't erase. Why? Because they haven't happened. No. Right back of all of these escapes, of course, were the areas he was trying to escape from.

You'll find somebody saying sometime, "Well, I wanted to be the Lord Mayor of London once on the backtrack. I can remember it very vividly. I wanted to be the Lord Mayor of London."

And you put that down and you try to erase Lord Mayor of London, you know – Lord Mayor of London, Lord Mayor of London. Let it strike you, man, why did he want to be Lord Mayor of London this ferociously? It is there with ferocity, you know. I mean, it just doesn't erase easily. There it is, Lord Mayor of London.

And you say, "Well, what would the position of Lord Mayor of London get you out of?"

Of course, the obvious answer is Wormwood Scrubs. That's the only – you know – something of this sort. You get a lot of hem and haw though before you're liable to get Wormwood Scrubs.

"Well, it'd get you out of, oh, leading a boring life, and it would get you out of this and get you out of that."

"Well, is there anything there it would get you out of that you'd hate to be in?"

"Well, we're not going to take that up. This is a gentleman's agreement",[laughter] "and we've been doing fine in the session so far."

"Well, what would it be?"

"Well, the Lord Mayor of London at that time was the only one who had the right of signing a pardon for somebody in Newgate."

"Newgate? What's with Newgate?"

"Oh, Newgate. Well, now, that's something else again. You really want to know? Well, you really want to know about Newgate? Well, we could start in with the jail fever, of course, but it's actually the straw. It's actually the straw. It molders, you know. And there were no toilet facilities at all, so they just threw in more straw, and uh – uh – and so on. And then there's little rats, and so on." And he'd say, "Well, you don't want to know anything about that. No, let's get on with this. Let's get on with something pleasant like a Goals Assessment."

And you say, "Well, what could you – what might you have forgotten about New-gate?"
"Ohhhhh, zyaaaaaaa! You're not going to catch me. You know, you're not going to get me running that." Ha-ha-ha. If you can strike one of those, you'll change the case just like that.

So prospect some. And out of all the vast gray seas of granite, you might find some little pieces of mica which when picked up turn into solid gold. Okay?

**Audience:** Yes.

Thank you.

**Audience:** Thank you.
Hello.

Okay, this is 17 August, AD 11 and I had a very nice lecture to give you today; and I'm not kidding you. I had it all taped and was going to explain to you all about valences. Instead of that, I'm going to rack up an overt on auditors.

Because I've just caught you out. Man, have I caught you out. All summer long we have had one god-awful problem. Why the hell can't you find a goal on a pc. When it takes me one hour and fifteen minutes to find the goal and the terminal and it takes Mary Sue about two and a half hours, why can't you find a goal on a pc?

And now I know why. And I'm going to twirl my long black mustache and look right down your throat.

There is a phenomenon – that an E-Meter ceases to register in the presence of an out-rudiment. The E-Meter tone arm will cease to register on any process you are running when a rudiment goes out. You can be fooled by thinking a process is flat when actually all that is wrong is that you've got a rudiment out. The tone arm will cease to move; the needle will cease to move; everything will cease to move except the rudiment that is out – that will move.

In other words, if you ask for the rudiment that was out, you'll get a response on the needle. But all other things in the presence of an out-rudiment do not move. Now, can you get that real clear?

All right, you've got Mr. Pc, and Mr. Pc is moving very well on the tone arm and the needle is moving very well and suddenly the tone arm slows down and stops, and it stays stopped for twenty minutes. So you say the process is flat. Flat, my hat! A rudiment went out which caused the process no longer to operate. The only thing which will now operate is the out-rudiment.

Now, if you get the rudiment off that has gone wrong and you get that rudiment in promptly and properly, the process will now pick up the motion of the tone arm and will now, in addition to that, move the needle. You got that now?

Now, don't make a mistake on this because this is the most important part of auditing there can be. There is no more important part of auditing than what I'm telling you right this minute.

A process can appear to be flat just because a rudiment's out. You're running "How often have you failed to leave something?" And all of a sudden, why, it's sitting there at 4 and it
just sits there at 4 and it just doesn't move. And then you say, "Well, that's the end of the process, ha-ha!"

*Mmmmm. Rrrrf.* Aw, you had a rudiment out and the process appeared to go flat and the process was not flat at all. And the only thing which will now move the E-Meter is the out-rudiment.

You can find the rudiment, the rudiment now will operate, but it's the only thing that'll operate the E-Meter. ARC break, present time problem, something wrong in the environment – these various rudiments, you see, will move the E-Meter. You flatten that with a rudiments process then you move back over onto your process. And what do you know, this process that was so flat, is not flat at all, but it wobbles the tone arm and it lets the needle fly around and so forth, and there it is.

So, two things have been happening, and this will become more horrible to you as I go along. I think very often auditors – not just here! I'm not scolding you here. You're better supervised here than elsewhere – but I'm talking about auditors elsewhere in other classes, in other areas, in HGCs and so forth. Here's where your HGC Clears aren't getting made, right here on this exact point I'm telling you.

These people are leaving Prehav level processes unflat on the pc. That's on the running of it. Just because they get the rudiments out, then the Prehav level looks unflat so they assess for a new level. Ah, but the old level isn't flat, so, of course, the pc doesn't go anywhere. So they just grind and then they not flatten the next level, you see, and then not flatten the next level and then not flatten the next level and we just go on grind, grind, grind, grind. Do you see what can happen here? You got that? Have you really got that?

*Audience:* Yes.

You really see this?

*Audience:* Yes.

All right.

The same thing will happen on a Goals Assessment. And I think your preclear's goals lies in the first hundred and fifty goals the pc gave you and I think it is knocked out by an ARC break. And I think the pc's goal has already been given to you, long ago, and now appears to be flat because it's ARC broken out of existence by some technical flub. Them's hard words. But I think I could take any person in this unit and in the matter of a few minutes get the ARC break off by auditing off the auditor who is doing the assessment and find in the first hundred and fifty or two hundred goals on the list that one of those goals is still alive and is still sticking and won't go out.

Interesting. I think I could do it with every person, not only here, but Australia, America; anybody who's had trouble finding a goal. I think that is it. I may be wrong because I've not put this immediately to test. I do know that I could find your goals. But I am pretty sure this is the phenomena that's getting in your road.

And you know what makes me sure? Because there is something – there is something in the South African regimen of Goals Assessment that hasn't been in any other unit or course.
And what is it? I made sure that they had every student there checking the rudiments on every other student's pc, regularly and continuously. Isn't that right? And it aren't been done since. So the answer must be rudiments. There is the one difference, and that's why I think that is the difference. Follow me?

Seem logical?

**Audience:** Yes.

That if everybody, every twenty-four hours or something like that, was getting rudiments checked by another auditor on his pc, and that they were always finding them out, and that this isn't now being done anywhere – a piece of the line-up has been knocked out.

If the Director of Processing of a Central Organization does not, every single day, check the rudiments on every pc in the shop, he's a knucklehead. Well, he's a friend of mine, but he's still a knucklehead. Because, in the first place, the pc very often doesn't go live for the auditor easily on the rudiment where he will go live for another person on the rudiment.

And you can sit there and you can say to the pc, "Do you have an ARC break, present time problem? Is it all right if I audit you?" and so forth. 'Have you got a withhold?" and so on. And they're all apparently null. And then somebody else walks in on the thing and says, "You got a present time problem, a withhold, an ARC break?" Ka-wooww! They're all live.

You should have seen Richard Halpern's face one day when I took one of his pcs and found every rudiment falling off the pin. [laughter] "But!" he said to me plaintively. "But," he said to me, "I just checked those fifteen minutes ago and they were all in." And it's true, he didn't get a fall on them fifteen minutes before. Isn't that interesting?

All right, two auditors should always audit as a team. Auditors shouldn't be out in the brush country of lower south Slobovia, upper north Manito, Wisconsin, auditing by themselves. Anyway, auditors ought to audit in pairs. Wolves should run in packs, auditors should go in pairs. Oh, I didn't mean there was any comparison between the two. [laughter] I didn't say mice!

Anyway, auditing in pairs – should check the rudiments on each other's pcs, every session. Sounds arduous, doesn't it? Sounds like an awful lot of administration, doesn't it? Sounds like an awful lot of people falling over an awful lot of chairs and so forth.

Well, actually you don't have to do it very formally in an auditing session. You can almost lean the guy up against the mantelpiece, prop the meter on the mantelpiece and say, "All right, take ahold of the cans. Now, do you have an ARC break with your auditor? Do you have – been audited with a present time problem? Is it all right if you're audited in that auditing room? Do you have any withholds from the auditor or anybody else including me?" And so forth. Fall. Fall. Fall.

Well, you don't do anything about them. You say, "Joe. Joe. Get on the ball. The rudiments are out on your pc."

"Well, which one?"

"All of them."
"Oh, no!"

You know, that kind of response.

It's a new look. The soothing drone of the auditor's voice has not got the pc into a super control where he mustn't be out of order. Get the idea?

That was in the South African lineup. And Jean, I'm sure, did it.

As a matter of fact, she had two cases that were banging her head in. And she finally, herself in person, went in and they've been running null on present time problems.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"Oh, no, no, no."

And they did it all the weeks of the course. And she extended the course over a week just to make sure that it was better. And she grabbed hold of the meter on them and she found both of them had such fabulous present time problems that each one of them broke down and wept the second she put her finger on the present time problem.

Ah, they'd been audited. But she was saying, Routine 1 does not work, you see, and something else is going on here. We must be doing something, you know? Yeah, they were running a Routine 1, but it should have been picked up during the Security Checking. But it wasn't picked up in the rudiments on the Security Check, don't you see? And so those people had actually gone six and seven weeks without anybody probing in to find out if there was something wrong with the PT problem. And there was something wrong with the PT problem, and that comprised almost 50 percent of her class. Do I make an impression on you?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Out of kindness to the pc and yourself, for heaven's sakes, start cross-checking rudiments. Ka-now! See? Start cross-checking rudiments. By which I mean, get somebody else to check the rudiments on your pc. You check them perfectly soundly and run your sessions just as before, but always get somebody else to cross-check the rudiments on a pc. You got it? And do it often; do it frequently! If not every session, at least every couple of sessions, for heaven's sakes. See?

Now, I'll tell you what you do with these endless goals lists. I could tell you what you do in a colloquial marine fashion, but I'm not going to tell you that. [laughter]

You get you-self, the auditor, off of the case. That is to say you go on auditing a case, but just get any charge that you may have built up on this case with your Goals Assessment, off. Run yourself on the Prehav Scale. We don't care how, see? In other words, get that – get that flat and then take the original goals list. The original, and find out if any of them are still alive and work it over and find out if there's been an ARC break around any of these goals and so forth. Get slippery about it. I'm tired of giving you a mechanical robot activity, it's time you graduated up into body class II – half human, half robot. [laughs] Okay?

Now, let's just work over that original list and let's find out what is there.

You know, I know at least one person who probably is spooked because Mary Sue, operating I think with another auditor, shook that down in a part of an afternoon. And I think
this pc doesn't trust his goal or terminal, because it was that easy, it was that fast, you see? It was that quick. And everybody else takes so long. Well, of course, it must be something wrong with that particular terminal and goal. No, there's nothing wrong with that terminal and goal, nothing at all. They were running just dandy.

There might be an unflat level someplace on the past run, but that would be about the only thing. Actually, a past run has been a little bit lengthy, so I would suspect there was a rudiment out on the run not on the assessment, and I'd check that over very carefully. But get your rudiments checked. Get your rudiments checked well, get them crisscrossed, get somebody else to check the rudiments on your pc and that's going to speed up all this nonsense about assessment. And don't be so anxious to rub out goals. You're trying to find a goal, you're not trying to erase all the fellow's goals.

Now, it doesn't take very long to find a goal on a pc. Just disabuse yourself from that – it just doesn't. Williams was almost staggered into the -- . Who was the -- the wife -- the wife of Lot that went into a pillar of salt out of frozen shock from watching Sodom and Gomorrah go boom, or something. I've forgotten. It's some fairy tale. And anyway, he turned in -- he went to Australia and he started his course and everything was running all along, and he practically turned into a pillar of salt from shock at the length of time it was taking these goals to be assessed. Because it never happened to him in Aus -- in South Africa. Well, I was riding him awful close. And we were -- and that was the missing factor, and I'm sure it hasn't been done since.

The American ACC managed to go all the way its length with tremendous gains -- tremendous gains. A great deal of instruction took place, everything was fine, all the students happy, and without one single goal being found in six weeks. A record, man! Well, they weren't cross-checking rudiments, that's for sure.

So, put that in as part of your auditing rundown, because it is a missing piece. When we had all these gains and got all this stuff whizzing and going down in South Africa here in this spring, that was part of the rundown -- is everybody was checking everybody else's rudiments. Isn't that right? How often did they do it?

Female voice: We did it every two days.

Every two days they checked the other fellow's pc's rudiments. I'm sure it hasn't been done since.

You get these little tiny pieces of stuff that get left out of the pudding, you know? It's a beautiful pudding -- it's a beautiful pudding except nobody put any yeast in it or anything. See, it just lies there like a pancake.

All right, that was part of the rundown. Rudiments out means Goals Assessment not done.

Now, I've given you some other tricky ways of getting around Goals Assessment. There's a lot of -- this hasn't been in vain by a long ways because you've learned a lot of tricky ways of getting goals and all that sort of thing. You know more about that now and I've had to dig up a lot more about that and that's had to be articulated from one end to the other.
But I am sure, just as sure as I'm sitting here and just as sure as there's a body in this chair – I'm pretty sure of that – that it is simply a matter of you get the rudiments out maybe on one or two goals. Just as slightly as that, you see? You're going on down the line erasing goals and you get the rudiments out on a goal and then out on another goal, and maybe one of those goals was it. You see? And you get the rudiments out. And then maybe on the remainder of the list, why, of course, they all null with a great speed because the pc is chopped up or ARC broke or got a PT problem. You've got in other words, an inoperative E-Meter on the subject of goals. It'd be very operative on the subject of rudiments but it's very inoperative on the subject of goals.

Now, if this isn't correct and if this doesn't bear fruit, I will find out why. Don't worry. But I'm pretty sure that this is it. And what makes me sure is it is the one piece of stuff that was missing from the South African course. That was missing. And it's now missing here at Saint Hill. And it's now missing in Australia, I'm sure. And it certainly was missing over in Washington, I am sure. See? It's the missing item. Somebody else looking over your shoulder and checking the rudiments on the pc repetitively and often, making sure that those things are in. Okay?

You have a whiz at it here. And you go back over that goals list that was first given to you, or that you first got, and you cover that list again after you have gotten any possibility of an ARC break off or a present time problem off or anything else off or any anxiety off or having – finding one's goal as a present time problem off. You got it? Just get all of those things straight, as straight, as straight, as straight, even if you have to run yourself on the Prehab Scale, don't you see, on – off the pc. And I'm sure that you're going to find the goal was in the first couple of hundred. You hear me?

All right, I'm pretty sure this is the case because, you see, I'm not having the trouble you're having in finding goals and terminals. I'm just not having this trouble and it's just something that has got me saying, "What? How? How are they managing this? What has entered into this?"

Well, now here's another oddity: I get goals and terminals without checking the rudiments. [laughter] Hm! You've seen me do it – repetitively. But you can assign that to altitude, because I'm in no uncertain toned voice when I'm getting off goals and terminals. "Is it this, is it that, is it the other thing?" You know, bang, bang, bang-bang-bang-bang, so on. There's a great deal of certainty concerning this. And also it doesn't seem to be very important. I don't make it very important. But I've even said to the fellow, "Well, do you have ARC breaks and that sort of thing?"

And the guy said, "Oh, yes, yes, yeah, yeah."

"Do you have any overts on me?"

"Oh, yes, something like that."

"Well, skip it." [laughter]

So, that is an invalidative part of this analysis. But I think if you look this over very, very carefully, I think you will find that that will deliver into your paws. I think you have slid over the goal and I think, long since, it's in the background. Because you're also doing some-
thing else which is wrong, as wrong, as wrong. You are asking for more goals before you go over the goals list at the beginning of every session, see?

I never want any more goals off the pc. I got enough after he's given me – after I've gotten writer's cramp writing fifty or sixty of the things: I got enough goals. It's almost by postulate one of those is going to be it, you know? I should be careful saying that because you'll think I mean it.

But I just sort of look him over, you know, and, "Hm-hm-hm. One of these is it. One of these is it. Must be."

But then, there is this factor: is, I've actually never known a pc to lie to me. When I ask them for something, they deliver. See, which is all I mean by altitude.

I say, "What were your childhood goals?"

"Burrhm." – "Thank you." – "Burrhm." – "Thank you." – "Burrhm." – "Thank you. All right, that's good. Now, what are your antisocial goals? You know, like burning down the town or something like this."


"Well. Burrhm."

"That's it."

"Burrhp."

"That's it. Oh, that's enough, to hell with the rest of them."

I don't want him to have an artistic goal anyhow. And then I say, "All right. Now, what withheld goals do you have that you just wouldn't ever dare tell anybody about?"


I wind up with a list of thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty – something of this character. That's it, I don't look over more goals.

Now, the difference is that because everybody was chewed away from this we had more methodology invented than was actually being employed originally on Goals Assessments. And the original Goals Assessment, it was quite odd that the one goal you made fall there actually will continue to fall. That's quite a discovery, but it's true. But you don't even have to do it. There's one goal there going to fall more than the rest of them, and that'll continue to fall unless you get an ARC break in the road. You understand?

Of course, this thing – altitude is one factor, but only one factor of holding a pc in session while you are doing a Goals Assessment. And you can hold him in session like he felt he was cast in concrete, you know? It just doesn't ever occur to him to have a present time problem or an ARC break. That's about the – that's the real secret of auditing.

If you yourself are sufficiently matter of fact, sufficiently relaxed, sufficiently in control of the situation and know your business well enough, there is never any doubt enters your pc's mind from one end of the session to the other but what he should be sitting there getting
audited. But if there's a bunch of doubts around, then you've got to keep your rudiments clean, clean, clean.

So just as they have a large forty-seven foot wastebasket at Times Square; it's "cast your ballot here for a clean New York" – I think that's awfully cute – forty-seven foot wastebasket. That's just what Times Square wants. I can see it now. It was so outrageous that a bunch of businessmen have now chipped in to make a park and a grass plot and so forth there, and so on.

But just with that type of corny, corny, corny advertising we should hang up little signs all over HGCs and classes and so forth: "Keep your rudiments clean for a Clear." Pretty corny, but it's true.

Now, the amount of importance which you are giving an assessment is quite interesting. But a person can be assessed straight through to Clear by Assessment by Elimination, providing the rudiments are all in. If you use the other data which I have now dug up and given you. That is, get all the not-knows out about it and find out why he had the goal and so forth. Another – another side of the coin – an entirely different side of the coin.

Okay? You had enough hell for one day? You mean you haven't?

Female voice: Did you say hell or help?

Just hell. [laughter]

Go back over and check it, and I think you'll find it's true, that your pc's goal long– occurred a long time ago for running. I think so. This would be the only way that you possibly have missed somewhere.

There's the other road and the other road is you can assess a pc straight through to Clear. You get rid of all of his goals, he comes out at the other end; you get rid of all of his terminals and so forth, and he comes out at the other end and that's, that's it. That can happen, too. Apparently, they're practically two different processes.

And now I will give you the lecture I was going to give you today. All right?

Audience: Hm-hm.

Well, this is an important lecture. It summates the findings of a great many of years and particularly a great many of the findings of this summer. And the name of this lecture is "Valences." And I should start it with a definition of a valence.

There are several types of valences. In some other old PAB you'll find them classified into various types. But a valence is a synthetic beingness, at best, or it is a beingness what the pc is not but is pretending to be or thinks he is.

Now, that beingness could have been created for him by a duplication of an existing beingness or a synthetic, which was a proper term, beingness built up by the descriptions of somebody else. That just as Horatio Alger, Jr. built up a synthetic beingness called "Local Boy Makes Good by Hanging on the Coattails of Rich Man" (which was his total motif), a synthetic beingness could be created which everybody would believe in and try to become. Or, Mama can run Papa down so continuously that Junior never, under any circumstances,
ever meets Papa or sees Papa but becomes the synthetic beingness of Papa. All of which is an interesting thing.

One of the basics of this, by the way, is the first lecture of the first congress I ever gave in England. That — there's a tape on this. It's what you think the other fellow is, not what he is, that is the other fellow's — your trouble with the other fellow.

Now, this is a valence. A valence is, then, an artificial beingness of some kind or another. But with that we don't have, factually, "own valence." There is no such thing as one's own valence. This was thrashed out in 1950 and went loose through the middle of the fifties and people refer to it, and I may have even said it a few times — his own valence so forth. But it is not correct — it is just not correct. Because a person's own valence is silliness. That is a silly statement, because a person is himself or in a valence. You see, it's one or the other. He is either himself or in a valence.

Now, a valence is a package. And one of the earliest observations concerning this when I started to come to grips with this thing we now call a profile or a graph, I analyzed it from all sides and came to just one conclusion regarding it. And that is that it was a picture of a valence and that is all that graph is — it's a picture of a valence. And any change that you got on a pc was because you shifted his valence.

Now, you've already read that years ago. It's an old datum but now it merges up into first order of importance. Pardon me, it shoulders its way up through other data to stand on top as a king-of-the-mountain datum. That's a picture of a valence and you're never going to get another picture until you've done something about valences on the person. And this boils down to this didactic statement which can now be made, which makes this a very important lecture: The pc will not gain in any way, shape or form through any effort to alter the characteristics of a valence.

Swallow that one, because it's a very important statement and it's a very factual statement. A pc will not change in any way by reason of processes which seek to alter the characteristics of the valence he is in.

He's in the valence of an ogre. All right, you're going to change the characteristics of the ogre and this is going to make a better pc. No-no. No-no, no-no. The pc will alter only if you change the valence as a whole package.

And why is this? It's because the pc cannot take any responsibility whatsoever for any of the package of characteristics known as a valence. They are somebody else's. And he takes no responsibility for any of these now-I'm-supposed-to's that go and make up this package called a valence.

A streetcar conductor, of course, as a valence, has a number of now-I'm-supposed-to's, right? There he is ding-donging up and down the line, letting on the passengers and taking first crack at the nickels and sixpences. And after that the company gets what's left. And whatever it is that the streetcar conductor is doing, he's got a now-I'm-supposed-to. He's supposed to get up in the morning; he is supposed to go to work; he is supposed to see the passengers on and off; and he is supposed to collect the fares and make change. You see, now-
I'm-supposed-to's, now-I'm-supposed-to's. He's supposed to wear a cap; he's supposed to wear a uniform. You get the idea? I am supposed to, I am supposed to, I am supposed to.

All right. Now, somebody gets into the valence of a streetcar conductor and all of these now-I'm-supposed-to's, are the now-I'm-supposed-to's of a streetcar conductor, they're not anything that can be touched or reached by the person. All the person could reach is the knowingness or identity called a streetcar conductor.

Now, let's get down and find out what use does a thetan make of a valence. This is the only use he makes of a valence. Survival. The road out. The modus operandi of getting on in life surmounted by knowingness. Valence is a solid knowingness; a body is a solid knowingness.

You see a streetcar conductor, you "know" he is a streetcar conductor, so therefore all valences are knowingnesses. They're an effort to get somebody else to "know" that you're there and efforts to get somebody else to "recognize" something. And therefore they are a road out. They are a road out of unwanted areas.

This fellow is slogging around in the mud firing off Mannlichers, Lebels, Lee-Enfields, Springfields, Garand Mark 1's or whatever other asinine thing the infantry is supposed to do. And just as he catches the trench mortar in the midriff, he discovers he does not want to be there. He is in the wrong valence called "a soldier." Wrong valence. That knowingness is now invalidated, it must become a "not-knowingness." So he exteriorizes and he says, "the only way to fight a war is as a general". Obvious, isn't it? So his next lifetime he's going be a general.

I'll give you a big joke on me with regard to this sort of thing. I always said that in the event of another war, I'd be a war correspondent. I'd be sitting there with a blonde on each knee and a bottle of whiskey in front of me and a typewriter – real tough picture, you know? I used to tell my friends this around New York City. And I'd – we'd hear the horns go and then I would lean over and say, "Sit over on the settee a moment, honey." And I would pound out on the typewriter, "Our brave boys, today, went over the top", you see, and put it on the wires to Associated Press. But some of my friends had bad luck in the Ethiopian – ha – war and so on. So, when the war came along I didn't do that. But nevertheless, that's just an example.

You know, the trench mortar catches him in the midriff and he says, "In the next war", he says, "I had better be a war correspondent because the last war correspondent I saw was in that nice thick dugout eight miles to the rear of the front lines." You got the idea? He says, "That's the thing to be", you see? "That's dandy."

So the next war comes along, and he tries to be this thing and he can't be this thing, so he's very unhappy about the whole thing. He can't be this war correspondent but he tries. And how he will go on a long cycle of tryingnesses if this is really one of these plowed-in sort of valence pictures, not as – not just a joke as mine was. And he's trying like mad and he'll go war after war, you know, life after life, and somehow or another he'll eventually familiarize himself enough with the tools of the trade. And sure enough a war comes along. And so help me Pete he gets to sit in this dugout and pound out this deathless line, "Our brave boys, today, went over the top", see, while he's sitting there.
All right, that's fine. That's fine. He goes along like that; is very successful. Time goes on, you see? And they have run out of war criminals by a few lifetimes later, you see? They've run out of war criminals utterly. They've hanged everybody, you see? And they find out they can no longer charge presidents, kings and things, and generals with starting wars, so they assume quite – probably quite rightly – that it's the fault of the press. So immediately after this war, the fifteenth life that he's been a war correspondent, he finds much to his horror that all war correspondents are now being arrested and being shot in a painful manner.

So just at the moment when twelve bullets, straight and true, hit him in the chest, he decides he had better not be a war correspondent anymore. This is something he had better not be. So he decides that the best thing to be in a war is Mata Hari, you see, or something like this. So over years then and ages and so on, he'll go on working uphill and upgrade to solve this confusing problem called war, to become a Mata Hari, you see? He learns how to be a woman, you see? And he keeps picking up female bodies and he becomes enticing one way or the other and he gets himself well endured to certain horizontal activities, and – excuse my French. But he moves on up the line and he finally makes it, you see?

And then lifetime after lifetime, why, he's just happy as a clam, here, being Mata Hari. And every time there's a war, why, he immediately becomes an espionage agent and everything is just dandy, and time goes on and so forth. And then he finds out that the G-2s of all of the armies – this one particular war – have gotten together and found out that this is how all of their information is getting across the lines. So every person who is a camp follower, vandiere, call girl, anything associated with it, ever looks at a general, is promptly picked up and shot. And as she stands there in the courtyard, you see, with twelve bullets going through her chest, she decides at that moment to be nothing after that but a peacemonger. Now, that's the thing to be – a peacemonger. You get the idea? Still trying to solve this silly problem, you see?

Valence, valence, valence, valence. Valences are calculated to do something. They are calculated to solve a problem. And every valence picked up is solution to a problem.

So therefore, you can say, if you'll excuse my rough talk, that these identities as they are passed by on the track are old antiquated solutions to confusions. They're antiquated solutions to confusions.

Now, the goals which go toward beingness are of course the much more definite goal. And the goal which is much more profitable in auditing is the beingness goal because it goes at once toward identity.

Now, a person is not himself, he is a different knowingness the moment that he is a valence. And the auditing truth which emerges is this: You can patch up a valence's broken leg providing the valence is supposed to have nonbroken legs. Got the idea?

And if your auditing of a valence does not violate any of the vital now-I'm-supposed-to's of the valence, it'll work. Therefore, you can do assists on almost anybody, but every once in a while they're bemused and amazed on an assist that should have worked but it didn't work. It worked on everybody else but it didn't work on this particular person. Well, you can chalk it up just to this and this alone – this alone: You have violated a now-I'm-supposed-to of
that valence. And the pc can do nothing about these now-I'm-supposed-to's, they are not under his control.

So your effort to patch up the broken leg was of a valence and the valence, oddly enough, was a crippled war veteran. Well, a crippled war veteran is supposed to have broken legs, so of course you get nowhere. You break your heart, you know? You say what's all this? Well, what all this is, is you're auditing a hidden valence.

Now, any pc is being dominantly, at any given time, one valence, but may be tortured or upset by other valences which are the – only the concern of the valence he is being.

So, any pc's troubles are only the troubles of the valence in which he is. And those are a pc's troubles. And the troubles of the valence are part and parcel of the now-I'm-supposed-to's of the valence.

So, this tells you bluntly and obliquely and straightly and helicopterly that there ain't no remedy of a valence's difficulties. There just is no such thing as being able to take valence A and remedy the difficulties of valence A. You can get rid of valence A but you can't get rid of the difficulties of valence A, because they are outside the power of the pc to touch, because they're now-I'm-supposed-to's which belong to something else, which he doesn't fully control, called a valence.

So we take a girl who is all geared up – she's all geared up; she's carefully grooved in war by war, you see; she's carefully grooved in and she knows the proper solution of this. And if another war comes along, she knows what she should do. She's got this solved, you see – Mata Hari. And she just is horrible to get a withhold off of. But she's awfully good in getting secrets off you. [laughter] She seems to have a total promiscuity as a viewpoint; something that's incomprehensible. And no affair she ever has seems to have any real point to it. That's so mysterious.

And you try to figure this thing out and of course you have not got the key to the closet, so what skeleton is in it must remain, therefore, a mystery.

The key to this closet of course is, in event of another war, she's going to be Mata Hari. And a war is so dangerous that she mustn't let go of any part of this solution. But she would like to feel better. You get the anomaly about it? She'd like to feel better but she can't let go of any of the things that are wrong.

So you get this oddity of "Please audit me, but you better not make me well." That's what it looks like. But actually it's "You better get me over the bumps so I can take care of myself without having to be a Mata Hari in the next war", don't you see?

"These holes that keep appearing and disappearing on my chest while you're auditing me tell me that I had better not be anything but a Mata Hari in the next war." So, you'll sometimes have a somatic turn on in a pc and go off and turn on and go off and turn on and go off and turn on. You never seem to be able to get rid of it. It's part of a valence package that keeps them from becoming something else, and they know better than to become that, see? And so they'll actually keep around the somatic, to the degree that they can, to prevent themselves from becoming an unworkable solution to a future problem.
So this girl's attitude toward men is unresolvable because it's part and parcel of survival. And just as you would be able to get your head torn off or get somebody very upset by you by walking in on a grizzly bear and taking his rations away from him, don't try to take that solution away from a pc so long as it seems absolutely vital that it be a solution.

What you've got to do, quite on the contrary, is to get the pc to face up to the various factors which make that a valence.

I wander afield. The only point I'm trying to make with you is just this one single devastating point, just one, and that is: You cannot make a valence well. You can move a valence. So this tells you that any process run at random on a pc has a very small chance of success.

You take Mr. A and you say, "All right, now we're going to solve your ideas about problems, Mr. A. And we're going to set you up, Mr. A, so that you can reach and withdraw, Mr. A. And we're going to get you over breaking your legs, Mr. A. And we're going to get rid of those funny red marks that appear and disappear on your chest, Mr. A."

Ah, but the trick is you're not auditing Mr. A. You're auditing a luckless person who has it all taped in the next war to be Mata Hari, but he's a man. So this life is a total loss as far as he's concerned. Wrong sex. Wrong, wrong orientation for a proper solution to the goal. And if a war came along, he would be utterly flabbergasted, because he could just see himself drifting back into this war correspondent, who of course is blamed for his war crime. Okay?

Move valences, don't audit them. Now, that just strips down your bag of tricks, as the effective bag of tricks, to a very small bag – the really effective tricks. This preselects them for you, left and right.

Is this process going to change, familiarize, accustom the person to identity; or is it going to handle environments which make identities vital; or is it going to alter, in other words, valences?

If this process is going to alter valences, it will work and work rather rapidly and smoothly and stay worked; and if it is not going to alter valences, it is not going to work and it is not going to stay well and solved. Do you follow me there? That's a big piece of information all in one batch.

Now, what makes a valence stick the way it sticks? What makes a valence stick the way it sticks?

Let us define a psychotic. Let's newly define a psychotic in terms of knowingness. A psychotic does not know what is going on in his environment and does not know what is going on inside himself. It is all unknown and therefore unobservational – unobserved. He doesn't know what's happening inside himself, and he doesn't know what's happening with himself, and he doesn't know what's happening where he is, and he doesn't know what's happening in front of him or behind him at any given time of the day or night. This is the one common denominator of all psychosis: Not-knowingness, what is happening around him in his environment and not knowing what is happening where he is.
Now, let's take neurosis. Neurosis is he's got some idea what's happening where he is on some things and some faint idea what's happening in his environment on some things. But, generally, unknowingness overbalances the knowingness and so you get a neurosis.

Now, let's move it up scale a little bit and let's take you. You know what's happening where you are but you don't know what's happening in somebody else a few feet away – exactly what's happening at all times of the day and night. You don't always know what's going on with everybody. You got the idea? So, that makes a slight unknowingness, doesn't it? So, just look it over now. Just get this as a pictorial picture, just as something to be graphed very easily. There you sit right where you are, and you know what you are, you know where you are, and you've got a good idea what you're doing right where you are.

All right, now let's take it to extreme. Do you know what is happening a hundred miles straight ahead of you? All right, do you know what's happening three feet straight ahead of you? Yeah, in this particular instance you do. Do you know what has happened within a few feet of you all of your life, at all times of your life?

Oh! There's some spots in your life where you didn't know what was going on, a few feet away. You did know what you were doing but you didn't know what was going on there, is that right? All right, those are the stuck spots of your track, because it's a disagreement – total disagreement. You knew, facing an "unknown", see, it's a "know" versus an "unknown" and these two things are out of agreement.

You never be surprised – a whole bunch of cheerful idiots all of whom are stupid and they all know everybody is stupid. You know, they get along beautifully? Look at a communist cell sometime. They're all happy and they all know they're stupid, you know?

But if a fellow gets up to a point where he has the least power of observation of any kind whatsoever, he starts to run into this one. And that is, immediately in his perimeter there are things he doesn't know, which makes an inequality.

Well, now, these unknowingnesses can get so overwhelming that one will adopt a valence to resolve them. He'll pick up a valence which knows about these things. They do it so often that in the United States a great many of the scientists today are content to let the valence know everything that a scientist should do and know.

I got the Polar – my Polar Times this afternoon and it's got a bunch of pictures in it and of course the polar regions are now being absolutely infiltrated and butted into and so on. Everybody is charging into the polar regions and anybody who is a member of the Polar Society gets to know all about what snowdrifts they're jumping into now. And man, let me tell you they're really jumping into a lot of snowdrifts. The boys are having a ball.

And here's a photograph, here's a photograph and here's a bunch of perfectly valid human beings, but they've just invented a motor that will chew up snow. It's a ten-horsepower motor, and a fan blade goes underneath the snowbank and it just keeps chewing up snow. And it's all very nice, and so forth. But you look at the guy who is standing there posing with the picture, you see, of it and he is a scientist one way or the other. He isn't doing anything. He's testing it. And in all the midst of all these parkas and everything, here is the perfect mock-up, you see – up there at about 89 degrees north – here's the perfect mock-up of a scientist.
They've got to have the old school tie; they've got to have their diploma signed just right; they've got to have all of these various things; they've got to be just so; they've got to belong to the right societies in order to be these things. And they get that — that beingness has got to be just exact, you know? It mustn't vary a hair.

And if anybody comes along and thinks a thought in the field of science who doesn't have this exact beingness these boys almost go mad! They just go berserk! Why?

Also, this doesn't add up. The boys who invented most of the civilization in which we are now confusedly involved and who laid the fundamentals of it, were not one of them scientists. Firestone, Ford, you know, Edison. These birds were about as far as you could get from this particular mock-up.

But this other mock-up is a kind of a whole track mock-up. Actually, they've got a scientist all mixed up with a technician. Oh yes, a good scientist always demands of his technician that he have the right old school tie and that sort of thing because he doesn't want him running off with the uranium pot.

But it's a sort of a body running without a head now, because they're calling scientists technicians and that sort of thing, you know? It's all messed up. But it's an exact beingness — it's an exact beingness. And the moment you try to shake that beingness even the least little bit and you — just by a question, you know?

Yeah, I asked one time, I asked a, quote, "scientist", unquote, who was being hired at vast expense on a government project to develop jet propulsion — atomic jet propulsion. And I said, "Well, have you ever made up an orifice — an optimum orifice pressure table for jet orifices?"

Well, this would be the most fundamental thing you would ever dream up if you were doing a jet propulsion job, you see. Because it says how big is the cylinder and how fast must the velocity of particles go out of the cylinder to give you the maximum horsepower — foot pounds of thrust. And this bird was absolutely turned into screaming, squirming jelly. They hadn't done it, you see? They were still using the Chicago Fire Department's hose tables. [laughter] And I had suddenly, inadvertently exposed to view, you see, the fact that they were being about as thorough, you see, as somebody throwing bits of paper in the wind.

And I actually wasn't trying to invalidate the boy. But he just went all to pieces and he became absolutely savage about me — just real bitter, you know? Because, obviously, he's living the life of a mock-up.

You see, you've got the right old school tie; he's got the right letters; he's got the right this; he's got the right that; he is at a right desk; he is wearing the right pipe; he is, you know, he's got it all taped; he reads the right papers and everything else. But, of course, he isn't doing anything. See, all he is, is a package of now-I'm-supposed-to's operating with Chicago Fire Department's hose pressure tables. This is — becomes a very solid valence.

They seldom send the scientists out to fight the wars, by the way, and it could be just another Mata Hari dodge, you see? But the guy evidently really isn't thinking up anything; he really isn't adding anything. He's adding up figures and standing around and posing with a… One of the hard cases in the parka, you see, is the fellow who set this snow eradicator going
and then stepped aside so the scientist could pose there by it, you see – manipulating it. Marvelous!

You can see on all sides of you these outrageously artificial valences which are pretended valences, and you see the level of pretence of the valence. And when you see it to that degree, of course, it immediately becomes spotted for you and you say, "Ha-ha! Yeah, that's very artificial."

Ahhhh, but Suzy Glutz sits down and she is not in this type of artificiality and you say, "She is real." Yeah, George Aloysius Doakes sits down and you say, "He is real." See, no pretence here, this man is a downright matter of fact – well, maybe that's the valence: downright, matter-of-fact. [laughter] He's identified himself hasn't he? Well, if he's identified himself by a bunch of tricks such as clothes, hat – well, you must be looking at a valence. You must be looking at a valence and a package of valences.

Now, the obvious valence that the fellow has a body does not necessarily condemn him at all. It's the valence that he is being and is using the body to be, that is the auditing target. So a human being has a body. All right. So a thetan has a body and it's following the current mode. Well, this doesn't actually make a valence. You know, it's not plowed in; it's not below his level of consciousness. He's just soared down from Arcturus and he picked up a body and he's walking it around and he sits down.

Now, you say to him, "Who are you?"

And he says, "Well, I'm – I'm X54 and just came in from Arcturus."

The only trace of valence there is "X54" – because he knows it. See? But of course a psychiatrist would lock him up.

I've always been going to write another Ole Doc Methuselah story, you know, about this type of crisscross.

Anyway, what I mean by valence, as far as an auditing target is concerned, is more or less the mental-image-picture package which the person has composed to resolve the problems of existence which he doesn't know anything about. He knows practically nothing of this valence. He cannot really identify the valence. He has fixed it up so that it is really unknown and really hidden. Because this thing, apparently, was surviving and it was totally unknown to him. He picked up the package and he's going on with the package, because it's a survival package. This he's fairly sure of.

He notices that this drunken, bum uncle of his, who flops around all over the place and gets sick regularly Saturday night all over the living room floor, is cared for. He doesn't have to work; everybody steps very light in his vicinity; he is just leading a perfectly easy wonderful survival life. And then we wonder why the little boy in the family all of a sudden grows up and is practically his exact image.

Well, one: He doesn't know why this fellow is leading this life, you see? And two: He's got all sorts of confusions himself that this fellow doesn't seem to have. So to escape from his own confusions, he could pick up the valence of this stumblebum uncle, you see?
And it's always easier to pick up a weaker valence than a stronger one. So your more logical target is the weaker valence.

Now, if the pc has a bunch of chronic somatics of one kind or another, these are part of the valence picture; these are not the pc. These are part of the valence picture. So somatics are part of the valence picture. Somatics are not part of the pc.

There's - even the mechanics of this has been worked out some years ago. I worked it out so you've got to have actually two identities counteropposed in order to get a smush and to keep a valence in. You've got to have a couple of identities pinned up. In other words, you've got the pc being himself versus this thing in order to feel pain. A pain phenomenon has to be highly artificialized. In other words, to hurt, why, you've got to have a couple of valences kicking around which are this way and that. I won't go into the torturous methodology of how this was worked out. I think it was Washington, 1957.

But it works like this. This fellow - to have experience, he says to himself - he will have to survive. This is the way he's got it worked out backwards: To have experience, he'll have to survive; to survive, he has to be this package.

You've got somebody who's convinced that he could not survive as himself or experience as himself. He has to be something else in order to experience; he has to be something else in order to survive; he has to be something else in order to live. And he is so sold on this idea of having to be something else in order to live, don't you see, that you haven't a chance until, all of a sudden, he realizes that he could live without it.

And of course his total game or his games condition is the "know–not-know," "have–can't-have," "be–don't-be," "do–don't-do," arrangements of this particular valence. And that's its relationship to some environment. And of course the tragedy of it is, it's usually measured up for an environment which no longer exists.

You get the boys going around - the Teddy boys, you know, or the Edwardian jackets, you know, that sort of thing. They think this is pretty good. They've got themselves all rigged up.

Now, you get the other crew that's going around these days in the slick motorcycle jackets - these leather motorcycle jackets, you see? They're all rigged up to live in space opera. Of course they're just waiting. They're just waiting. Russia and the United States are going to have a ball sooner or later, and they're turning into space societies now, the like of which you never heard of, you know? Socialism. All these things are part of these: Balanced economy, slave dictatorships. And they're getting themselves all fixed up to be rocket jockeys. They're going around acting like they ought to act, you see, if the society were a space opera society. Well, they're getting familiar with it and they're getting in practice and that'll be a very good solution.

It's true too. You'll be able to put them in a spaceship and say, "All right, Arcturus or bust!" you see, and they bust. [laughter]

And you'll see these various stratas with you right now as classes. You'll see whole classes of things.
I don't know what the girls of today are being, particularly. I haven't looked it over very thoroughly lately, but I will say this – I will say this, that the society has got practically every woman a bit out of arrangement, you see? Because here we had a perfectly nice society going along, which was an agrarian society, and its values – male, female, familial – they were all figured out, they were all taped, everybody knew where they stood, you see? Might have been rough, but everybody knew where they stood.

Now all of a sudden you have coeducation and "Girl sniper does for eighteen hundred Germans", you see? And what's she supposed to be doing? Well, she doesn't know. So she picks up all kinds of oddball valences of how women fit into other types and classes of society. And you find some real wild ones, you know? I mean not necessarily a wild girl but you find offbeat valences of various kinds or another.

And a woman tends even more so in a society which is in a state of flux and which hasn't instantly and immediately found a specific use or need for a woman at any given instant, such as an agrarian society where it was all comfortable, you see – everything was taped. Now you're in a society where it isn't all taped and the exact specific need for a woman isn't quite manifest. You know, she's supposed to get married; she's supposed to have children; she's supposed to work.

Now, wait a minute, let's see. She's supposed to work. Yeah, but she's supposed to work at home? No, not really. Where's she supposed to work? Well, she's supposed to work out and contribute her money to the family coffers. Aw, now wait a minute. Now wait a minute. This doesn't make sense. Now let's see, how can we figure this out?

Well, the girl goes half-balmy trying to figure this out and all of a sudden says, "Well, there's a much better solution, you see? I had a much better solution 1,266,000 years ago and a much better solution to the whole thing, you see? And that was to be a ballet dancer." Yeah, well, there's still uses for ballet dancers, that's for sure, you know? Well, there you go, that's the best thing.

Only difficulty is she can't dance at this particular time and she's going to have to go several lifetimes grooving in, grooving in, grooving in. She'll eventually pick up a mock-up, then she'll be able to carry through this ambition. But right now it's on sleep, see? It isn't manifest, it doesn't solve the thing, therefore she's quite unhappy about it. Her now-I'm-supposed-to's get thrown aside so she then picks up a package of now-I'm-supposed-to's, you see, to get her out of situations which oddly enough she isn't in either. [laughter] You get how the confusion merges and how it spins around.

All I'm trying to tell you is just that you've got to find and move valences in order to straighten out cases. You've got to do that. And you can't straighten out a case without moving a valence.

When you have moved a valence you have changed a profile. When you have not moved a valence, I don't know what you've done.

All right, let's look this over. How would you apply this directly? All right, fellow has a toothache. You don't say to him, "What valence would find a toothache profitable?" You could ask him that. But you could say – this is just a quick one, you see, "Who had a tooth-
ache?" That was the oldest one, 1950, June. "Who had a toothache?" Bang, bang, bang. You remember several people who had toothaches and it tends to split the valence.

That is more valid than putting him in communication with the tooth in his head because that isn't his toothache. In the first place, this tooth can't ache without another tooth aching plastered on top of it in some kind of a mental image picture. Ah-ha! It can't ache, that's what's interesting, without another picture valence splattered on top of it. Got it? All right. We're going to say to this fellow. "All right, now uhm..." He just keeps having this problem about cars; he just can't seem to keep a car. Every time he gets a car, why, somebody takes it away from him one way or the other, and so on. All right. You say, "When did you have difficulty with a car? When did cars have difficulty with you?"

Uh-uh. A car isn't really a valence. Could be. There's some engineers – I've got an engineering firm. They're a very good engineering firm, and both the son who is about forty-something, and the old man who is close to seventy, talk to you. And when they start talking they start the motor. And they do. They say, "Rar-rar-rar." That's right. Well, Peter – he's heard them over the phone. Yeah, they say, "Rar-rar-rar." [laughter] And both of them have been to the hospital for repairs lately. [laughter]

So, we might – we might get someplace unexpectedly on this subject of a car because it might, itself, be a kind of a valence, you know? But we say, "When did you have difficulty with a car?" and, "When did cars have difficulty with you?" Well, if it was a valence it would work, but it would be much more profitable to say, "Who would have difficulty with cars?" See, "Who would have difficulty with cars?" "Who would have difficulty with cars?" "Describe a person that would have difficulty with cars", you know? Process it right there at "Be". And all of a sudden, you'd find a fantastic thing.

All right, I'll give you the right and wrong one again, here, that's a little plainer. You say, "When have you hidden? Thank – ..." This guy is – we find him on "hide" and we say, "When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden?" Yeah, you get some kind of a result and you have a lot of somatics, and so forth. And he comes back the next day and he's got the same somatic, the same package. So we say, "When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden?" Yeah, you get some kind of a result and you have a lot of somatics, and so forth. And he comes back the next day and he's got the same somatic, the same package. So we say, "When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden?" Same somatics, same package, the next day. You, well, you're processing a valence, see? He isn't there to be processed, practically. You see, he's overwhumped in some kind of a valence and the valence is supposed to hide.

And you'd say, "Who would find it necessary to hide?" "Who would find it necessary to hide?" "From what confusion would who hide?" You know? That's an awful tough one, it's a divided split-double-question. But – it wouldn't ordinarily be used – but that's what you're trying to find out. You know?

"Who would try to hide from what confusion?" "Think of somebody who is always hiding." "Who else would be always hiding?" "Think of a person who hides." Because that valence has got the confusion, he hasn't got it. But you could double it in brass and you would produce probably more bombastic results. You would be processing the condition in which the fellow found himself, and so forth.
You could go at it this way. You could say, "What beingness would be a good solution for an environment where it couldn't be? What beingness would be a good solution for a tough environment?" – better one. We had this a long time ago. We had "Who would survive what?" you know, that sort of thing. Process your who's; process your valences.

All right, now let's get a little bit further and let's go upstairs a little more into the high school aspects of the thing.

Got a guy with a toothache. All right, you're going to cure this toothache. You'd say, "Who would want to cure a toothache?" And you do an assessment on terminals. You'd say, "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would want to cure a toothache?" "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would want to cure a toothache?" "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would want to cure a toothache?"

He's given you the goal. He's got a toothache and he wants it cured. You've got your goal. So your goal is understood so you're jumping right off from there. But make sure he wants to cure this toothache, you know? And you just run two sides of it and do a terminal assessment on the thing.

It might not last to a terminal. The thing – whole thing might blow before you got a terminal, do you see? "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would cure a toothache?" Cause-Effect line of the goal.

You get a whole terminals list on the thing: Don't be a bit surprised if it's blown. But if one of them doesn't blow, you've got it – you've got the valence. You've got it right there, *bongo! bongo!* and it's a real stuck valence.

So open up with your Prehav Scale and you do an assessment on that valence and you run it at that level of the Prehav Scale, not even bothering to mention the toothache again. You see?

You're not now running the Prehav Scale against a tooth. See, you're running the Prehav Scale right directly and immediately against the terminal you've found. So what did you do? You did a Routine 3 operation to do an assist.

Now, if you can see that a Routine 3 operation can operate as an assist and is workable as an assist, your faith and ability in doing Goals Assessments, of course, would increase enormously, wouldn't it?

Now, if you can find a hidden standard on your pc – and this is quite a legitimate operation, having not to do with an assist: Having to do with a present time problem. You find a hidden standard on your pc. "What would have to happen in order to know that Scientology worked? What would have to happen in order to know this processing was working? What would have to happen?" Oh, you'd get a whole list of these things and you'd do an assessment on the thing. These are goals; these are present time problems. You assess them down, you find one that bongs real good and real hard, bangbang on the meter, you see? You take that one, take that one all by itself and there must be a goal of some kind associated with that particular hidden standard. And if it isn't inherently stated in the thing that fell, you're still going to have to get the terminals for it.
All right, let us say, well, he's got a shoulder ache and that's what it is, you know? And when the shoulder ache gets more, why, he knows he's getting worse; and when the shoulder ache gets less, why, he knows he is winning in auditing. And this is the standard he uses in order to measure his auditing – worse or better on the sore shoulder. Good.

All right. Well, you could still go at it on both ends, "Who could have it?" and "Who could cure it?" "Who would have it?" and "Who could cure it?" or "Who would cure it?" or "Who would try to cure it?" or "Who has it?" If you just did an assessment on "Who has it?" you would win. Or if you did an assessment on "Who would handle them?" you'd win. You see? Just get your list of terminals that have to do with sore shoulders if that's what fell.

All right, do your terminals assessment, move it over onto the Prehav Scale and you get the terminal, if the shoulder is still there, and run it on the Prehav Scale – with your rudiments in. You follow this? All right, there would be a method of handling a hidden standard. Right? Using this rule of handle the valence, don't handle the significances.

Now, I will say this as a final word here. For a long, long time I had the question: "Should you handle solids or significances? Should you handle conditions? Should you handle solids?" And I knew even last year that you had to handle solids. You'd better handle solids if you're really going to get anywhere.

But this was not the full picture. No, the picture is this: Do not handle the conditions of the valence, handle the valence. Now that, clear-cut and well-stated, you'll find is far more workable than conditions and solids because some conditions can appear to be solid. "Think" to somebody could be a black blob.

No, let's make it much more workable than this. Don't handle conditions of a valence. Don't audit at those things. Don't say, "Well, how could you cure a sor-shor-uh-a sore shoulder?" Boy, try to say that one as an auditing command. And so forth and so on. "Now reach from the shoulder, withdraw –." Even though assists work and that sort of thing.

This is the limitation, by the way, of a Touch Assist – is explained to you right there. And you know how limited it is. Well, its limitations are the limitations of the valence. You're trying to cure a valence of some kind or another. It's the valence that's got a bad one, not the other. So the condition, the condition, the condition. No, because it's the condition of the valence.

In order to handle this thing, handle the valence. Handle the terminal. Always handle the terminal and you've got it. And this thing will wrap up and I think you'll find this will hold true very, very nicely and very easily.

Now, that moves Prehav – a Prehav 13* sort of an activity right up into the limelight. The tremendous success you had on Failed Help by making a long list of terminals of everybody the person had ever known in this lifetime, and then assessing those down, and then running on the one that seemed to be the livest – Failed Help; is of course, simply expanded into this other area of you assess the terminal on the Prehav Scale and you – not just Failed Help – but you take any level of the Prehav Scale that this terminal falls on.

* Editor's note: Apparently what is meant is "Formula 13". Formula 13 involved making a list of terminals the pc knows in PT. See Red Vol. IV, p.179.
So you get Prehav 13, is an exceedingly profitable type of activity if you went right at it and did it hammer and tongs. You have a person make a list of everybody they have known in this lifetime. And then you go on and add to this list the way you would do a terminals assessment. And you just take everybody they've known. And then you assess that list to get the one that falls the most this time. Now, you don't assess it by elimination, you just assess it by the steepest and biggest reaction. You assess it by reaction of the needle.

And it turns out to be Mama or Grandpa or something of the sort. All right, don't pay much more attention to it. Doesn't matter if you miss. Take that particular terminal that you found by the greatest reaction and you move that particular terminal over into the Prehav Scale and assess that terminal on the Prehav Scale. Find out about Grandpa all up and down the Prehav Scale and you finally find that Grandpa is falling gorgeously on Failed Abandon. And then you run a five-way on Failed Abandon and you've got this thing pretty well set up.

Now, that was the original Prehav 13. Of course, you don't run any twenty-minute rule with Prehav 13. You run the needle quiet, and the tone arm doesn't seem to be moving too much, and you run the needle quiet. But it's just a little – very short period of time that you observe it. Do you see? And then go over and take off another one. Take another terminal and assess this – this lifetime terminals for the now livest terminal and run it on the Prehav Scale. Assess it on the Prehav Scale. Do you follow? And as soon as you've got this set up, run it and promptly get the charge off of that one.

And all you're trying to do is take charge off of these terminals, one after the other, and you'll find your pc will make a tremendous jump.

Now, a pc who has always got the rudiments out should probably be run for a while on Prehav 13, because you're running valences. You're running valences pure and simple. These are the people they're tangled with up and down the track.

Now, you'll find some of those are pretty tangled. And some of those might require a session or two to run, but the pc will emerge at the other end of this thing feeling much better, always – consistently and continually.

Now, when you're trying to clean an auditor off, you use this same procedure. You take all the auditors the fellow ever had, do a Prehav 13 type of assessment, get the auditor that falls the most, move him over onto the Prehav Scale, get the idea? And then you run that level flat and you take the next auditor and – any way you wanted to go about it like this.

You could take any Scientology personnel or any people in Scientology and make a list and run it the same way. You have another type of action, and it'd be very beneficial. You'd get all this... That, by the way, is how you would get off all the auditing a fellow ever had. And also, if you used all Scientology persons, you'd get off all the auditing he'd ever given, too. See? Not that it's terribly important, but you'd get them both off. That's for sure. It's an interesting thing.

A fellow could have been run on a thousand processes and all of them wrong and this rather short – short activity knocks out all the auditing he ever had. Leaves him with the gains and takes away all the losses. Interesting thing to know, isn't it? If you do it by valences.
So, just look at this as a valid activity: That anything you can do by valences is going to get you someplace and things you can't do by valences won't get you anyplace. If you want lasting gains, do it by valences.

All right now, goals – goals. You can run lots of goals on a pc, one way or the other. And I'm sure you can find goals on a pc, left and right. But if you just ran goals, goals, goals, goals, goals, for weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks without finding any kind of a goal at all, you'd never get a crack at the valences. You only want the goal to get you into valences. See?

Now, you could probably do an entirely different type of Goals Assessment. You could just take a list of the fellow's goals and find – do a valence assessment for each goal. Then check the goal and it's blown up. And that would be auditing by assessment.

Do you see how you'd do that? You'd just take a list; he gives you forty goals; you say, "Fine." You run down the thing; you find one of those things is hot. Well, let's do a terminals assessment on it right now. We don't bother to erase it. Just do a terminals assessment. Well, the thing is going to blow up on a terminals assessment. You'll probably never get to the Prehav Scale with it.

If you just took goal after goal, find out "Who would do that?" and "Who would it be done to?" and so on; and just shook down all the terminals and got him to remembering people this way and that; and got the valences all stirred up on the thing, even a minor goal would produce a considerable case change, don't you see?

So he's got this silly goal, well, "To eat my dinner better." All right. Almost starting from the first goal that he gave you on the list, say, "Who would eat their dinner better?" and "Who would force somebody to eat their dinner better?" You know, something like this. And you get a list of those people, you know, and you'll find out that goal – that goal is cleaned up, man. That cleaned up slicker than any platter he ever cleaned. Got the idea? There would be a different way of attacking this.

Until you've got a clear-cut idea in your own mind of exactly what the put-together is – exactly what the put-together is in the mind – the put-together is a very simple thing. The fellow found himself to be inadequate. That must have meant that he was in some kind of an environment which was horrifying to him. So he adopted a beingness of some kind or another to get him out of it or to be something else, don't you see? This is going on. But he also had a goal to get him out of it.

So he went out of it with a goal and he went out of it with a beingness – sort of a double action was going on here. Now, he doesn't want to go back into that again and he'd just better not ever go into it again. So, of course, you start picking up goals and you start picking up terminals, and you pick up goals and you pick up terminals. Well, you get all of his escape points and he has to look at them sooner or later. He has to see how he got started along this particular line, he has to see where he was going. He starts as-ising bank like mad. Right?

All right, I'll give you one more thing, one more thing here, and that is you can always put a Not-Know bracket after a Know bracket on the Prehav Scale.
You've got a five-way bracket and it has to do with Grandpa – a grandfather leaving. Well, now find out on five different legs what isn't known about Grandfather's leaving, you got the idea? So that you run the five Know, the five Not-Know. And that'll just about treble your speed of run.

Now, the mechanism by which people used to be able to recall on ARC Straightwire – and then they'd recall the same incidents over and over again and then they'd never get any further than this – they – you know – they'd just recall those same cycles of incidents and no new incidents would turn up and you were whipped. Well actually, what was standing in their road was the not-know – the not-know. What did they not know about this particular thing, you see?

So if you were to have added Not-Know on any Recall Process of any kind whatsoever, you'd have plowed out more track. Simple?

"Well, let's see", you'd say, "With whom have you communicated?" or "Recall a time you communicated." And then, "What don't you know about having communicated?" or "What communication don't you know about?" And you'd find out that your ARC Straightwire would not then cycle on the same span of track. It'd be more and more track, and more and more and more and more and more and more and more, as long as you were running Not-Know alongside of the Know. Right?

So we look over this, then, we find out that we could as easily put in Not-Know or some version of Not-Know in every command bracket, five for five – run the Know's, run the Not-Know's. And you'll plow more and more track, more and more track, more and more track and speed the run.

Give you a model of that sort of thing: Well, it's just "What don't you know about Grandfather leaving? What wouldn't you know about a grandfather leaving?" or "What haven't you known?", or any way it works out on your command sheet. Get the idea?

Those commands – package commands are very unsafe. It's very unsafe to run an exact package command with no check for the pc against the E-Meter. You should always clear your commands against the E-Meter and find out if they're all live and all answerable before you settle down for any kind of a run. Okay?

Well, now, you have tomorrow and a whole weekend in order to digest all this and after you've digested it, probably somebody will change your valence and probably it was only the valence remembering, so thank you.

[laughter, applause]
CONTROL OF ATTENTION

A lecture given on 18 August 1961

Now you've given me a guilty conscience!

Given me a guilty conscience now. This is the what, 18th of August? And you are getting an extra lecture today. But that's basically because of this burning fact: You're not doing good. That's the burning fact. When worse auditing is done, there will probably be people shot over it. I hate to say something like that. But when worse auditing is done around the world, it'll be done with brickbats or something of this sort.

Now, I don't wish to be unkind. I don't wish to be unkind, but I wish to be very, very factual. You're not auditing; you're in a games condition. That's why you're not getting goals. You couldn't possibly miss these things the way they've been missed.

And this tells us about 90 percent of the auditors get into a games condition over goals processing and that is the secret behind Routine 3 and that is the data which has emerged. They themselves have been so thoroughly suppressed in their goals and have been so smashed back into environments that they themselves did not want to be in, that in the final analysis, when they start to audit, they do fine right up to the point where they start to run goals and terminals on somebody or something like that and then they go blooey. And you've just got to do a better job of auditing and you've just got to lay that games condition aside on the subject of goals.

Now, I was even thinking you could possibly get run back and forth a little while "What goal would you rather another didn't have" or something like this and run the games condition on goals for a little while till you got over this.

But this is the primary thing. It isn't that you're flubbing technically particularly, but it is just absolute nonsense, man. It is nonsense to have the second goal the pc ever gave you, the proper goal. Now, that's – that's silly! And then go on for five weeks looking for a goal. Now, that's already turned up here. Pc gives you a terminal – gives you a terminal and the terminal is the right terminal and it falls, so the next day the wording is changed on the terminal and it doesn't fall and that's washed out. It's called something else the next day by the auditor. So of course it doesn't fall. The other wording that it was changed to never fell anyhow.

I'll give you an idea of it. "Black cat" fell. So in the next auditing session the auditor takes up the thing and he says "cat" and it doesn't fall. So, he says, "Well of course, I haven't found the terminal." But a check-over reveals that "black cat" was falling on – on one day and "cat" wasn't falling on the next.

But "black cat" is still falling and black cat is the terminal. Now how else do you explain that, than just say, well, the guy can't have a terminal, that's all.
Now look, I know basically there's a certain terror in making Clears. I know, it's kind of spooky, man! Kind of spooky. I – I myself get a jolter once in a while. You know, the records on Clears are coming in here fairly rapidly and here's another Clear, you know and once in a blue moon I find myself, you know, saying "Ah-da oh-oh! Ump!" You get the idea? I mean, just some little reactive flick and I laugh about it, you know, I say, "This is silly as hell."

See, you can get a reactive flip on this – this type of thing, you know, and you're fairly sure now that you're on the right line. And the only way you could stop making Clears right now is just don't run the rudiments, don't find the fellow's goal, and don't let him have his terminal. And if you do that, and audit it badly, of course you won't have a Clear.

I think there's a little bit of jolt connected with this. Now, that's just my private opinion. But don't think for a moment I haven't got confidence in you, because I think if I just point out what you're doing, what I think you're doing; and if that fits, the next time you're looking down the barrel of assessing somebody and so forth, I think you will be able to just checkrein yourself a little bit the way I've done, you know. You say, "Well, uh ..." And all of a sudden you realize, "Wait a minute! I left that whole block of goals out. Ho-ho-ho-ho. Well, now." And get yourself by the scruff of the neck and put yourself back in the lineup and take up that block of goals and let's go over them, let's go over them real carefully.

This is hard lines, isn't it? But look-a-here, if we have operated up to a point where we can learn this, then the time is not wasted let me assure you. The time is not wasted, because I've been looking for what it is and the – the long goals assessment ...

And do you know that I've studied this, just literally, for months. I looked over auditing records and reports and they all seem logical and there just doesn't seem to be a single thing out. But when I gave you a raking over the coals on the subject and you got busy – it confirmed it. That's it. I mean, right away you start finding some goals and terminals. They've been there all the time!

Well now, how do you account for that? How do you account for it? Otherwise than the fact that there must be, not – not carelessness, but there must be this little bit of unwillingness to find the goal and terminal, you see. There's just a little bit of a games condition going on here, you get the idea? Because you're too bright, otherwise, to make these mistakes and you don't make these mistakes in run-of-the-mill auditing. See, that goes along fine. But on goals and terminals, bang!

Now of course, suppressing somebody else's goal is the most natural thing in the world if you've got a bug on being murdered. If you've been murdered recently, what's the goal of the murderer? To kill you, of course. And what is your whole evasive action? It's actually, fundamentally devoted to knocking out the goal of the murderer to kill you. Isn't that right? So if you knock out the goal of the murderer to knock you off, naturally he won't. See? So it's almost livingness to suppress goals.

See, there's whole classes of goals that one would just instinctively suppress, you know. We'd instinctively suppress a goal such as the secretary of state or the president of the United States is all of a sudden going to sell out to Russia, wouldn't we? Well, we'd be horrified! All right, now let's look how far this could go. Are there whole classes of goals that...
could horrify us? Yeah, well, we must have a lot of built-in modus operandi of suppression of unworthy or unwanted goals. Well now, that easily slips over into suppression of goals. Suppression of goals, suppression of terminals.

I don't think you're trying to suppress Clears. You'd be proud as punch if you made a Clear. But I think this instinctive – this instinctive "suppress the goal", you know, is standing right in your path, with concrete blocks on this assessment.

Because now I can tell you that from some data to hand here now, that the terminals and goals did exist in the first part of the list. They existed in the first part of the list. How did you miss them? How could they be missed?

Now, you can go ahead with an assessment. If you were handling every incident that came up and you were cross-questioning and crisscrossing every incident that came up and you were checking the guy backwards and forwards and so forth, all the way through and you were actually clearing this – actually auditing him as you assessed him – you know, running not-know on every incident that came up and running not-know on what he doesn't know about the goal and what area he escaped. The type of clearing which I was describing about three days ago, remember? You could just plow the whole thing up and bring him out the other end Clear, too. See, you could do that, but you aren't doing that. You're just running repeater technique and trying to find a goal.

Well, if you're trying to find a goal, you can find one and it's usually in the first dozen, two dozen, fifty, hundred and fifty goals that the person gave you. And as far as terminals are concerned, it's usually out of a list of thirty – thirty, forty terminals. It's not hundreds of terminals – thirty, forty, fifty, something like that. Can be done and you can find it.

So therefore, we must be letting our reactive minds get a little bit in our road of clearing, wouldn't you say? Must be just something on that order. Otherwise we wouldn't find a goal on Tuesday and on Wednesday change the wording of it, so that it didn't register and then say it doesn't exist. Got the idea? We wouldn't let a goal hang fire for four weeks or something like that, before we suddenly said, "Well, I guess we'll have to let him have it after all." But it'd been there for that many weeks, you see, still registering.

Well, the idea of get more goals, get more goals – this is all fine; this is all praiseworthy and so forth. Yes, add to the goals list and perhaps your directions here are to some degree at fault. I take full responsibility for that, not having obviated them.

But you just don't need all of these goals, you see, in order to do a Goals Assessment. You – you it... Yeah, get your hidden goals and get your withheld goals and unknown goals and suppressed goals, and – and that sort of thing – ask for these in your classification – but when you've got about 150 goals written down there, if you can't find a goal amongst those that would stick, you better turn in your E-Meter. It's just nonsense, not to be able to.

Now, if you cleared up every reason he had each goal and went into it this way – not with a repeater technique but with Not-Know and found out what – you know, got the terminal for the goal and found out what he doesn't know about that type of a valence, you see, and what area that valence would want to escape from, and what goal... You know, just take up
the whole thing, with lots of not-knows and just cover the whole thing. Oh, yeah, you'd make a Clear that way too.

But you're not doing that, you're doing it by repeater technique and repeater technique is simply to eliminate and leave us standing with a goal that will register. You should be able to do it in an afternoon, on any pc that walks up the street.

So let's just rack back our sights here on what we're supposed to be doing on the thing and we are not alone in this kind of a mistake. Because the mistake has been made in Australia and it has now been made in Washington. It's not going to be made anymore.

See, we've been making this mistake a long time. I've finally isolated the factors which are causing us to make this mistake and the factors which cause us to make the mistake is an expectancy of: having to get all of the pc's goals before we find a goal – which of course isn't necessary at all – or have to find all possible terminals before we find a terminal to match the goal, you see. You're being just a little bit too thorough, a little bit too rigorous here, a little bit too stretchy on the whole thing.

Pc gets down to a point where he's comm lagging on you for a minute before he can give you another goal; well, hell, you've got the list; you've got everything on the list you want. Got the idea. He goes home and he does he – he... You say, "I'm going to do a Goals Assessment on you tomorrow" and you say, "Make up a list of goals. Write down all the goals you ever thought of and also the goals that you don't want anybody to know about. Write them all down and bring them in to me." Take the list, say, "Are there any goals you didn't write down on this?"

"Well, no, not really", and needle falls.

"Well, what goal did you not write down on this?"

"Well, I purposely didn't write down the goal to – burning every city I live in, you know." Something like this.

Write it down, you know, strip it down a little bit. You don't get any more action on the needle particularly, for that moment. That's it. Now you have his goals list. Now one of those goals is going to consistently fall, that I guarantee. If it is read out and phrased and so forth, it will continue to fall. Otherwise, your rudiments are out. You've stopped the goal from falling by getting the rudiment out in some fashion or you erased it or you've invalidated it or you've just done a lousy technical job in some fashion.

Auditing, perhaps to you, might seem to be something that had enormous numbers of rules connected with it. And as long as you think of auditing as having enormous numbers of rules, you aren't auditing. These rules just serve as guideposts of one kind or another. But back of those rules, your good heart can carry the day.

You trying to help this fellow out? All right, there are certain things his mind will and won't do and if that is the basket of rules by which you're operating, you're perfectly safe – rather than a basket of ritual. And I call to your attention that every religious organization on the face of Earth must have fall – failed in its original representation to the multitude. Must have failed; must have! Because they developed rituals.
Never let the ritual get to be the thing. Now, we can give you a ritual which repetitively spoken gives you a great ease of proceeding. And you shouldn't depart from it, particularly, but it has no value beyond making a constancy of session, that's all. That's all the value that a Model Session has. It just gives you a constant representation and it gives the pc a little confidence, because he isn't being asked these things in different ways. And it also has the technical advantage of running out former sessions, because you're using the same words. Repetitively, by repeater technique, the sessions never stick then – if you always use the same bridges and that sort of thing – you run out your own sessions. So you're just doing two jobs in one. It's a good piece of auditing, but its value, is no greater than that. It won't do anything. It won't do anything. It's just a standardization.

Now, let's look at what is happening. Here is what a pc will not do and this is what you must learn in auditing. A pc will not go into session with his mind fixated, his attention fixated on something else than what you're trying to do. His attention is fixated on something; now, you are not going to be able to get him in-session. Nor will you get his interest in the process you are running and don't be amazed if your pc is restless and you haven't solved this point of concentrated attention.

Now, a pc sits down and practically can scream at you sometimes and tell you "My attention is definitely concentrated on the fire hydrant which is outside the front door." He'll warn you, if you ask him.

All the rudiments are simply covered on something like this: "Is your attention fixated on something? Is there any reason you wouldn't talk to me?" and you've got all the rudiments. Your rudiments cover nothing else. You could look in vain to find something else. "Is your attention fixated on something? Is there any reason you won't talk to me?" and if that was your rudiments, that would be all right.

Now as a matter of fact, however, the questions are a little broad. They aren't sufficiently particular and so you have the rudiments. How many ways can his attention be fixed so as to stop a session from occurring? Well, it can actually only be fixed a very few ways.

He's got a present time problem of short duration or he's got a present time problem of long duration. Now that would be a fixation on the exterior environment and usually the short – the long duration problem is a fixation on something subjective. Present time problems of short duration are fixed attention on the immediate environment and present time problems of long duration the present – the attention is fixed on something in present time all right, but it's also been fixed on this thing for a long time and it's usually subjective.

So his attention is so fixed – he can articulate this if you ask him hard – his attention is so fixed that, of course, to do anything else than keep his attention fixed there, would be painful to him. So you get into trouble.

Now there's the – the primary sources of fixed attention: present time problem of short duration; present time problem of long duration. Under the heading of present time problem of short duration you get such matters, is, "Well, I haven't given the – the housekeeper a message I had for her and I have to sit here remembering that at the end of the session, you see, I'm supposed to give the housekeeper this particular message." No go. You won't get any auditing done.
You got somebody who's sitting there saying, "Well, yes, yes, yes, when did I eliminate a king? Okay, okay." "Now, I must remember to give the housekeeper the message", you see. "All right, well I eliminated a king..." "Remember the housekeeper, the message." "The king, uh..." "When did I eliminate a housekeeper?" [laughter] You get what's going on?

Well, you're not paralleling what the mind is doing, and of course when you don't parallel what the mind is doing with auditing you of course fail with auditing, naturally. Now, the reason you fail might be interesting to you. We'll take that up in a moment. Let's take up the problem of long duration.

The fellow's attention has been so consistently and so continually fixed upon this particular thing, that at no time can he get his attention really on anything else and he more or less knows about it. It's very close to the surface and it is very real to him and you could say it is the reality station for his attention. Everything else is sort of unreal and this is pretty real and it can be anything. It can be a sore eye, you see. It can be a – a bad side. It can be whether or not he's getting old. You see what I mean? It's whether or not her beauty will be totally destroyed at long last, you get the idea? But it's – it's – be something here. It's something and it's been going on for a long time. By long duration, we mean this lifetime; absolute maximum limit. Got the idea? We – as soon as we exceed this lifetime, we have case. That is the most flagrant of these.

Now, you very often find a present time problem – this gets confusing to pc, because a present time problem of long duration becomes case. He finds out this has been going on for actually ages and he thought it had just been going on for the last few years and factually it's been going on since ancient Troy. You get the idea?

Something on the order of this: Is his son going to disgrace him? See. This is his – you know, he's thinking about this all the time, and he comes into session. It's quite – it's quite up on the surface, usually. If you were to ask him if he was worried about anything and criss-cross it and really press it down – does he go around worrying about something? Does he go around thinking about something all the time? Is there something that bothers him most of the time? And he finally says, "Well, is my son going to disgrace me? Well, yes, as a matter of fact ..."

And we assess this thing out, handling it and we run it as a button, "son" see. And so help me God, it goes back to Egypt and becomes Ra, the sun god, and goes back into ancient – and space opera and goes back to glare fights, see. "Son", s-o-n, s-u-n, all these things are all messed up one way or the other and it becomes a case.

So a present time problem of long duration can become a case, don't you see. But ordinarily we say a present time problem of long duration – we have a case or two of that going on right now, I mean, where the present time problem of long duration became the case. But ordinarily it's just the – a problem. Maximum duration is this lifetime. Something on the order of years. Certainly months. Absolute minimum is months.

Now, I'll give you the reason for this. The reason why you can't audit him with one of those things and it will become very plain to you. You – you won't make this mistake all the time. Supposing you were standing there looking at a tree and you were engrossed in the
beauties of this tree and somebody stuck a pin in your back. Do you know that the pain of the pin thrust would be many times magnified by the violence of attention shift.

The rate of change of attention is a way of defining pain, relative. Relative pain is defined by rate of change of attention.

Now, if a fellow walked up and he says, "It's a nice tree; I think I'll stick this pin in you", you'd turn around and you'd have some defense against it and you'd say, "No, don't do that", or something like that. But you're looking at the tree, don't even know the fellow was behind you and he sticks the pin in you. Sudden – sudden shift of attention from the tree to something painful. And it makes that pin thrust feel like a two-edged sword going in.

Hiroshima, going about its daily wartime activities and all of a sudden there's a loud bang and there is no Hiroshima, you see. Attention shift and that was sufficiently violent that the people who were in the catastrophe had no time for twenty minutes. Time did not exist for twenty minutes. They just hung right there. Well, it wasn't the violence of it; it was the sudden shift – the shift was so remarkably fast, don't you see – and the amount of attention shift. And of course this shifted everybody's attention off all of his PT problems and all of his realities and of course shifted them onto something which was a total unreality and a sort of – net result was we got no time.

So we find that on the track, sudden attention shifts is the common denominator of every hung point on the track. It's when somebody's attention changed; not when his attention was on something. It was when it changed.

You could put a man in paradise and then consistently shift his attention rapidly and he'll become very unhappy with paradise. Do you see? Sudden attention shifts. That's – that's the common denominator.

This is not something new, in Dianetics and Scientology. The first lecture on this is July, American Legion Hall, Elizabeth, New Jersey, 1950. Not something new. Furthermore, it's not even really new with Dianetics and Scientology, because Locke and Hume and some of the others have discussed attention, but they never really discussed attention shift; this is a brand-new factor.

All right. Attention has always been known to be a part of psychology up till 1879 and then actually was more or less dropped out of the lineup. The psychologist does not pay much attention to attention. That's mostly because he's in a total dispersal of some kind or another. It's all unfixed attention, he thinks.

Now, shifts of attention: You are using processes which are sufficiently strong that regardless of what his attention is fixed on, his attention can be yanked off of it and put on the subject of the process. You're using high caliber mental weapons, see. They're very, very high caliber.

So you can make up your mind to run a process and sure enough, that process will yank his attention, but it lays the seed of the first ARC break of the session, because it's painful. He's worried about parking meters and you all of a sudden get him worried about waterfalls. Hm, duh-duh, duh-dum. There's a point of confusion right there in the session.
Now, his attention doesn't totally come off of parking meters. So his attention isn't totally on waterfalls. So he's got parking meters and waterfalls all mixed up now and you've accomplished an identification for him. Which is interesting, isn't it? You've got a new identification. You're not auditing him downhill, but you certainly aren't giving him a good session.

Now, that is true – and mark this well – of a present time problem of short duration and a present time problem of long duration and in neither one of these do you find any exceptions to the rule that your auditing must parallel what the mind is doing. Now, you can go so far with this paralleling what the mind is doing – that you start Q-and-Aing and not really handling what's there. That's the other error. You go too far with the parallel. So that he says, "Well, I've had trouble with ..."

But you say, "You're having trouble with your family? Who in particular in your family are you having trouble with?"

"Well, I'm having trouble with my sister."

"What trouble have you been having with your sister?" Oh, no, he's ...

He says, "Well it's because of my brother and sister are always fighting."

And you say, "Well, have you been – had objections to people fighting?"

And then he says, "Well, no, not really, except the police."

"Well, do you have trouble with watching police fight?"

"No, except when they're fighting with firemen."

"Well, do you have trouble watching firemen fight?"

We'll say that you at least got "watching" and "trouble" in there, but you're just letting his mind go all round and round in a dispersal, you see. He's still got the problem, oddly enough, that he's having trouble with his family.

Only you're riding over the hills and far away, you see, you're actually pulling an attention shift on him. You're not coping with what attention fixation he had. You're now trying to pick up the attention dispersals, see. So you're not worrying about the present time problem, you're going over the hills and far away. That's what we call Q and A.

And I will lay down this rule and it is not a rule so much as an observation. I have never seen a case progress unless the attention factor on the immediate environment – whether of long duration or short duration – was not handled first. I have never seen it fail and I have never seen a case fail to get some version of an ARC break when this was done. So the ARC break always occurs when you don't pay attention to the attention factor.

All right. There it is. If you don't handle the present time problem of short duration, the present time problem of long duration, when doing auditing, you are inevitably going to get an ARC break and there's where ARC breaks move in. What's the ARC break? It's a sudden attention shift. That is all. I don't care whether it was done because of your error or because of what you were running or anything else; it's just a sudden attention shift. That is an ARC break.
When you don't handle attention fixation, you inevitably arrive with attention shift. When you have attention – sudden attention shift, you get an ARC break. This is getting awfully elementary, isn't it? That is an ARC break. It's an attention shift. Unpredicted, unexpected attention shift.

Therefore, you flubbing an auditing command lays in a little, tiny ARC break, even though the pc says it isn't. We don't care what the pc says – must have been! Ah, but there's a much greater ARC break then laid in, when his attention is totally fixed upon trouble in the family and you are auditing Egyptian waterfalls.

Now, the ARC break is going to mount up and his confusion is going to get more and more and he's going to have to protest sooner or later and he protests in a version of an ARC break, but this ARC break turns up by you making a little bit of a flub. You notice that the pc is restive and it makes you restive and so you give some kind of a crossed up auditing command, and he takes exception to it and then you, knucklehead, start to cure up this particular flub. Oh, but that wasn't it. It isn't anything you have done in the session, except to audit him with what you're auditing him with and therefore, it's almost impossible to cure it as an ARC break.

"What have I done to you? What have you done to me?" Well, it doesn't have anything to do with it. Because he hasn't really – isn't really thinking in terms of technical difficulties. And the technical difficulty is what he is objecting to but, he doesn't know it.

So of course – "What has he done to you?" "What has he withheld from you?" – this isn't going to do very much, don't you see. You'd have to run "you" on the Prehav Scale or something like that to get rid of this ARC break, because we have to get – practically get rid of you. Because we haven't remedied what the difficulty is and the difficulty is, is we've given his attention one hell of a yank and it's still halfway on – on the trouble in the family and we've got it halfway on trouble with waterwheels and he doesn't know which way is cooking. Sound familiar to you? His attention is there, and it's there, and it's not there and it's not there, at the same time, don't you see.

Now, you're going to run this as an ARC break because you flubbed auditing commands. Well, it isn't because you flubbed auditing commands, it's because you gave him an attention shift – a sudden attention shift. And he doesn't know what's wrong and you don't find out and there we go. So therefore people with chronic, which is long duration, present time problems, or people with short duration present time problems, get ARC breaks in auditing sessions. And they ARC break in auditing sessions to the degree and with the frequency that, they have attention fixations on problems which are not handled by the auditor. Seem real to you? Can you see this? Can you see this? Is this very plain?

All right. Now, "willing to talk to the auditor" is the other one. Now of course, a pc with a heavy ARC break is not willing to talk to the auditor, but also a pc who does not want the auditor to know something is unwilling to talk to the auditor. But when a pc has a withhold, something new is occurring. The pc is sitting in the middle of the session, with a known where he is and an unknown where the auditor is and so the auditing session is a ridge. He's got a not – he's got a "know", the auditor's got a "not-know" on the same subject.
Now, in view of the fact that the pc's attention is fixated on this withhold, even at a lower level than – than analytical inspection, when we don't get it we're guilty of auditing a pc with an attention fix and it comes back to attention fixation. So if we don't get off the withholds, we've got a pc with his attention fixed on something. Same thing, isn't it? Make more sense?

They had marvelous luck and everybody on the course over in Washington really learned to pull withholds and they made terrific case gains and everything was going along fine on – on – as far as this is concerned. They really learned to do Security Checking and so on; and to that degree I'm very happy with them.

But of course, they'd make case gains. You can always make a case gain with a withhold. Fellow's attention is totally fixed on fireplaces where he burned the baby. You know, "Fireplace, fireplace, fireplace. Now I've got to have my attention fixed on this." But it's a little bit of a complicated attention fix. It's an out-fix with an in-pull. Which of course is guaranteed to anchor it. See. He's got his attention fixed on it, but it mustn't get out and it must be a not-know everywhere else than where he is, you see. And you get what is known as guilt and it forms such a tremendous part of Catholic and Freudian mental therapy.

Guilt, guilt complexes – oh, these are terribly important. Well, what it is, is an attention fix. With the additional complication that it's got to stay fixed to pull it in, so it mustn't get out. See, it's just a little more complicated version of attention fix. So you can't audit anybody with a big withhold. That's simple.

So it breaks down to the fact that you try auditing somebody with a present time problem of short duration or a present time problem of long duration or a withhold and he's going to get ARC breaks and you're going to have trouble in the session and that is all there is to it. And the session is not going to run right and it's going to go over the hills and far away and that's it.

And I don't care whether the pc says it is all right, I don't care if the pc says he likes it, I don't care whether the pc says this is perfectly all right; he knows you're trying hard. The basic mechanic of the whole thing still holds and down underneath all of this "you're trying" and "it's all right", and so forth, are the same forces of ARC break building up. Those same forces are still building up. It doesn't matter what the pc says.

This happens to be a mental mechanic which takes priority over all postulating and everything else on the part of the pc. So it doesn't matter what the pc thinks about your ARC breaks or your auditing. If this condition is there, the pc could think you were a wonderful auditor and make no progress. How fascinating.

Now, if you're very alert and you're very good at observation and you're very slippy, one way or the other, you notice the pc's wandering eye. I do. This accounts to a marked degree for my auditing gains and their consistency, is I see the pc sitting there and I see the pc looking into limbo as I ask this question or other and I want to know what the pc's looking at beneath the level of the eye socket. Pc isn't there. I know it, so I find out where the pc is. It sometimes doesn't take more than a few comments and a few directions and something or other. And his attention just slides very smoothly off of where it's anchored and it comes over
just exactly where I want it to and from that moment on, why, we're in, man. We're running! You see?

And halfway through the session the pc's starting to go, you know, this way and that way and so forth. Let's find out where the devil he's gone to now. Got the idea? He's gone somewhere. It's the goneness of the pc that you ought to be worrying about, because you want the pc here, you don't want him somewhere else that you don't know about. It's perfectly all right to have him elsewhere if you're putting his attention elsewhere. That's perfectly all right. Put his attention all over the place, as long as he's paralleling the auditing with his attention, everything is going along fine and man, will he come out the other end – slick as a new-washed baby.

But if his attention starts wandering over this way on the present time problem he had with Aunt Bertha – oh, you in trouble now! You're in trouble. Because your auditing had nothing to do with anything that could ever reach Aunt Bertha.

Now in running terminals, you will find – sometimes find this condition obtains and this is an interesting condition. You're covering a long, long, long line of track with this particular terminal and the pc was present and the terminal was present, and the pc is seeing more than the terminal is seeing and there is more than that being embraced in the auditing command, so there's a lot of track stacking up that the pc isn't given any liberty to inspect, of any kind whatsoever; and that is why you run versions of Alternate Confront. Let's let him look at the rest of the track and get his attention off of it.

And the reason we use Alternate Confront of a proper command – please, at the proper time. You're trying to do it by E-Meters. Do it by the pc. Pc doesn't seem to be so interested just now in this particular terminal. Well, his attention's gone someplace else, that's all. And what will put his attention right? Auditing will. What auditing? Well, Alternate Confront's the best cure-all you know, when it – when his attention has done this on the long bank track, you see – on the long track, when his attention has gone skittering and scattering and so forth. You're running kings and he's gone galloping along the track and everything is fine and he's happy with you and he's cheerful and he's making gains and all of a sudden then his eagle eye spots a queen; and you go on and ask some more questions about kings, and queen, queen, queen. You say, "What's going on?"

"Well, it's nothing"

"Yeah, but what is? What is? What's – what have you been looking at there?"

"Oh, well, man. Aha, boy! You know there's one advantage to being a king. It's the very fine variety of queens that you can corral. Except sometimes."

And you say, "Well, what about this?" Well, there it is. Of course, I'm not above saying something on the order of "Well all right, what's this got to do with kings?" Not challengingly, but "What is – what does this have to do with kings?"

"Oh, it's a pretty bad overt against a king if you steal his queen. Yeah. Ha-ha, yeah, ha-ha. Yeah, yeah."
He's now back on the subject of kings. Because queens are now an overt against kings. So he'll go on and run the auditing command. But you've spotted it and you've flicked his attention. Got the idea? So you've kept him parallelizing what you want him to do.

Now, a cruder way to do it: "Oh, your attention's on queens, huh? All right. Well, that's fine. Going to give you two more commands on kings and we'll end this process if that's all right with you. Okay. What king have you eliminated? Thank you. What king have you eliminated? Thank you. Very good. Anything you care to say before I end this process? Okay. End of process. If it's all right with you, we're now going to run some Alternate Confront" – whatever version you have of Confront; just as long as it's track version and you say, "All right, look at the bank. Thank you. Look at the bank. Thank you. Look at the bank" – whatever it is. "Look at the bank. Thank you. Look at the bank. Thank you."

And he says, "Hu-hu-hu-hu-hu!"

And you say, "What was that?"

"Oh", he says, "these queens." He says, "Yeah, ha-ha! Boy, that's really some way to get rid of a king, you know. Why, you cave him in, and break his heart and do this and that and so forth. Yeah, yeah, yeah. We used to take them in the Roman arena, Roman parades, victory marches and that sort of thing. Why, we'd get the queen dagging along back of a chariot or something like that, when we hadn't captured the king and so on. I guess it was a sort of a dirty trick."

And you say, "Good. Fine. All right. Look at the bank. Thank you. Look at the bank. Okay. Look at the bank. Thank you. Look at the bank. Thank you. Anything you care to say before I end this process?"

"No."

"All right, fine. End of process. Okay, we're now going to run kings. All right, what king have you eliminated? Thank you. What king have you eliminated? Thank you."

"So-and-so." Bzzt. And you say, "What were you thinking about when the noise happened?"

"Oh", he says, "So-and-so." Bzzt. And you say, "What were you thinking about when the noise happened?" He says, "So-and-so."
All right, you say, "That's good. All right. What were you thinking about when the noise happened? What part of the auditing command were you answering when the noise happened?"

"Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so", you know.

"Okay. All right. How does that noise seem to you now?" No action on the meter; you say, "All right", and without any kind of a – kind of a bridge you return to the process.

You assume that it did something. You don't ask him if it did. Your pc is not your oracle – knowing the mechanic of the thing. Those are rudiments and that's how she is cut. That's the way the cookie crumbles. That's the way the cake carves and the way the balloon goes up.

You are doing the oddity, as an auditor, of finding where the pc's attention is anchored and thereafter guiding the pc's attention and if the pc's attention isn't going where you want the pc's attention to go; you aren't auditing. So that anything gets in your road of guiding the pc's attention, you had better get rid of it.

Now, I'll lay down another statement. Don't call it a rule; it's just a statement. It's an accusative. It's in the accusative tense. Anything that happens in an auditing session is the auditor's fault, even if the building burned down. But that isn't totally what I mean. If anything goes wrong in the auditing session, it is never the pc's fault. It is never the pc's fault. Lack of gain on the part of the pc is not the pc's fault.

The pc will only do in a session what the auditor tells him to do or what the auditor doesn't tell him to do. And if the auditor doesn't tell him to take his cotton-picking attention off of those gams in Georgia, in some gradient that is an acceptable gradient, of course the session will go wrong if the auditor wants the pc's attention on boats in Alaska.

You have to take the pc's attention off of things in order to put the pc's attention on things. Because you haven't yourself put the pc's attention on the things it is stuck on as he comes into the session, you are not quick to take responsibility for taking his attention off of those things. You see? That's what happens.

But if the pc has ARC breaks, if the pc doesn't make a win, if the pc doesn't get a goal – it's the auditor, man. It's nobody else and that's for a D of P or for anybody else. It's just the auditor and that's for you. You want to know what went wrong in the session? Well, not from any part of the pc. Nothing went wrong from the pc's quarter. You did something wrong. That's all.

Just as the pc must be at cause in his lifetime, because you can put him in an auditing chair and erase his whole life, he must have been at cause that whole life or you couldn't have just him there. You can erase the traumas he has had with his mama and his papa and his cousins and sisters and aunts and employer, without having his mama and his papa and his cousins and sisters and aunts and employer present in the auditing room.

And if it was their fault and if they had any bearing on ordering his life about and ruining him, you actually realize that you would have to have them in the auditing room, in order to clear a pc. Do you realize that? He'd have to scrape them up from all the way back the last
couple of hundred trillion years and bring them all together in one lot someplace in order to accomplish any kind of a case gain.

Well, this is not true. You have one person there – the pc. And isn't it miraculous that by shifting his mind this way and that, that he actually can get over this and that. Well, therefore he must be cause on the whole track, right?

But in an auditing session, in an auditing session, there is another cause and that is the auditor and the great oddity is that auditing works. Because it violates this other principle. For the first time, you are having an effect on a pc in violation of the fact that the pc is cause over all effects. Wrap your mind around that one, you really have learned a lot! So this has to be terribly clever on your part. You've got to be very slippy, because you're being cause in a section of track, on the pc's track and that you can do it and get away with it is miraculous. That auditing can happen is utterly fantastic!

Now, the only way it can happen, of course, at all, is if he has some willingness to do what you want him to do. Because he has to do it, all you can do is... Basically, you can't force it into existence; you can suggest it into existence and he can take cause over it. So his cause must still be there. But your direction of his cause must therefore be acceptable to him. Otherwise he is no longer cause over this section of track called an auditing session and if he isn't cause over that section of track called an auditing session, of course he won't make any gain.

Well, how do we keep him cause on that section of track? We simply audit him exclusively with his attention on the auditing session, without his attention splintered up into this, that and everything else around in the environment on present time problems of short or long duration and the ARC breaks that resulted from your leaving his attention on it and also the withholds which he is keeping away from you and not communicating to you.

Though all those things get in the road of this other thing, he must actually willingly follow your auditing directions. And he must have a very clear view of what he is following, otherwise he isn't cause over that section of track. Well, if he isn't cause over that section of track, nothing is going to happen on that section of track and he's going to make no gain. This should be very plain to you.

You assume, probably wrongly, that the pc is delicate or that you can do something to bitch him up and so forth. Yeah, well, the only thing you can do to a pc is not give him a win and the only way you can do that is not by controlling his attention or having his attention there to be controlled. And the only way you can deprive him of a win is violate his attention factors. And the only – only attention factor you can violate is having his attention on something else rather than the auditing command. And if you violate that you don't get any wins.

You don't get any goals, you don't get any terminals, you don't get anything. He sits there for two-and-a-half hours and that's it. Why? Well, because his attention wasn't on the auditing session. Now, you can say auditing works, but auditing in the absence of the pc's attention isn't auditing, so no-auditing doesn't work.

The pc's got to be there to be audited. How do you get the pc there to be audited? Corral his attention. How do you corral his attention? Keep your rudiments in. How do you keep
the rudiments in? Well, you check them very carefully. It's not very hard. You make far too much out of this business of auditing; it's too easy. You know, you're always overreaching with the difficulties of the thing. It's not that hard!

All you had to do was have the person's cooperation. How do you get his cooperation? Well, don't have his attention on something else while you're auditing him, that's all. All right, if his attention is going to be on a present time problem of long or short duration? Nah! You haven't got his attention. Now, he'll tell you all sorts of things. There's all sorts of reasons and rationales. He feels betrayed. He sat down there to get some auditing; what's auditing to him? How is he defining auditing as he sits down in the chair? Well, it's to get over his headache, that's auditing!

And he gives you a goal, he said, "Well, I'd like to get over my headache in this auditing session."

And you don't even give him any hope, man! You just write down that and you write down a couple more goals and then you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and then don't read the meter, and – and so forth. And then you say, "Well, we're going to go on auditing kings."

Well, the pc just went that-a-way, you see! His attention is over that-away and your commands are over this-a-way and so an auditing situation doesn't exist, so no auditing is going to get done in that two and a half hours and that's all there is to it. And you're just plain lucky if you don't also have an ARC break and a this and a that and the other thing during that session.

Well now, what does it take, actually, to get his attention on this thing. Well, there's several things you can do; you can just sit down and overtly handle the headache.

Just – just start saying, "Well, who had a headache? Thank you. Who had a headache? Thank you. Who had a headache?" or "What type of personnel has headaches? Thank you. What type of personnel has headaches? Thank you. How could a – what – what type of person do you think would have that particular headache? In what kind of an environment? Oh! Well, what don't you know about that picture? Thank you. What don't you know about that picture? Thank you. What don't you know about that picture? Thank you. What don't you know about that picture? Thank you. What have you forgotten about the picture? Thank you. What have you forgotten about the picture? Good. And what don't you not-know about – well, what shouldn't be known about that picture? Thank you very much. What shouldn't be known about that picture?"

And he says, "What picture?"
And you say, "That picture."
And he says, "Oh, well, I can get it back."
And you say, "Well, how is it?"
And he says, "Fine."
And you say, "Do you have a headache?"
"No, I don't have a headache, that was pretty good!"

And you say, "All right", and you go on with the rest of the rudiments.

Well, boy, does he know he's being audited! Why? You found his attention where it was and you moved it over to where you wanted it. *Thud, bang!* You see?

Now, I can tell you that as far as I'm concerned there are no missing weapons. If you can run an engram with Not-Know – if you can run an engram with Not-Know and Forget and so forth, and slippety-bam, without chewing all over on the thing... You find the terminal of some kind or another and you find this and that, and then you find this engram and the engram shows up and you kick the engram in the head. Not by taking up the personnel in the engram, but just taking up the picture of the engram, just taking up just exactly what it is, blowing the thing, moving it around on the track. Well, if you can do this, well, for heaven's sakes, you could handle any auditing fixation of attention that was coming up, don't you see.

He'll say, "I have trouble with my family all the time."

"Well, how long have you had trouble with your family?"

"I've had trouble with my family for years and years and years."

"When's the first time you had trouble with your family? Okay, let's date it. Oh, all right, that's fine. That's fine. Oh, they held you down, poured boiling water over you. Well, that's very interesting. Age of six. Good. Got a picture?"

"Oh, God", he says, "I sure got a picture!"

And you say, "Well, all right. Good. All right. What did you do?"

"Well, I kicked and screamed."

"What did you do?"

"Well, I kicked and screamed." This would be one way of doing it, see.

"All right. What else happened around there?"

"Oh, I don't know exactly."

"Well, good. What don't you know about that picture? Thank you. What don't you know about that picture? What don't you know about the incident? What don't you know about that – that thing? What you don't – what don't you know about it? What happened that you could never figure out? Well, what don't you know about it? What have you forgotten about it? What have the other people forgotten about it? What should they forget about it? Who'd be guilty if you forgot about it?" You know, *boom-boom*, play it on all sides from the middle. All of a sudden, *boom!* It's gone.

You say, "All right, that's dandy. Now, now let's move into high gear here and let's take a look at this trouble with your family. Now, what – what do you think about trouble with your family?"

"Well, I have trouble with my family."

"What trouble do you have with your family?"
"Well, I have all sorts of trouble with my family – or I did have. I did have a lot of trouble with my family. Yeah, I can see how that hooks up. Matter of fact, I would keep telling them all the time, you know, I keep telling them, 'you're always getting me in hot water!' Yeah, well, what do you know about that!"

"Well, now how do you feel about trouble with your family right now?"

"Well, I'm not worried about trouble with the family."

"All right. Well, that's all right. How do you feel about trouble with the family?" Cranked up E-Meter, see. "Oh, you're still having a little more trouble. What family is that?"

"Oh, well, that's my own family! You know, I've always had my own family. You know, uh, my – my – my wife and children, all mixed up with my own. Hey! You know, they're different!"

You say, "Well – well, what trouble are you having with the family?"

"Well, I'm not having any trouble with the family."

You say, "All right. Now do you think we can get down to session here?" Bang! Here we go on the session. You got the idea?

You're in the business of handling people's attention. And that consists of finding out where it's fixed and putting it where you want it. Got it? And gradually they came out of the woods and they find out they can put their attention anywhere they want to put it and there we go and we're on our way. That's about all there is to it.

And you get out of this rudiments and you get assessments, and you get Terminal Assessments and you get all sorts of odds and ends, and running on the Prehav Scale. Oh, these are just methods of fixing and unfixing attention and that's about all there is to it in auditing.

But every time you violate auditing a pc, thinking his attention should be over here on spot X, when his attention is actually on spot A and you have assumed that his attention is on spot X without examining to find out whether or not it's on spot A, you of course get all the evils of a session. First of them is no progress, next of them is ARC breaks, next of them is no trust in the – in the auditor. You get all of these things, one right after the other as you come right on up the line. They all arise from this one cause and from no other causes. Follow me?

Now, knowing this, knowing this, you then can say vividly that anything that happens in an auditing session is the auditor's fault. Anything bad that happens in the session must be the auditor's fault. Why? He didn't find out where the pc's attention was fixed and didn't get it over onto something else.

Now, I'll tell you something else. The earliest method of clearing, 1947, 48, 49, was permissive; highly, highly, highly permissive. It was very delicate. You – it amounts to this repetitive auditing command: "What picture would it be safe for you to look at?" You know why it failed? You know why it wasn't being done and why no clearing was occurring by 1950? Although my Clears were not all that good, they were not bad. But do you know why in 1950 it suddenly blew up? Because I hadn't isolated this attention principle. I hadn't isolated this attention principle so that I could articulate it to an auditor.
And it has taken roughly eleven years to be able to articulate this very thing and I've seen it occurring now and I've just had a little example of – the old style of clearing accidentally got entered into, in a session and then the auditor violated the thing and I suddenly realized that all the old violations only ever summed up in just that one thing. They kept giving him something to look at and the rule was that you couldn't give him anything to look at that was outside of his environment. You could give him something to look at that was in his environment, but you couldn't go any further than that. You know, you could get the picture of the last five seconds or something that's real safe and so forth. The auditing command which accomplished that clearing is "What picture would it be safe for you to look at? Good. Look at it." See, that kind of an approach.

And the violation was – the violation was – and why that type of clearing worked, is everybody insisted on dictating what picture it was. Now, "the engram necessary to resolve the case" was perfectly valid. Of course, that's where his attention's fixed so you run it as a picture. But in tremendous numbers of cases we were running people who were not finding pictures safe to look at, and so couldn't look at the engram necessary to resolve the case and that was it and there blew up clearing in 1950.

But you could today take somebody, have them sit down and say, "What picture would be safe for you to look at? All right. Now look at it." He'd get it. And you'd say, "Good. Now what picture would it be safe for you to look at? Good. Look at it." Just practically nothing else but that, he'd wind up at the other end. Long route!

Now I had a lot of little speedups that I used to use. "What sound would it be safe for you to hear? What sound could I make?" See, this is the violation of "we mustn't give them something out of the immediate environment", you see. "What sound could I make that it would be safe for you to hear? Or what sound could you make that it would be safe for you to hear?"

And the fellow says, "Swwwttt! Yeah, that'd be safe. Swwwttt! Swwwttt! That'd be safe."

And you say, "Good. Make the sound."

"Swwwttt!"

And you'd say, "Now, close your eyes. Now, do you get a picture of the room? Good. Now, can you hear the sound again?"

"Oh, that's what you want me to do. All right. No, I can't."

"Well, let's try it. Let's try some sound or another of some character and let's fish around until you can finally hear the sound again."

That's because one tiptoe down the track, you see, lies the battlefield. But you can actually get them to look at these little pictures and look at facsimiles and what's it safe to look at and what's it safe to feel, what's it safe to hear. Just go on down the line, turn on all the perceptions one after the other. "What picture would it be safe to look at now. Good. Look at it", so an. It goes down the line, down the line, all of a sudden he's looking at an engram, you know. Not sure he likes that. "All right, that's fine. What part of that would be safe to look at?"

"The headsman, he'd be safe to look at. You've got to look at him, as a matter of fact. You can't do anything else! Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha!"

And you'd say, "Good, good, good. What would be safe to look at?"

Just creep through the thing, you know, the slow freight through Arkansas. You lick one engram, he's got the next one licked – already half-licked. Next thing you know you've accustomed him to his bank and familiarized himself with his bank. And the reason clearing occurs is because this other attention problem therefore, unbeknownst, you see, didn't materialize. Why? The permissive approach always found where his attention was stuck.

The guy's worried about the parking meter. You said, "What picture would be safe for you to look at?" Well, the parking meter would be the picture he would get. You see? That is not a very good nor a very fast method of clearing, but it mustn't be lost sight of as a method of clearing. Very gradient, very gentle, very patient with a pc, never giving him a lose, trying to give him wins all the way along the line. And it takes a gentle kind of auditing which is – and a very smooth type of auditing, which is almost impossible to teach, but it works. It works, just as such.

Now, you work auditing today, you say, well – much faster. You say, "Where's your attention fixed, bud?" You're running rudiments really, but you're really saying, "Where's your attention fixed?" and "What don't you want me to talk to you about?" which is "Where your attention is fixed?" All right, we know we got your attention all squared up and it's taken us three sessions to get the attention all corralled.

We got present time problems of long duration. We found a terminal. We found a long terminals list that had to do with the sore shoulders, don't you see and we got that worked out, and we ran that. And all of a sudden his sore shoulder went away on the Terminals Assessment, don't you see and we handled his long-duration present time problem. And we found there were three more long-duration present time problems. We found terminals that were likely to have those long-duration present time problems. We found one of those terminals stuck a bit more than the others, so we ran that on the Prehav Scale, you know. We did a Prehav Assessment. We ran that a bit and we found out this was all straightening out and the fellow knows he's making progress. His confidence is rising. Why? You're coralling his attention.

And they gradually get all of his present time problems of long duration, making sure that we handle the present time problems of short duration in the session. We make sure that he doesn't get ARC breaks and his attention gets stuck here and there. Keep the rudiments in, in other words, all the way along the line. Next thing you know, why, we've got a guy that when we get him rolling on assessments and that sort of thing, it is just bang! You know? It's
just nothing to it. We've coaxed the pc into a total sessioning. If you take that kind of approach you can't lose!

The only sin – the only sin that might be – is that you get into a bit of a games condition with the pc over the subject of goals and terminals. He's not going to have a body and he's not going to have a goal. And you get into this kind of a games condition with him. Well, already you must have lost control of the pc to get into that kind of games condition.

I told you early in this lecture that I thought of tailoring up some processes to handle this games condition. That isn't necessary. The moment that you find out, you actually can find where the person's attention is fixed and handle that attention and get it over to where you want it, your idea of games with this pc goes because you've got the game now, man! And you feel pretty hot about being able to do something like that. And if something goes wrong, don't chalk it up – don't chalk it up that you didn't hold your little pinky just right on the edge of the E-Meter. That isn't the reason the session went awry. Session went awry because you missed, somewhere on attention. You just missed somewhere on the attention factors. The attention factors went awry. Either you really were auditing this fellow with a present time problem, otherwise he wouldn't have gotten an ARC break, or something went astray here that you missed.

And now that you've got a certainty onto what you missed, you're not in a – in a fog as to what will cause this sort of thing. So auditing becomes a much more certain activity to you.

Try this sometime, if you don't believe what I say here; I mean if you have – if you want to get a good – you believe it all right, but if you get a subjective reality on it is what I meant to say. Pc says, "Yow, yow, yow, ARC break."

You say at once, "What was your present time problem?" See? This is not smooth, you know. The smoothest way is to say "Well, yes, I heard that. Yeah, I'm sorry." And then slide over and then look and get the rudiments in, you see. But just – just for the hell of it, sometime or another, in the very near future, pc gets an ARC break, ask him – don't even mention the ARC break – say, "What was the present time problem?" He'll give you an answer, just like that! Just automatically, right on the tip of his tongue.

"Well, I came into this session – I came into this session because I had a pain in my chest. That's – well, I – I needed auditing today. I had a pain in my chest."

That's the first you've heard of it. So you see, you must have missed. Must have missed. Either you weren't looking at the E-Meter, or you didn't have the sensitivity up or something was there or your questions weren't searching enough or you weren't suspicious enough about this thing. And basically it starts with your eagle eye didn't notice there was something different about this pc today, that he seemed to have a sort of a wandering eye, you know. Sat down and you say, "All right. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?"

And pc says, "Yes."

And you say, "All right. Start of session." And, "Session started for you?"

And the pc says, "No. Not really."
Oh well, hell, that's enough, man! What's it just told you? It's told you an encyclopaediaful. Promptly and immediately, you've been told, the pc has a present time problem because his attention is stuck elsewhere. All right. So you say, "What goals would you like to set for this session?"

And he says, "Well I'd like to get this pain in my chest fixed up and I'd like to get this and I'd like to get that and like something or other and something or other and something or other."

And then if you were to say after these two indicators, "Do you have a present time problem?" – of course you say that, formally – and don't notice any fall, oh, wow! Is your E-Meter busted? What is the question you should ask at that moment? Because you've already been told twice he has a present time problem.

Didn't get into session easily so his attention must be someplace. Gave you a type of present time problem of long duration – pain in his chest. Told you these two things. Now you're going to run something else? You haven't a prayer of running anything else. Not a prayer! You've got to do attentionwrangling. So mount ol' Paint and go out and round up the attention units.

For a long time we said well we didn't handle chronic somatics. Basically we didn't handle chronic somatics because there was no process by which you could rapidly handle a chronic somatic. Well, that was then; this is now. You've got processes that sure handle chronic somatics, man! You just – just get a terminals list on the chronic somatic and you normally would have handled it. Just as idiotically as that. Just get a terminals list. Takes you maybe two hours to get a terminals list utterly complete on the thing because, boy, is this ... The fellow's got something that the medicos, you know – the medicos oil up their secretaries to write bills for hours. You know, it's that serious a disease and so on, you know.

There'd be – between times of making out the bills, why they actually do batteries of clinical tests, you know and move him from hospital to hospital and specialist to specialist, you know. He's got cancer of the lumbosis compounded with felony! [laughter] And you say, "Well, that's just too much for me!" No, that isn't too much for you. Because he couldn't have it. He's a thetan.

In the first place, it takes a valence to get that complicated a mishmash of sensation. Well, if it takes a valence to get that much mishmash of sensation, he's obviously in a valence, so obviously just a Terminals Assessment on chronic lumbosis of the cancer with a felony would be absolutely adequate. You'll find people with that exact sickness back on the track. And you'll find him knocking their heads in, too.

And you take these people in leper colonies. So they've got leprosy. If you were to say, "All right. Give me an – . Who had leprosy? What sort of a person would have leprosy? Oh, this sort of a person. All right. And how would you describe that person?" You write it down. "What other person would have leprosy?", and leprosy, and leprosy. And you'd find probably Gomez sitting amongst them.

You see, ol' Gomez was a very thorough – he was what's known as a – they have antibiotics, but he was an antileprotic. And Gomez, as dictator of Venezuela, decided he was tired
of leprosy in Venezuela, so he hired two riverboats and he told all the lepers in the country that they were going to be moved down the river to a wonderful paradise and going to be given huge grants of land. And he had everything up around and they all walked aboard singing hymns and hallelujah and he got every cockeyed leper – anybody who had even had a white spot on him, you know – he got them all out in the middle of the river, in these two riverboats and then the boys on the bank pushed the plunger on the dynamite. That was the end of leprosy in Venezuela, but I hesitate to say that it was the end of it for Gomez. [laughs] He was real cute.

Now, there's a man with a nice package of psychosomatics. [laughter] He used to take anybody he suspected that was being against his regime and hang them up by their genitals from hooks, which I consider one of the worst activities. He not only did that, but he would hang them up in dungeons below water – at below tide level so that the water would seep in, trickle by trickle by trickle by trickle, you see. Man, that guy's going to have chronic somatics! He was a boy! He was a boy!

Anyway, you was – just start getting things like that – you're running a guy like that, you see – and all of a sudden, why, he doesn't know what it has to do with lepers but "boats". "I'm just a spectator here", he'd say, "I'm on the bank and seems to be a couple of boats blowing up out there. Nothing to do with me. Well, anyway, let's get back to the session." [laughter]

And you say, "Well, he said it had nothing to do with him, so we won't pay too much attention to it, and we'll go on here a little bit further", and so on. You don't even bother to ask him if he's got another picture now. And all of a sudden you notice this wander in his eye, you know. If you then woke up to a point of asking him what he was doing, "Well, it's these boats."

"Well, what about those boats?"

"Well, I just – they – just seem to be stuck. And that's funny because, you see, I was just – just a spectator, here on the river. I can see – I'm a – I'm an Indian, you know. I mean a low-caste person that wouldn't have anything whatsoever to do with blowing up boats. And there are these boats blowing up out there. Isn't that peculiar? And it just seems to worry me, somehow. I don't know why, but it just seems to."

Well, of course, you – about that time you should cut loose with something like Forget and Not-Know and so on and irresponsibility flies off and he says, "Oh, God! Yeah, that's what I did. Well, I think it was a good thing to do." And he goes through all of the ramifications of the thing and all of a sudden the thing blows. And couple of days later the doctors come by to slop oil on him and they say, "What happened to you?", you know. Well, he's had a miracle cure. He's had a miracle cure. [laughs] Well, you get the idea? You get the idea? Well now, we couldn't handle chronic somatics rapidly in the middle fifties, so you had a lot of stuff out about "don't handle them." Well of course every time an auditor handled them, he'd foul up one way or the other, so we'd say don't handle them. All right, well, that's changed. That's changed. You're making Clears. You're making high progress and you have things that can handle them and do handle them. This time you got a good subjective reality on doing so. Because I tell you, you're not going to run somebody with a hidden standard,
which is always a present time problem of long duration. A hidden standard is *always* a present time problem of long duration.

You say, "What would have to happen for you to know that auditing was working?"

He'd say, "Well, the top of my head would have to stop going up and down, up and down. And when it stops I know auditing is working and when it doesn't stop then I know auditing isn't, you see and that's the way it's – auditing is working."

You say, "How long have you had the top of your head going up and down?"

"Well, ever since I was a little boy I can remember the top of my head going up and down."

You say, "Well, that's dandy. Whose top of whose head went up and down?" And you start making a terminals list, you get some pictures, you shake it out, you handle it by terminals, you handle it by pictures and you've got it made.

Now, your case is going to make some progress. Why? Well, although his doesn't appear so, actually every time he sits down in a chair in a conversation, much less session, he knows the conversation's going well because the top of his head isn't going up and down. He knows the conversation's going badly because the top of his head is. He knows he should make the deal because the top of his head is going not going up and down, don't you see. He'll use it as all kinds of barometers. He knows who's going to win the election, because when he hears the name McMillan the top of his head doesn't go up and down. These things are fantastic, you know? And you go researching into them, you find out what the score is on it.

All right, well, I've given you a Friday lecture, but it is very much to the point. You can plow right on and now I'll give you the rest of it, which is simply this: that if you have not now found the goal in the first fifty to a hundred and fifty goals or you've not found the terminal in the first thirty or forty terminals given to you by the pc, then you are auditing somebody who has rudiments out, by which I mean: Present time problem of short duration? Probably not. Present time problem of long duration? Indubitably so! And you will have to handle it before that case makes another single budge forward. He's not in any kind of case to be audited at all. You'd have – have to come down on him with a terrible crash to get anything even vaguely resembling a stable attention on goals, when his whole goal is to keep the top of his head from going up and down, only he hasn't mentioned it to you on the goals list. And you haven't been searching enough to ask for it. You got it?

So when you get rudiments in, get them in with a crash, and when rudiments turn up that you've got a present time problem of long duration staring you in the teeth, well, for heaven's sakes, sail into it, man. You've got the weapons, you've got the tools, you've got the armor plate – well, let's go! Okay?

All right. Now do you feel terribly crushed and abashed because I've been talking to you so accusatively? [audience: No.] It's all right then? You'll still be able to sleep over the weekend? [laughter] All right. Well, that's okay, but don't sleep over your preclears! [laughter]

Thank you very much!
Okay. What's the date?

Audience: 22nd.

It's the 22nd? By George, it is. [laughter] Twenty-second of August 1961. I fooled you that time. There is a date on this watch and it's always accurate. I just never read it. Pretty hard to keep up with Galactic time, Earth time, Greenwich time, Australian time. Just as if there are a lot of times.

Well, I'm surprised, frankly, that you had courage enough to come to the lecture today. I thought you would probably not come.

What I told you the other day – for once in my life, I'm right. As a matter of fact, "Astounding Campbell" ran a whole editorial one time on the fact how damnably right I was and that was what was wrong with me. [laughter]

No, unfortunately, I am right. The reason the Australian course took a long, long time to get people going on Goals Assessments, the reason nobody got their goal in Washington on the Washington course and the difficulty which has been entertained here are all under the heading of "rudiments out, goal vanishes." If the rudiments are out, the goal vanishes.

Now, this is the way it is. And it is worked out with this particular unit at this time. I am very sorry to say that person after person after person, the goal has been there for weeks and weeks and weeks. Smothered by an out-rudiment. So it was just the rudiments were out. That was all. And that happened to the goal. And the goal does occur in the first 150 goals a pc gives you and the terminals should occur in the first couple of hundred terminals. And that is the way it is.

The mystery is solved. And I want to thank the people here at Saint Hill for bearing with me because I have kept my cotton-picking paws off of you. And maybe this has slowed down your case gains, but it's speeded up Scientology. And I will now let you in on something: the fact that I have not been doing Goals Assessments on you because I could do Goals Assessments and it proved absolutely nothing.

And if it depended on me to do a Goals Assessment on everybody on Earth who will be cleared from this time henceforward – . Pretty grim, huh? And me interested in boats, too. [laughter] So look it over. That doesn't make sense, so what I've had to do here is suffer agonizingly and watch this go on and on and on because I couldn't figure out what was happening. You see, I wasn't at all sure – I wasn't at all sure – that we had not encountered another phenomenon. And the other phenomenon was that goals just kept nulling and a person would sooner or later eventually go Clear on just nulling goals. And I was not at all sure that this couldn't occur.
And you've proved it conclusively. It doesn't occur. All right. That's very well worth knowing. And it — I haven't been using you for guinea pigs. I've been teaching you the best I knew. But I at the same time have not gotten myself so involved with cases — beyond steady-ing you up and keeping you on a straight line — that we failed to find out what was going on with Goals Assessment.

So it's a — it's a green light now. The starter's gate is open. There is no reason now why any case, no matter what condition that case is in, cannot be cleared. The barrier is only this barrier: that the goal or the terminal of the case becomes smothered by out-rudiments. And the goal disappears off the E-Meter if the rudiments are too wildly out. And so assessment can go on forever. An assessment forever does not make a Clear. Now, that's very well worth knowing. So that was the only bug, as far as I'm concerned, on the line.

Now, with case after case here in just the last few days we have been coming up with the fact that it was goal number two, goal number forty and so on. And yet we've gone on and assessed just endlessly past this point with no appreciable case gain, you see.

Now we go back, clean the rudiments up very, very carefully and what do we find sitting there? We find the person's goal answering up live. We find the person's terminal answering up live, but smothered — smothered by an out-rudiment. So if it took this long to learn this after we had the technology of Clearing as of spring of 1961, you see and if it took clear into August to learn this bug, I'd say it was very, very profitable to remember that bug.

So this can happen with an E-Meter — although we've known this for a very long time that this could happen with an E-Meter, that a reading could disappear off of an E-Meter because of an out-rudiment. That was not an unknown phenomenon. But it didn't have great importance until we were doing Goals Assessment and I hadn't connected it directly with this difficulty in goals. And it's been quite a little stunt here trying to find out what did connect up and why. But that is the only thing it is. It isn't anything else. It's nothing very spooky. And it's just the fact that Goals Assessments take forever when the rudiments are out. When the rudiments are in, they are rapid.

The goal of the pc will be found in the first 150 or so goals and the terminal will be found in the first couple of hundred terminals. Certainly within that wide order of magnitude you'll find the goal and the terminal of the pc.

Now, when the goal and terminal of the pc is found, now why don't we get instant and immediate clearing? How can clearing hang up now? Rudiments out. That's all. Just the rudiments out. If a case is running and running and running and running and running for a long time on the Prehav Scale and so forth, we could have several bugs. We could be running on a foreshortened Prehav Scale or something of that sort. But that's up to me. That's not up to you. I can give you the best and most now in a Primary Scale. And I've already given it to you verbally. I haven't released it in actual put-together.

There could be something buggy about that or this could have occurred — and this is apparently the next bug: The level looked flat because the rudiments were out. So this phenomenon also applies to the running on Prehav Scale. If it's flat and a level looks flat, then you must turn over hell, heaven and everything else to make sure the rudiments are completely in. And then check the level again for another run. And that's the only way to be safe.
Run it another twenty minutes. Run it twenty minutes to flat, then just tear the rudiments to pieces any way, shape or form you possibly can with sensitivity at 16. In other words, just get them in, in, in. And then run another twenty minutes of the same auditing command. Got it?

_Audience voices: Mmm-hm._

In other words, don't trust a flat-test until you put the rudiments in. Take the first as a conditional flattener. Now, get the rudiments in and run another twenty minutes. So you actually have a forty minute test for the end of a level on a terminal, goals terminal. Follow that? Seem a simple thing to do?

All right. So let's make another little rule of thumb here as we go, just as a cautionary point. When we have gone to 200 goals and we haven't gotten the pc's goal, we get the rudiments in with sensitivity 16, no matter if it takes us _sessions_ to do it. We handle those various chronic, long-duration present time problems. We just handle everything we can and go back to the beginning of the first list we made and go over it again and we'll find the pc's goal every time. Because we're doing it just time after time. This is just working out pocketapocketapocketapocketapocketapocket. It's just open and shut. It's just a – mostly a matter now of going over it. And everybody who has gone through this routine so far – that's over half of this particular unit – we found the goal in the first 150.

So if you get up to goal number 200 and you haven't got the pc's goal – although you were sure the whole time that the rudiments are in; you're absolutely sure that during this assessment the rudiments are in – that fact alone says they're out. That alone says they're out. So you'd better start back at the beginning of the thing. Get those rudiments in with sensitivity 16. Just – be just niggling, nasty about the whole thing. Get them really in. And then go over that goals list again from the beginning and you'll find the goal. Now, that's what's throwing it out. And that's how we can get it in. Okay?

This is quite a win for us. This is quite a win. The first Clear from this unit was Vickie. Now, a lot of people had a hand in this. Took too long to get her goal, so she had to be stabilized out after she arrived back at Joburg. She stabilized out and went Clear, boom!

There was just nothing to it. I mean, it was dead easy. But there was an awful lot of work went in on this case by members of this unit and by Mary Sue and so forth, making sure of the goal and terminal. But we got these a little late. It was a little late in the course when these things finally came so we couldn't complete the run and it took just a few hours to stabilize the case after it got home, so that's your first Clear.

Now, the sooner you get the pc's goal and terminal, the more time can be devoted to this. Now, you've done a lot of work here this summer on the subject of Routine 1A, Problems and Rudiments. I was trying to get problems, ARC breaks and that sort of thing pre-straightened out. Now, oddly enough, that is a successful action. Might not look successful at first glance. It might look like a wild excursion, but it isn't. We have to remember that Vickie was absolutely flattened on Routine 1A before the rest of it took place. Isn't that interesting?

All right. Therefore, you can put another little rule of thumb down here. This is an interesting tip. You've got a pc that's ARC breaky. You can get into this kind of a jam: How do you clear rudiments with a rudiment out? Ah, that's a fascinating question, isn't it? How can
you clear rudiments with a rudiment out? And there's the biggest single problem. That's a rough problem. How do you clear rudiments with a rudiment out?

Well, I'll tell you frankly that you cannot clear an ARC break with a present time problem in existence. And if you make an ARC break with the pc while you are running a present time problem, you have had it. You have just about had it!

The ARC break is sufficiently bad that you can't clear the present time problem. And because the present time problem is in existence – you tell me what happens when you try to audit a case with a present time problem in existence? Isn't it no-change? It's no-change, isn't it. You can audit a case twenty-five hours with a present time problem in existence and get absolutely no graph upgrade of any kind whatsoever. The case shows no improvement of any kind. Why? Present time problem had it pegged.

Well, let's look at this in the little tiny vignette of you trying to clear rudiments on somebody. And you start a present time problem. "Have you got a present time problem?"

"Yes", the needle says. "Yes", the pc says.

"What is it?" you say. And the pc tells you. And then you drop the lampshade and accidentally let off a 12-gauge shotgun and do a few other little minor things that causes an ARC break with the pc. What are you going to do? That is a very interesting point. What are you going to do? Because your ARC break clearing process won't run. Why won't it run? It won't run because there's a present time problem in the case.

The guy gave you the present time problem. You made the ARC break. Now, because he's ARC broken, you can't audit the present time problem very easily. Now, where're you going to go? So there's the biggest, single jam up in auditing and is the basic source of any feeling you have that it's hard to clean up an ARC break. The ARC breaks which you've had trouble cleaning up are those which occurred while you were trying to clear up a present time problem. Think it over. And of course, they didn't clear. There's no process known to man that will clear an ARC break if it has been made on the present time problem. Grim, huh?

So it isn't choosing the wrong level that stalls a case from clearing. It's clearing up rudiments. Ability to clean up those rudiments. And when this one occurs – when you get an ARC break going when a present time problem is in existence – of course you can't clean up the ARC break.

Well, I'll give you a tip as to how to go about this. This is not an unsolved problem. It has been unsolved to you up to this time although you probably haven't really looked at it straightaway as a problem. Only it is the roughest problem of auditing. That's why your case doesn't make any progress from that point thereon. And of course, because the ARC break is there, the present time problem now reads null. It's submerged because you've got an ARC break on top of its read. So you, of course, don't now suspect that you're running a case with a present time problem on it because you think you've solved the ARC break. You got the idea?

Here's the way I would handle this. I would just somehow or another bull my way, plow my way, blunder my way through the present time problem process that I was running. I wouldn't try to clean the ARC break.
Seems to be a violation of auditing, doesn't it? But it isn't. In other words, the pc's got a present time problem, you had a registry. Now, if while trying to clean that present time problem you get an ARC break, you had better give the ARC break minimal attention and continue with the present time problem whether it now registers or not. Otherwise your case will hang fire. You look kind of "What's this?" You want to know how the hell you do that. Well, you just altitude your way through it without invalidating the pc any further or something like that. You'd be surprised what you can do with a hearty "Oh well, I know that was an awful goof and I'm sorry. But let's just bull our way somehow through this present time problem. Let's at least get that out of the way and then we'll handle this other thing. All right?" And go ahead and handle the present time problem that you were handling. Okay?

You see that as a practical course. Otherwise the problem is totally unsolvable because you cannot clean the ARC break with any ARC break – TR-5N or anything else. It won't work when it's sitting on top of the present time problem. That's it.

All right. Now, running an ARC-breaky pc normally is because the pc is being audited over problems you have not detected or you have ignored, in some fashion. Any active, busy person in life has a great many present time problems which he not-ises in order to be audited. I wouldn't be looking at anybody. But they have a lot of present time problems, don't you see. And they not-ise these things. And they say, "Well, I don't have a present time problem because here I am being audited." Wrench! You see? "And I'm not going to do anything about that letter, that telephone call. That's all later." Got the idea? "And here I am being audited. Okay. Go ahead and audit me."

Now, you don't get a registry. The guy's sort of ARC broke himself, you know. He said, "Well, that's it", and you got a present time problem on a not-is.

You as an auditor should suspect – let us take an executive in a Central Organization; let us take anybody who leads an active life in any way – that that person has hanging fire at the moment he's being audited at least one present time problem. And on such a person in beginning session, if you do not find a present time problem, get suspicious. And run one anyhow. Got it?

*Audience voices:*Mmm-hm.

Now, that's the only thing that'll hang cases up in clearing is out-rudiments. And if a present time problem in – is in existence, you, of course, cannot clear the rest of the rudiments. And a present time problem can be not-ised. It can be submerged by the pc himself. Can actually be just smashed into existence.

I've had a pc say, "Well, I just don't pay any attention to these things. I don't see why anybody else has to have ARC breaks or anything, because I just don't pay any attention to these things." The only thing that registered, "Do you have any ARC breaks you are not paying any attention to?" You get a registry.

The pc actually, with attention just totally fixated on this ARC break has not-ised it, and has forcefully put another flow of attention elsewhere, while holding almost with force this ARC break into invisibility. You get a slow gain. See that?
Well, that works on many people with present time problems. If a person is leading an active life and if a person has a lot of Indian clubs in the air in existence, you can just count on the fact the person has come into session with a present time problem. It is utterly inevitable that they have come into session with a present time problem. And that's it.

And on such a person, it is faster to run Routine 1A, any version of, to its bitterest end before a Goals Assessment or goals run is attempted. It is faster. Interesting, huh?

We're not just taking the evidence of one case, although we do have one case in complete evidence of this, but we have other instances of this.

So if you're getting a slow run after you've found a terminal... Now, we know why a terminal disappears. We know why a goal disappears or a terminal disappears. It becomes invalidated in some way, rudiments go out in some fashion, various other things happen in that early assessment area. Rudiments out so you don't find the goal, you don't find the terminal. Assessment goes on forever and it actually does the case no good. Don't think that it does the case any good because it doesn't.

All right. Now, got that? If the thing isn't running smoothly, suspect first that you haven't flattened the level. There's something left on this level. Every time you finish up a level, suspect there's something left on the level, because a series of unflat levels can keep a case from clearing.

So remedy number one of this – these difficulties we've been having in clearing is simply do a double check on the level, as I gave you before. Twenty minute check – it's flat, quarter of a tone arm motion. Twenty minute test – quarter of a tone arm motion or less for twenty minutes. Dandy! Wonderful! Wunderbar! Gorgeous!

Now, let's get the rudiments in. Now, let's run it for another twenty minutes and see if we still have a quarter of a division or do we have four dials? Got the idea?

All right. Now we know it's flat. Now we can count absolutely on the thing being flat before we go on to our next level assessment. Okay?

Now, if a case, in spite of this precaution, continues to hang up in running the goal – on terminal, Routine 3, case continues to hang up – and we're not now paying any attention to Security Checking; we'll take that up in a moment – a case isn't blowing Clear, assume the case is being audited over a present time problem. And just do everything you can possibly do to thresh out this thing. And you have Routine 1A.

And it would not be amiss, if a case apparently is hanging fire, is going, let us say, something on the order of twenty-five hours without any appreciable gain. Even though he's being run on his goal and terminal, twenty-five hours is a perfectly adequate test on this. And the person doesn't seem – twenty-five hours of goals and terminal run I'm talking about – doesn't seem to be making a terrific gain. Something's happening here. Get a profile on him; profile hasn't appreciably done something one way or the other, assume immediately the person is being run on a present time problem. Shift immediately over to Routine 1A. Flatten Routine 1A. Go back and pick up the goal once more that the person had and terminal and continue your run. Okay? Got it? And we won't have this, forever clearing. That will put it to bed in a hurry.
Now, a case that, in the process of doing a case assessment sheet and doing early work with, appears to be ARC breaky, drop your Goals Assessment and go on at once to Routine 1A and get problems goodbye forever. Because a case ARC breaks only when present time problems have their attention split. That is the basis of the ARC breaky case. ARC breaks, present time problems.

Routine 1A is the treatment. And I don't care how many versions you run of Routine 1A. I don't care how many oddities you throw into it as auditing commands; get that person totally, totally, totally accustomed to problems. Confront on problems. "Recall a present time problem." "What problem isn't present?" You know? Anything, anything at all. Only get problems just completely shaken out. I'll give you a little bit more on that. But let me finish off this dissertation just exactly on the subject of Clearing.

Get 1A flat, flat, flat. Now, there'd be two places where you'd flatten 1A. One, it becomes obvious to you that this pc is hard to hold in-session. That's becoming obvious to you that the pc is hard to hold in-session. The pc is ARC breaky. Your auditing is fairly good and the pc continues to ARC break. Assume at once that the pc is being audited over the top of present time problems, which could include merely a present time problem of long duration and hidden standard. You see, that all comes under the heading of present time problem.

All right. That one. And later if the case doesn't seem to be going Clear after being run for twenty-five hours on the terminal and so on – doesn't seem to be – all right, you missed. Let's take up Routine 1A, flatten Routine 1A completely, utterly and completely. Get off all of these stuck attention points on the subject of problems, worries, anxiety and concerns. Come back to the same goal. Don't do a new Goals Assessment. Come back to the same goal, same terminal, get your rudiments all the way in. Reassess it newly on the Prehav Scale and sail along. You'll find out it probably will now assess at the same place that it assessed the first time you ran it. It very probably will. And then go on clearing the case. You got that?

Now, this gives you a little more scope, doesn't it? It gives you a little more hope along this line but I have seen all these points working out. I have a good reality on these various points and it seems very improbable that any auditor doing a businesslike, technical job – you know, knows his TRs pretty good and knows his Model Session pretty good and knows how to run an E-Meter and so on – it seems very improbable to me that with these precautions he would fail to clear any pc that sat down in front of him. Even though they were stark staring mad. Okay? I just would think it improbable that it wouldn't happen because that is all that is happening that stands in the road of Clearing.

Rudiments are out and the chiefest rudiment that can go out is – the one that causes grind is the present time problem. That's the main one that can go out. So that's the one you've got to get off because it can stall everything else. Given an auditor who is giving an auditing session, of course.

Okay? Hm? Is that easily grasped by you? Easily understood? Hm? Feel yourself coming out of a little bit of fog of why are we grind, grind, grind on assessments and why are we grind, grind, grind when we get the fellow's goal and terminal, huh? Does that make any sense to you? All right.
If present time problem is that important, then we had better do something more comprehensive about Routine 1A. And we’d better get Routine 1A into some kind of shape. Hm?

All right. Routine 1A is simply Problems and Security Checks. That's all Routine 1A consists of. Routine 1A does not have any auditing commands. It is simply problems – handle them, you see. So this gives you a completely wide-open field for the handling of problems. How do you handle problems? And that's what it comes under the heading of, which is a whole subcategory of Scientology. And it's become a very important category.

But Routine 1A is a designation by definition, simply handles problems and Security Checks.

All right. So we've got this whole subclassification of, "How do you handle problems? What's the anatomy of a problem?" I've given a lot of lectures on it. Postulate-counter-postulate, each postulate being surrounded by its own confusion. It is problems alone that give you this terrific idea of survival. If you want somebody who works very, very slowly, in an organization for instance, have somebody who has lots of problems. Everything will seem like forever to them, see. Everything seems like forever.

It's your timelessness. A problem gets locked up in time. Because it's a number of factors which are all jammed together and so on. So a sort of a timelessness or a slowness or something like that is caused by problems. So this tells you that problems could be read directly by, one, a sticky meter; an unchanging graph – see, the answer to each one of these things is that the guy's got problems. This is what you'd say, see. Meter's sticky – guy's got problems. Unchanging graph – guy's got problems. See. Relatively simple remark. Slow reaction time. His reaction time is below normal – guy's got problems. Fellow isn't moving around much in life, doesn't like to leave his home – guy's got problems. Got the idea? No motion – guy's got problems. Follow this?

The answer to these various motion characteristics are all problems. Problems stick and float and tend to move forward in time. And the fellow can be so fixated on the thing that he looks like he's moving forward in time, but actually he's stuck in the past. So of course everything seems to be timeless around him. So therefore, his reaction time, his inability to move around and do things, his loss of activity in the society, an unchanging graph, a sticky meter, which – and an unchanging meter, you can add that to the list – all of these things denote problems.

All right. Now, if problems are that important, aside from all earlier definitions of problems, there must be another definition of problems that is even more useful to you. And that definition of problems exists in one single word: unknown. That's the problem.

A problem is an accumulation of not-knowingnesses and a consideration of the person as to the value of the not-knowingnesses.

I told you one time that a thetan was a mystery sandwich, that he was stuck to his bank with mystery. Clear back about 54, 55. Mystery sandwich. Thetan – mystery – bank. And that's how his bank is stuck there. That's how he stuck to anything. That's how he stuck to valences and so forth. Mystery is the glue of life. If you want freedom, you must restore knowledge. If you want slavery, establish ignorance. Now, there isn't – I didn't make a single
comment about Rome or anything of this sort. I'm on my good behavior today. But if you want to – if you want to install a great deal of slavery, you've got to take the knowledge out of the subject and create a bunch of not-knows.

The common denominator then – and it's very interesting to have a common denominator of all problems. Aside from their anatomy of postulate-counter-postulate and confusion-counter-confusion and all of this sort of thing, the common denominator of all problems is an unknown. An unknown. A problem cannot exist in the absence of not-knowingness. When knowingness is established, a problem ceases to exist.

There's an old Dianetic Axiom on this, by the way: is randomity can be caused by a missing datum. Man, that's the most randomity that can be caused. The randomity currently called an automobile engine – a lot of randomity connected with automobile engines these days and the missing datum, of course, is an engine.

An automobile engine is a way to make a state tax motorists. See, it burns tremendous quantities of fuel which is very dear, which is very hard to get. Keeps the state wealthy and keeps the oil companies wealthy and everybody's wealthy, but you haven't got an engine.

What you need in an engine is something you can throw a couple of carrots in and it has a maximum of about three working parts and there it goes. That's an engine, see.

An automobile engine, for the absence of an engine, causes you to put in fuel at high taxation and high sales price to create heat; and then to put in a radiator and a water jacket and a fan to take the heat away. Which I think is an awfully interesting action. Both of them are totally opposed to one another. And the engine must run by heat, so you cool it.

Now, all kinds of things could be said about this, but of course the missing datum is something in the field of engineering on the subject of propulsion or motors or something. See? It's a missing datum. I don't adventure to tell you what the missing datum is about engines, but it causes all this other randomity, see. And every time you get in your car, you say, "Well, can I afford to go home?" You know? [laughs, laughter]

I think the gasoline in the United States is now worth something on the order of ten cents a gallon and the government gets about thirty-five cents a gallon. Oh, but recently, I understand, there's been a gas war. And now they have to pay the service stations to sell it. I think that's about right. They're selling it for fourteen cents and they get – at the stations and the oil companies and so forth, costs them nineteen cents to provide the station with it or something like that. Nonsense.

There's that randomity. Then there's the randomity of replacement of engines and then there's the randomity of automobiles that actually can't be controlled. They haven't got a good positive engine, although the engine's all right. But the engine slows down in speed. It's very hard to slow down one of these engines. Just because you take your foot off the accelerator is no reason you are instantly and at once braking with an engine. You aren't, really. There's a split second or two there when the engine's inertia goes on. Various other things are occurring.

And you get the randomity of traffic. Traffic accidents, that sort of thing. Relatively uncontrollable motors. They're not slung low enough. They're not positive enough. You get –
well, you get the problem called Los Angeles. Totally. Freeways swooping in all directions. Going up into the sky and down into the valley, all completely hidden under a vast miasma of smog, see. Automobile. Automobile mufflers. This causes a bunch of randomness.

So everywhere you look, you get more randomness, more randomness, more randomness, more randomness and so forth and it's the missing datum, engine. What's a proper method of propulsion?

All right. You see that? There are all kinds of problems evolve out of this one missing datum. Now, man's difficulties were busily getting more and more difficult. His various relationships nation to nation, person to person, group to group, this sort of thing, was getting more and more involved and so forth, because of a missing datum.

The missing datum added up to many data – a technology about man. So a lot of people kept coming in with all kinds of false knowingnesses of various characters and another. And this just created more problems, you see. One didn't have a positive datum concerning man. Well, was he bad or good? Or was he an evil beast? Obviously, most of their data is wrong because it isn't working.

All right. So this causes a tremendous – in the civilized world – it causes a tremendous amount of randomness. It's just the missing datum, don't you see.

All right. So – the only reason I'm calling this to your attention in the broad sphere, is so that you can see it easily when applied to a bank.

All right. Here's a pc and you start running problems on this pc and you run – you say, "Describe the problem" and "Describe the problem." He keeps giving you different problems. Different problems. Different problems. Different problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. You ever notice that? You keep running this, he keeps giving you different problems all the time. Even though you went in for problem A, you wind up with problem AAAZ. See, he's got problems, problems, problems. There's a missing datum someplace. There's an unknown.

And just as Los Angeles smog goes up to this idea of no engine – the data on how to make a proper propulsion unit, just as traffic accidents, automobile taxation, government efforts, oil company, you know, all these other problems. Each one of those could be considered as a separate problem, don't you see?

But if you started running them on the pc, "Well, do you have a problem?" And "Describe the problem to me."

And the pc would say, "Los Angeles smog."
"Describe the problem to me."
And the pc would say, "Traffic accidents."
And "Describe the problem to me."
And the pc would say, "Taxation."
Got the idea?
And these things don't seem to add up because you don't even know what the problem is, you see. But that's why he's got a problem, because he doesn't know what it is, see. And it causes you to Q-and-A with him a little bit because he doesn't know what it is. Then all of a sudden, you don't know what it is. Got the idea? Because obviously it's an unsolvable situation.

The common denominator of all problems is, you could cut through to a center problem of the pc with great speed by running unknownness on the subject of problems. Interesting idea, isn't it? Unknownness on the subject of problems.

All right. Let's give you a sample process. Now, let me define for you, first, two-way comm.

Two-way comm is an inquiry of the pc as to what is going on and an invitation to him to look at it and that is all. It's an inquiry as to what's going on and an invitation for him to look at it. An invitation. No direction for him to look at it. So it is limited to, "How are you doing?" "What's worrying you?" and, "Well, what's that all about?" And you've just about summed up the totality of two-way communication.

And when we say two-way comm, you'd better just limit it to just exactly that and nothing else: "How are you doing?" "Well, tell me about it" – which is just about the same thing as "Take a look at it" – and, "What is that all about?" That's two-way comm.

Now, I've done a no-bridge statement here. But you have been handling processes as two-way comm. Ah, ah, ah, ah, ah, ah. Two-way comm does not consist of any process whatsoever. You understand? There's no process involved in two-way comm except the process called two-way comm: "How are you doing?" "Tell me about it." "What is it?" Got it? That's it. And there's nothing more to two-way comm than that.

Now, our next observation in this particular line is that if you start a process, you flatten it. And that had to do with engrams – 1950. And it had to do with all of the 50s. And it has to do here with the early 60s. And this is a datum about auditing which has never changed. There has never been any change, variation and so forth. There are a tremendous lot of constants in auditing. And this is one of them.

Three basic constants of auditing could be – say: Run a session, flatten all the things you run into – don't keep Q-and-Aing and running into more things that you don't flatten; flatten what you contact and end sessions. These have always been with us, you see.

So that if you start any type of inquisition on the subject of the present time problem, you flatten it by the E-Meter. If you're going to run unknowns on a present time problem, flatten it by the E-Meter. What do I mean by flatten it? Well, you don't have to run a twenty minute test on it. But you sure have to get the needle action out of it. You have to get the needle action out of the process you are running.

All that is – all that is cautionary. I'm just doing a review here of something, because I'm about to give you a datum. And that is to say, in Model Session it is totally allowable to run out the present time problem by discovering the unknowns connected with it. And you'll run more present time problems faster than you ever heard of. It's with speed.
Use any version of the odd-numbered postulates. "What shouldn't be known?" "What is not known?" "What have you forgotten about it?" "What should be forgotten about it?" "Who would be upset if you did forget about it?" Anything you want to do. That is one process. You're running unknowns on the present time problem. And that is not two-way comm. You're running a process. You're running a process with a varied command and that's all you're doing.

So get that well established because you can wind a pc up in a fine state, man. Because you get him way down the track and you all of a sudden shift gears on him into saying, "I'm going to run some other process on this now", thinking you have not been running a process and you're going to be in trouble at once.

So running the odd-numbered postulates, which is the Not-Know, Forget, on down to Doubt and Pretended Know – the whole rack of the not-know scale – you can keep putting these to a pc in any kind of a version or wording you want to. And you don't have to go repetitive, repetitive, repetitive. "What have you forgotten? Thank you. What have you forgotten about that? Thank you. What have you forgotten about that? Thank you." Now, that is not being very smart and it's not being very speedy. Because there's something forgotten about the problem. There's something not-known about the problem. There's something doubted about the problem. That's something pretended.

And all you've got to do is get all these various versions of not-knowingness off the thing and the problem goes svoosh! I'm giving you this because you can stop worrying about a present time problem occupying threequarters of your session, if you do this well. Now, the only reason you object to a present time problem is because it takes such a damn long time to flatten one of the things. And there's such a marvelous opportunity, in this long time, for ARC breaks – as I've just pointed out to you are very dangerous while you're running them. See?

So we've got another process here which has just sprung up and – which is very old actually, but applied to this particular problem of problems is right on the common denominator of problems. The guy's got a problem because he doesn't know. Well, let's find out what he doesn't know. And the problem goes foosh! Got the idea?

A problem almost has one each – at least, a minimum of one each – of each part of the not-knowingness scale. Usually the problem should be not-known by somebody. The pc doesn't know something about it. In other words, an unknown. There's an unknown concerning it. By forgetting it he would get even with somebody. You see? Some part of it. Somebody else doesn't know about it, you know. All of these various versions of not-know occur around a problem. And there may be just only one of each. See? So it's a varied idea of problem. Well, let's plow out the stupidity of the thing and we've got it made, you see. See how that would work?

Now, if you became able to do this, well understanding that two-way comm just has its three parts of, "How you doing" "Tell me about it", and "What is it?" and that's all, then you won't get into the idea that you're running unknowns with two-way comm. That's phlooey, see. You're actually running a process.
Now, you said in the rudiments, you said, "All right. Do you have a present time problem?" and you got a little knock. No matter how tiny, but you got a knock on the meter. And you say, "What was that?"

And the pc says, "Well, that was, uh – I don't know how long the session is going to last."

And you say, "Well, we agreed to end it at four o'clock."

And he says, "Well, all right."

And you say, "Good. Well, do you have a problem?"

No knock. You've got it.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" Knock. And you say, "What was that?"

And the pc says, "Oh, I don't know. I'm pretty worried about the mail. I don't know whether I'll get the mail tomorrow", or something like that.

And you say, "Well, all right. What's in it?" You know?

And he says, something or other and something or other. And that's what that's all about and so on.

And you say, "Okay. How is it?" You know, "How you doing?" that sort of thing.

"Well, all right. I think I can handle that."

You say, "All right. Do you have a present time problem?" No knock. Now, you've handled it by two-way comm.

All right. But the second time you said it, "Well, do you have a present time problem?" – the second time you said, "Do you have a present time problem?" – you get another knock.

Well, the way you'd handle it with Not-K now is, without announcing the fact, you would start in on a Not-Know run on this particular problem. And it is a process and you should understand it as a process. The way you bridge out of that can be very careless, but it nevertheless has to be a bridge out. "I'm going to ask you a couple of more questions about this now and then end this." End this. See? It's not a process. But it is. And you'll find out the problem will have evaporated rather rapidly.

Now, what would you ask him? Well, he's worried about the mail. Now, that's a present time problem he's got. But this is going to turn one way or the other, one way or the other.

And you say, "Well, can you phrase that problem a little bit better?"

"Well, yes." And now it's twisted one way or the other.

And you say, "Well, is there something unknown there?"

"Oh, hell, yes. I don't know whether the mail's going to come or not. I just told you."
"Well, all right. Are you afraid somebody else is going to forget?"

"Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, that's the whole thing. They might've forgotten to send it to me, you know. And then that would be a hell of a mess."

And you'd say, "Well, all right. Now, should this be unknown to somebody or other?"

"Well, not really anybody, but it really should be unknown to my wife because she doesn't know I'm getting it."

And you say, "Well, all right. That's fine." you say, "Well, is there anything else there that is unknown? Is there anything else there that should be forgotten? Is there anything else there that if you forgot it somebody else would be real upset? Oh, I get it. All right. That's fine. All right. Now, do you have a present time problem?" No knock. Got it?

Now, if you learn to do that expertly and smoothly and try to kind of stay on the subject of vaguely what his present time problem is, not try to run his whole case and terminal, too. You got the idea? You're talking about mail. And he was worried about mail. So this seemed to be the common denominator of his present time problem, was an unknown about mail. Or it might have been an unknown about somebody going to mail him something or something of this sort, you see. But you got that sorted out. Now, you stay on that as a line of questioning. It's not-knowingness about mail.

Otherwise, you're going to get Los Angeles smog, taxes and we're going to wind up running the whole case and find him eight trillion years ago and so forth. And we won't have handled the present time problem. We'll be handling the whole case with unknowns, which we could do, too, see. But flatten what you contact. Not only flatten the process you're running, but flatten what you contact. Don't let that thing get out from under you.

You're trying to flatten that thing which you contacted. You are not trying to flatten the case. And that is the auditor's biggest difficulty on the subject of Q and A. And Q and A could be redefined as an auditor's effort to solve the whole case, having contacted one incident. See? They let that incident go. And then they get a hold of another incident and they get hold of another and another and another and another and another and another and another and another. Ohhh! Where are we? What is this all about? So the fellow said present time problem and he said mail. All right. Mail.

We got him to redefine it. We were careful about it. Let's make him really define this present time problem. And then let's get that present time problem fixed. That present time problem. It has to do with mail. Otherwise, he's going to go down to the deepest unknown of his bank. There's nothing wrong with that in processing. But there's everything wrong with that in rudiments. See? See, he's going to wind right up and find the unknown which is motors and he will suddenly say, "Motors!"

And you'll say, "What?"

"Well", he says, "this adds it up. Los Angeles smog, taxation, oil companies, the murder of Rudolf Diesel – it all adds up. Everything all adds up and so forth. And I got it and that's the basic unknown. They don't have a motor."
Well, that's great. There's nothing wrong with that at all, but that is not what we are trying to do in rudiments, see. So he will go around this whole excursion and get down to the central unknown of his track if we continued to question him in this particular line. And that's perfectly all right for a session but not all right for rudiments. So identify the object of the PTP. Remember you get changes on terminals. You don't get changes on conditions. So get the object of the PTP. PTP object – a car. PTP object – mail. PTP object – wife. PTP object – husband. Got the idea? PTP object.

Now, of course, there's another object going to creep in on you. And that's the beginning of the smog over to the tax company, you see? You're not interested in that other one. That wasn't worrying him a minute ago. Why should it worry him now? Well, we've restimulated him into a worry, so we can process him out of a restimulation. In other words, we're going to come off of that. Got the idea?

"So what don't you know about mail?" "What should be forgotten about this mail?" Preferably "this mail", you see. "What should be forgotten about this mail?" "Well, should this mail be unknown to anyone?", you know. Suspect him of that. "Well, if you forgot about it entirely, would that be an overt against somebody?"

"Yes, it sure would. It'd be an overt against me. I wouldn't pick up my paycheck", you see.

You got what you're trying to do? You're trying to take this whole thing, but you're trying to take it against one object which is the object of the present time problem. And if you get very good at this, you'll find out present time problems cease to worry you. You'll start to regard them with some contempt.

So the guy has a present time problem; you know that twelve, fifteen questions at the absolute outside later, he won't have this present time problem. He'll be fine, his attention will be in the session. Okay?

See this? So there's a trick there.

Now, obviously, that was one of the things we needed desperately in auditing, was ways and means of handling a present time problem, rapidly, effectively and scoot along right on down the line and get it all handled and get that rudiment out of the way and get the session going. Okay?

Now, you'll find out that if you can ably handle PT problems, that your ARC breaks will get very few. To minimize ARC breaks, handle present time problems.

All right. Now, there's one more little factor involved in all of this. And that's Routine 1A as a whole subject. Routine 1A consists, of course, of everything you could think of, in relationship to problems. Any time you think up a Problems Process, it could be part and parcel to Routine 1A. You could say, "Who has problems? Thank you. Who has problems? Thank you. Who has problems? Thank you." That's fine. That's Routine 1A.

"What problem could you confront? Thank you." – Routine 1A. "What problem isn't present?" – Routine 1A. You understand? "What unknowiness exists about problems?" – Routine 1A. Good or bad. See, it's all Routine 1A. You could run any of these versions for
Routine 1A and you'd come up at the other end with a total ability to confront problems without being upset about the unknowns of them.

You'll find man's main difficulty is confronting the unknown. And it's the one thing he does not like to do. Well, basically, it's hard to do. It's hard to do.

Germs. You say, "What germ could you confront?" And of course, the answer is, "No. I can't confront any germ." As far as your confrontingness is concerned, germs were an invention of a fellow by the name of Pasteur and existed only in his notebook. You've never seen one. You've seen a microscope, but how do you know you aren't just looking at Brownian movement? I never talked to any germs. Oh, I've been down skid row in Chelsea and I have talked to some germs, but – I'm sorry. I apologize.

But it's not there. You ask some – it's an absence of confrontingness, don't you see? There's nothing there to confront. You don't carry microscopes around and examine all of your friends, you know. I can see a social gathering now where everybody was insisting on microscoping everybody's hand before he shook hands, you know. Very interesting.

But anyway, it's a no-confront. Confronting the absent. Joe, Bill, Pete, somebody, wife, husband, something, is absent for forty years. And you say, "Well, what part of your wife could you confront?"

The answer, of course, is, "No part of my wife, she isn't here." It's a no-confront, isn't it?

All right. But it also happens to be an unknown. An absence adds up to an unknown and we're back to processing loss, which we knew as a very powerful, potent button about 57 and 58. Loss, the direct processing of loss when you start processing unknowns. Because what is so damned maddening about a loss is you don't know what has happened to it. [laughs] See? And it just becomes instantly a not-know.

So therefore, a person who has lots of problems is liable to start experiencing sensations of loss. You get all kinds of crossplays going here of one kind or another, you see. He's starting to assign causes of loss. Person has the problem of having murdered his father that he'd never seen. You find this in an institution. He's going around the bend on the subject of having murdered his father. You find them all the time. But he didn't, see. But the idea that his father is gone and that he doesn't know who his father was or he – some kind of a lineup of this character occurs. So a lot of not-knowingness about a father causes the fellow to go to the bottom of the Prehav Scale and pretend some knowingness. And to add to this, pretended cause.

And pretended knowingness and pretended cause are almost blood brothers. You'll find these two things going together consistently and continually. When somebody gets real plowed in on pretended knowingness, you'll find a pretended cause moves in behind it. And it makes somebody who is busy inventing things feel very peculiar indeed. I mean, somebody who's actually inventing something, it makes him feel very peculiar. Because if he gets down to the Inventor's Society, why, he'll find a bunch of fellows, perhaps, who pretend to know all about his invention and who invented it two years before he did. These things go hand in glove. Boom! Boom!
And we ran into this so often that I invented a rebuttal in Scientology which is quite effective, which is "Well, what did you invent?" And, of course, it leaves them there with their jaws flapping.

You say, "So-and-so and so-and-so and I did so-and-so and so-and-so."

And then the other person says, "Oh, yes, yes, I invented that. Yeah, oh, yeah, we did that and so forth. And we know all about that."

And you say, "Well, what do you know about?" That's the end of the conversation, man. The person who is in that state can't duplicate and they can't feed back what you've said, you see. That's the trick.

So they tell you something entirely disrelated, that is way over the hills and far away.

Up to that moment, you're caught in this trap. You say, "Well, I haven't done so much", you see. You – nothing has been made out of you for whatever you have done, you know. Nothing's been made out of you. But then you find out, hasn't been nothing made out of you; that you're just looking at a whole pool of nothing. It's an interesting rebuttal.

But pretended knowingness and pretended cause are blood brothers, not cousins, but brothers. And you find the two things coming up consistently and continually. You'll find somebody whose pretended – whose pretended knowingness is saturating his whole track from one end to the other.

And you get – you get to a point where he can't look at a monument without having ordered its erection. You got this? You see, his pretended knowingness goes along with having caused it. Now, when you start running into this, you're at the bottom of the not-know scale because it's a substitute know. You got the idea? It's a substitute know. It isn't a know.

Now, exactly how you handle that particular end of the game is very interesting because it isn't really a direct contact. It's very hard to make a direct contact at that end of the game, unless you go at it obliquely through the subject matter of problems.

The person has had so many problems that he has begun to substitute false solutions. And those false solutions are the pretended knowingness that you see on the case.

So, you actually don't process the pretended knowingness. What you do is process the guy for problems. Any Problems Process will cause such a pc to really get up on the step and fly. I don't care which one of the Problems Processes it is, but any one of them will just – will take off on this particular process. Because you enter it at the level of reality of what a problem is.

And then you'll find out, because you're handling the confrontingness or the existence of problems, all of a sudden his false solutions and pretended cause and that sort of thing fade out on the case. So problems are a very good approach on it.

1A, then, has very extended usages and can handle cases which are baffling you to this degree: You can say that if the case is baffling you, an excellent approach is to flatten 1A. Now, when I say flatten 1A, I mean to get the guy used to confronting unknowns.
When he was finally used to confronting unknowns, whether in the version of problems or otherwise, you would then have somebody who wasn't obsessively escaping from them. You would have somebody who was no longer experiencing superanxiety. You'd have somebody who wasn't experiencing "got to go", or "got to stay", "can't move", you know, "can't leave", "can't stay" or anything else. You've solved this. But it is the confrontingness of the unknown.

Jealousy is basically an inability to confront the unknown. Very possibly the absence of jealousy amongst the Polynesians is the fact that when infidelity – as it's called by the Anglo-Saxon – is accomplished in the hut, it is normally done in full view. See, there's nothing unknown about it. So jealousy becomes unknown in these particular zones and areas.

But where an unknown is racked up, you get jealousy and the sickness and so forth that somebody experiences over jealousy itself is not on the buttons of betrayal, is not on the buttons of this, on that, on the other thing.

And infinite numbers of explanations – we're just back to more smog. More smog and taxes and oil companies, you see. And all of these things are not quite related, but somehow or other the incidence of cancer in Los Angeles, you see, would come into all of this and so on. And just bzzz. Wild explanations which just dot the landscape all connect together to an unknown. And the unknown is "Is she being faithful?" or, "Is he being faithful?" or, "Is he being unfaithful or not?", or, you know... or, "Do they know something about the activities of my wife that I do not know?" You got – you got all these things? Unknowns. Unknowns, you know. "Is there something I don't know, that they know?"

And you get all these balanced knows and unknows. And a person who gets literally sick about love, for instance, you know and he's all mixed up about all of this kind of thing – don't enter it on the basis of male and female. Has nothing to do with it. You could probably solve it on the basis of old scarcity and abundance of women or men or something like this. But basically, it just comes down to inability to confront an unknown.

Now, that's a fundamental. Only this particular unknown has to do with the sexes. You see how you'd work this out? So when a case is presenting a baffling aspect to you, make up your mind that you had better improve the case's ability to confront the unknown. And we're right back in Routine 1A. A method of approaching the unknown is, of course, through problems.

You just get him to start citing problems. "What problem could you confront?" "What problem would you rather not confront?" And so on and on and on and on and on. Doesn't matter what you're running. You're still running something that is on the border fringe of unknown. See? Not-known. So therefore, you would – you would get that thing mopped up, wouldn't you?

All right. Why does a case suddenly dive into the middle of the bank and can't come out and won't come out and you can't plow the case out and you take dynamite, blasting powder, anything else you can possibly think of... What on earth would you say offhand would be the reason for this? Why does a case dive at his engrams? Why has a case got himself so glued into his bank? Why? Why? Well, it's just, why? I mean, the question itself, "Why?" answers it. The guy is unable to not ask why.
There's an unknown occurs in the incident. He gets some tiniest, slightest glimmer of the unknown and he dives right straight at the engram and there he goes. And you find another engram and he dives at this one. And you find another engram and he dives at that one. You find another engram and he dives at that one. And the next thing you know, you've got the most horrible mishmash you ever saw called a bank. Why?

The answer is he can't stand the question "Why?" That's all. He cannot confront an unknown.

In other words, he becomes very hectic at the idea that an unknown exists. It mustn't exist anywhere in the world. Well, the hell it mustn't! What'cha going to do? Run it totally on know? We can't. It's a stuck flow.

Here's an oddity though. His all-knowingnesses are invented knowingnesses. Even though you're in a body and your body is real, it isn't necessarily true. It is simply a know. But that know is invented. Somebody invented the idea of a body. You follow this?

Now, with the inability to confront an unknown, eventually you get into a state of inability to confront the known. You know, it's both sides of the same coin. And eventually you get somebody who can't confront. And then you'll have trouble with the person. So that to this person, any little tiny incident of the day or night becomes a problem that he dwells on.

He's outside. All of a sudden, he doesn't know whether he might have dropped his ballpoint outside the door or left it in the car. He doesn't have the ballpoint now. Did he leave it in the restaurant? Ah, is it here? Ah, did he have a ballpoint in the first place? Has he ever owned a ballpoint? And this just magnifies and magnifies. You get him in-session. You yourself say, "All right. Do you have a present time problem?"

"Well, I don't know where I put my ballpoint", he says very matter of factly, you see. You get a little fall on it.

You say, "Well, what about this ballpoint?"

And he says, "Well, I missed it."

And you say, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" You don't get any fall. And you say, "Well, it couldn't be too much of a problem because it only concerns a ballpoint." And what you have totally overlooked is the fact that to him that much unknowingness is enough to send him through the roof.

And he sits there all through the session without telling you and thinks, "Ballpoint? No, I didn't put it there in the car; I put it ..." [laughter] See, it isn't that the ballpoint is valuable at all. It's just the fact that there is an unknown. Where is this damn ballpoint? Got the idea? He's almost berserk on the whole idea.

You're not processing a person with a present time problem. You're processing someone with a craze, practically. And yet you as the auditor might say to yourself, "Well, that isn't much of a problem, so I won't pay much of attention to it." Well, the bug factor is, how much of a problem is a problem to a pc? And that is all regulated by his ability to confront the unknown.
And if he can't confront anything that is unknown, you will find him totally glued all the way up and down the track, totally mishmashed into every engram he has ever contacted—personally, privately, by himself. He's—every time he ran into one, he goes zoomp! Stuck, see. Got the idea?

All right. That's what you're trying to process. And of course, you're trying to get his attention off of something on to what you want to run or what should be run and his attention's stuck on his damn ballpoint.

And if you queried him, you'd find out that the last ballpoint that he had anything to do with was totally empty. And he didn't even have a refill for it and it wasn't the kind of ballpoint that could be refilled.

All right. That's what's stopping people from going to Clear. That's about all it is, too.

All right. Now, you could get something going like this. Now we're getting wicked. Now we're getting wicked. We could get something that would be as horrifying as this as a process. And this is a horrifying process:

"What unknown about an auditing session could you confront?" "What unknown about an auditing session would you rather not confront?" I don't care how many legs you put on it. You can run it just that far. And you get anybody who's having any very great difficulty auditing or just doesn't really think they ought to be auditing and they'll blow their skulls on it practically. It'll solve this difficulty. It'll solve the difficulty, wham-bam! And it is a specific process that you could run on an old-timer that doesn't really like to audit much anymore or somebody that's having a lot of difficulty learning how to audit or something like this. This would resolve on that exact process—is: "What unknown about an auditing session—?" Because, of course, the pc is sitting there being totally unknown.

And the fact that the pc has some unknowns is enough to drive the guy halfway around the bend. And he gets stuck up in every pc.

I know an old-time auditor that—I think he audits once in a while, but you can't get him to audit very much and he does a fly-about. Every time you hear of him someplace, he's someplace else. See, the intelligence never has time to get to you. I'm not talking about anybody that you know particularly. It's an old-timer from South Africa.

Anyway, he picks up every pc's somatic. No matter what somatic the pc's got when he's auditing the pc, he'll pick it up. And he'll have it for two or three days—the usual settle-out period for restimulation. Why? Because it's a mystery. And just the fact that—"What is it?" Bang! And that's it; he's got it. You got the idea?

He just snaps terminals with these unknowns, instantly. Well, it'd half kill him to run this process on him. But he'd run it and he'd come up at the either end feeling fine and smelling like a daisy. This is just a specific application of a particular type of thing in its simplest form. That is a workable process. And it does handle, then, a specific thing.

All right, we've got somebody and he used to write and doesn't like to write anymore and we want to rehabilitate his writing. Use the same factor. "What unknown about writing could you confront?"
"Whether the story's going to be bought, of course!" you see. And he – automatic. The unknowns. The unknowns have driven him out of it. Nothing else.

Eighteen lives ago the fellow could sure speak Arabic. Hasn't been able to speak much of it since. It go – turns on and off. Appears in Casablanca or something like that, asks a street beggar something, speaks Arabic. Startles the hell out of him, see. And then the next moment can't speak Arabic.

What's happening there? What's happening to somebody who can't learn German. Now, there are some unknowingnesses – German. Mm. One of these compound polysyllabic words or an irregular verb.

H.H. Munro remarks on a fellow being stomped to death by an elephant in a zoo that he was trying to teach German irregular verbs to. The fellow could make animals talk. You know the story.

Well, what is this? What's unknown about, not the German language so much, but "a German" would undoubtedly produce a considerable reaction there for the rehabilitation of a language, don't you see.

All right. Now, I'll give you another one. It is true that this is the case – this is – this is a truth here, as far as processing is concerned – that it is valences. Valences are packaged mass knowingnesses. And the treatment of a condition is an attempt to alter a valence without addressing the valence. And at no time can this occur.

You cannot, well – you cannot treat Mr. Joe Blow, if Mr. Joe Blow isn't present. You're trying to cure Joe Blow's arthritis, but Joe Blow isn't on this side of the planet. Maybe not even on this planet. You got the idea?

So you put some arthritis in a test tube or something, see. And I'll fool around with the calcium and so forth and you finally conclude there isn't much you can do about it and so on. And then this fellow is trying madly to do something about arthritis and he does something about arthritis, something about arthritis, arthritis and he finally has got arthritis. But he got arthritis. He was trying to cure Joe Blow's arthritis. Only you don't know that Joe Blow ever existed.

So, "What about arthritis could you forget?" and that sort of a thing would probably be a bit of a blind alley. You might get someplace with it.

Some process addressed directly at arthritis, just as such: Well, the probability is that unless you handle some mass, like an engram or something like that, that would cause jammed bones or something, you actually are not going to get anyplace with this arthritis. You got it? Because you are not addressing a character named Joe Blow who is basic on the chain of arthritis.

In other words, address the valence. Do not address the condition. It took me about fifteen years to find this out. So it's well worth filing behind your left ear. It's a good auditing rule. So, long lists of goals are not going to make anybody progress particularly, but long lists of valences could.
And I am now working on how to get rid of hidden standards – which is to say present time problems of long duration which people are using for standards as to whether auditing works or doesn't work – and the first process I have turned up with that has anything to do with this is one of the unknown processes and it runs like this. This would be a series of commands that you would run. And you understand that this is an experimental process, but I have every reason to believe that it would be quite a workable process. It's on the basis that – a treat-the-valence idea. In other words, get valences on the case. Don't get conditions.

You want to treat his arthritis, so you say, "Who or what might have arthritis?" "What isn't known about that person?" "What might you have done to him?" "What might you have withheld from him?" Four commands in a row. There is a method of using an unknown salted down with some other things and combined with this valence idea.

"Who or what?" It goes idiotic as this. "Who or what would have a case like yours?" Ohhh. "What isn't known about – ." Whether he said "who", why, it'd be "him" or "her" or whatever it was, proper pronoun or "it." "What might you have done to him?" "What might you have withheld from him?" And you run a Security Check and an unknown and a valence identification, all in the same bucket. I don't say that that particular one will produce any particular marvelous results because the thing is too dug in on something like that. And you'll get it best on your Goals Terminal Assessment.

But we're talking about the handling of hidden standards. So this fellow has bad eyes. And we are very interested in this. And it's a good, beautiful, hidden standard. Now, we know how to get it on the Security Check. We say, "What shouldn't be seen?", you know. "What have you done that shouldn't be seen?" And that sort of thing. And just start checking them off and flatten it out on the meter, you see. We can do that. We've already done it – and practically had somebody's eyeballs rolling around on the floor, you know.

But let's look at this now from this other process line. Not necessarily neglecting the Security Check approach either. We do that, too.

But this person's got bad eyes, good hidden standard. Is his eyes getting better? Well, auditing's working. Eyes getting worse? Well – what the hell – it's a present time problem. He isn't being audited. He's sitting in a present time problem so you got to handle it, see?

All right. So you'd run something like this. "Who or what would have bad eyes?" I don't care what version of this you use. "What is unknown about that?" "...the person?" "...it?" "What might you with – have done to them?" "What might you have withheld from them?" And you would just go on stripping off valences, valences, valences, valences, valences, valences, valences, valences and all of a sudden zzzzzzzz! Something is going to happen with regard to his eyes. See?

I'm attacking this problem of hidden standard and attacking this problem of problems because these things are the primary holdups in clearing, you see. As you can see, because I've been telling you this in this lecture.

Anyway, there is an experimental process which undoubtedly would bear a lot of fruit. Now, you could probably get rid of all sorts of things. You could probably invent a whole route to Clear with just knowing about this particular facet, you see.
You've got hit-or-miss, hunt-and-punch sort of thing that could handle an awful lot of hidden standards. Well, this fellow is worried about a habit he's got. And he just keeps worrying about this habit he's got. Well, "Who or what would have that habit?" "What isn't known about it?" – or "him?" "What might you've done to such a person?" "What might you have withheld from such a person?" And certainly we're going to get whole track God-knows-what, you see. But it's just going to be valences, valences, valences, valences, valences, valences.

Now, there's one more rule that goes along with this, is for some reason or other – well, it actually substantiates the theory that a thetan is a mystery sandwich. If you run lots of unknow and not-know, I mean lots of it, you've got to remedy havingness. So stand by to remedy havingness if you're running lots of not-know – not-know, first postulate stuff. Because frankly the whole bank is becoming unglued.

Havingness will remedy much more rapidly and so on. But you've got to keep it jacked up or the pc is liable to get pretty nervous because you're taking bank off of him in broadsword slabs. And he's got to be able to reorient himself in the physical universe.

So therefore, it'd be an awfully good thing to find the Havingness and Confront Processes early in processing in any event. At any convenient time early in processing. You find it too early and it's going to shift. But at any convenient time early in processing, find the pc's Havingness and Confront Processes, particularly since you are going to run some unknowns. Sooner or later, you will be running some unknown of some character or another on this pc and the second that you do this, you know that the havingness is going to drop and that you're going to have to stop the process every half an hour or so and remedy the fellow's havingness just to keep him flying. Okay?

So, it's a rule that goes along with it. That rule has been going along with Not-Knowingness for a very long time, by the way. Takes – terribly smooth auditing job to get around this and it takes a optimum environment for auditing and all that sort of thing never to have to remedy havingness on Not-Know. It'd just be superoptimum and nobody ever gets audited in a superoptimum atmosphere.

Okay? Well, now if you can wrap your ears – . Don't bother you wrap your brain around this stuff. [laughter] I want it to be available. But if you can put some of these in practice, why, I think you will get some of these cases really off the launching pad and really rolling. Okay?

Thank you very much.
AUDITING BASICS

A lecture given on 23 August 1961

How you doing? How you doing?

_Audience_: Okay. Fine.

You all dead today – I mean, all alive today? [laughter]


Well, I'm glad you made it. I didn't think you'd ever get to August the 23rd. [laughter]

Back there in the Roman Empire I was damn sure you wouldn't get here! [laughter] And I remember one space-opera society when I didn't think it was very probable that you'd make it. I remember standing there at the edge of the spaceport as the battle planes took off, and I said, "Well, they won't make it." I knew, you see, I knew the high command hadn't given you any ammunition.

Well anyhow – anyhow, you're in the midst of clearing. And your first takeoff on this subject has already occurred. And I've been talking about it for years – talking about it for a long time, everybody coming along and saying, "Where's the Clears? Where's the Clears? Where's the Clears?" Very embarrassing, you see. Central Organization pcs flying over banisters you know, and hung up by their heels you know, and being sup – people pouring cornstarch into them so they looked like they were standing up stiff, you know. [laughter]

And "Where are the Clears? Where are the Clears? Where are the Clears? Where are the Clears?" I never got so tired of a sentence in my life! Now, I'll tell you my withhold. "Well instead of sitting – standing there, asking me silly questions, why the hell don't you find out?" You know, I mean, kind of forthright. But that's kind of the way it was.

Because it's very mysterious over a long period of time as to what were the elements missing. What were the missing elements? What brought about this condition where people didn't get cleared? And now I realize that we might have had – well, we have had dozens and dozens of clearing processes. That's why I've been studying, you see, for some years, auditing. Been studying auditing.

There's been a parallel study: The theory and practice of Scientology has included, of course, theory, experimental results and that sort of thing, but this other study – a big broad one – is auditing, just as such. And I just sort of relaxed a few years ago and just started watching, looking it over and seeing what this was all about, and looking at it from all sides and "What were people doing with people?"

You see, it isn't good enough that I can take somebody and audit them and get some horrendous result and so forth, and everything is fine, because you run out of me rather rapidly. In the first place, it interrupts my photography. [laughter] And, you know, frankly, you
can only put in so many hours a day; figure out the number of human beings on Earth, and it gets to be some very disproportionate figure, doesn't it?

Group auditing, well, matter of fact, that comes close to blowing a lot of cases apart with group auditing, you know, but it still didn't make any total grade and there still weren't any Clears on a group auditing basis so it had to fall back on individual auditing.

Well, what happens in individual auditing that makes it fail to result in clearing? And our biggest single breakthrough on this – of course, aside from all the technology we have on how to audit – the biggest single breakthrough on this is simply that the goal disappears and the terminal disappears if the rudiments are out. And that is – becomes one of these crusher things, like when you pull the trigger on a guillotine, why, the blade falls, you know? And it's one of these facts that stand up there and – twice as big as the Empire State Building with three Washington Monuments on top of it, you know. I mean, it's a Fact! with an exclamation point and a capital "F." You can't do it.

Now, if that is the case, why do pcs get audited with the rudiments out? Let's take a look at that. Let's be very dispassionate about all this.

Why these four little simple rudiments? How come? And we find something very interesting when we look there. We find something very, very interesting. They aren't considered to be important. See, the level of importance of getting those rudiments in is slight.

Now the auditors -- . Our first Clear here, and one of her first clear observations is the fact that auditors thought of Security Checks as something you got through with luckily because nothing dropped. Duuhh! See.

So Security Check isn't looked at as something that will advance a case. It is looked at as something that has to be gotten through with and the faster we get through a Security Check, of course, the more time we can put on auditing. And I think rudiments fall into the same category -- the same identical category.

Rudiments are a necessary evil, and if we can just get through the rudiments without anything dropping, why, wham! whiz! everything is fine now, because of course if we spent any time on the rudiments, why, it'd just be time lost from auditing. Interesting! But I think that is the basic consideration. Do you agree that it's just kind of a -- it'd be too bad if you had to take up a lot of PT problems and ARC breaks and things of this character, because you wouldn't get any auditing done in the session.

See, it's an unlucky thing. It's just an auditor sits down in the beginning of the session and he puts the cans in the pc's hands and sometimes he has lucky days. Sometimes the pc has no PTPs, ARC breaks, withholds or anything of the sort, and he can get on to auditing. And sometimes he has unlucky days and the pc has present time problems and so forth, and he has to take these things up. Isn't that kind of the way it's looked at?

Well, I think that's about the first consideration we have to shift. Now, it looks like the rudiment is out mostly on the evaluation of importance of the rudiment. Now, I gave you a series of rules that if the rudiment didn't fall with the meter set at a third-of-a-dial drop, why, then you could neglect it.
Well, that was in sort of desperation because everything was going awry, and so forth. And I'm going to exercise my privilege of having created it to as-is it. And let's go to the other extreme, Aristotelian. He had a pendulum, you know. And the world was all described as swinging on a pendulum and it went between the two extremes before it settled at the mean. So we might as well go over to the far side of the pendulum and run the whole thing at sensitivity 16. Just for kicks, try it. Because the rules I just gave you yesterday basically take care of these rudiments being wildly out.

The materials I gave you on the 22nd, which just simply consisted of what you did if you consistently had too many present time problems – you did 1A. If present time problems is the trouble and if you were getting lots of ARC breaks, same remedy. Let's get 1A flat on this case. Got the idea? So, that gave you a good way to approach the whole situation and didn't leave you messed up with doing nothing but rudiments.

Now, I think that this is one of the difficulties with rudiments, that the rudiments processes don't work well. I think that is one of the basics – difficulties with rudiments – is the processes which are given in Model Session are tailor-made as a highly generalized shot at an awful lot of cases and I think they miss cases often enough so that auditors become impatient with these particular processes. And there are pcs who cannot run responsibility, so running responsibility on a present time problem is a waste of time. And it just takes you forever to clean up the present time problem running responsibility on it, so you say, "Oh my God, he's got a present time problem. I'll be sitting here running this responsibility, and the pc can't run responsibility." So there's a hell of a present time problem arises around the present time problem, you see? And that makes a rough show.

So, it must be – a certain dissatisfaction must exist around the processes, which are given in Model Session and which we've had for some time – must be a dissatisfaction with those. Otherwise you wouldn't feel such a strain on the subject of handling rudiments.

Now, there are several constants in auditing sessions and these constants are this – are these. And you've got an awful lot of rules and you could be terribly rule-happy. You know, you could just be ritual-happy until you can't see where you're going. But there are few out of all of these rules (and there could be said to be hundreds of them) – out of all of these there are very few of them which have any real bearing on the subject of auditing. And I can give you those very, very rapidly; run them straight off. I already gave them to you, I think, yesterday. I can give you possibly a slightly varied version of it, but just because I play it off the cuff.

And that is, you've got to start a session and get the pc in-session, and you've got to get all your rudiments in, and you've got to flatten all the processes you start, and you've got to end the session. And that's just about the lot. And the errors you can make with this are most flagrantly failing to get the rudiments in, running too many processes without flattening them, and failing to end session smoothly. And those are the failures that go along with this. And if you don't manage that little small basketful of tricks, of course you're going to have an awful time of it.
Now, you can get particularized and say, "Well you've got to have your TRs well." That's for sure! That's for sure! But that almost goes without saying, that a fellow who is an auditor would have his TRs in some kind of shape, don't you see.

Now, to this we can add this interesting observation (just to show you how particularized we can get): For a pc to be in communication with the auditor, it is necessary for the auditor to be in communication with the pc. There is some added factor here and that is added into in-sessionness. You see, the pc has to feel he is in communication or able to talk to the auditor.

Well, let's broaden this. Able to talk to the auditor, able to be in communication with the auditor. Let's spread it a little bit further, and an auditor who would give invalidative comments or who would fail to articulate an auditing command, so that he couldn't be understood and so forth, is knocking the pc out of session. Get the idea? Because the pc's understanding of what the auditor is saying drops. Therefore, the pc's understanding of what the auditor is doing drops. So therefore, the ARC drops, and the auditor finds a pc going out of session. On what? On himself not being in session. You see? So the auditor's got to be there, giving an auditing session, before you can expect the pc to be in-session. And that sums it up. Part of in-sessionness for the pc is for the auditor to be giving a session.

So we can add, in a masterfully way here, one third line to the pc being in-session. One, he's got to – the pc has to be interested in his own case, and he has to be willing to talk to the auditor – we can still say it the same way – but the auditor has to be giving a session. And that is in-session.

Now, what is – what consists of an auditor giving a session? Actually it's an auditor sitting down to run the session. The auditor sits down and runs a session. Now, he can run an awfully haphazard-sounding session and there'd be no doubt in the pc's mind whatsoever about who was running the session, and you'd get an awful lot of auditing done, wouldn't you? There'd be an awful lot of auditing occur on that. There might be a lot of rules violated one way or the other; but the rules I've just given you can't be violated. The second you violate those, you've got no auditing session whatsoever.

So it isn't how you hold your pinky, it's how you hold your pc in-session. And of course the best way to hold a pc in-session is by giving one. That sounds like one of these horrible, horrible simplicities. There's a whole tribe of Indians that I've commented often and their wisdom – their wisdom, read off their – actually, out of the books of the missionaries who were so interested in them, way up the Hudson someplace or the Saint Lawrence or somewhere. You know, "The way to cross the river is to cross the river." "The way to eat duck is to eat duck", you see. And their wisdom just ran on like this and it actually filled up numerous pictographs on numerous wigwams and has come down to us in the numerous pages of numerous long-since-murdered missionaries. Bunch of it up here in the Hudson Bay Company archives. "The way to cross a river is to cross the river." "The way to eat a duck is to eat a duck", or "The way to shoot somebody is to shoot somebody." This was a very Q-and-A sort of wisdom. But in this particular case it sure fits. The way to run a session is run the session – rather a thing.
Now, to tell somebody how to run a session has its limitations. And the limitations are these: How much disagreement is there on the part of the auditor with the forms and actions he is using to run the session? And that should be a subject taken up in a HPA [pronounces the "H" as "haiche" instead of "aiche"] Course, and that should be one of the subjects, and we will institute it in HPA Courses. After the fellow – you know, it's HCA [pronounces the "H" normally], but it's HPA [pronounces the "H" as before]. [laughter] Never heard it called anything else in the early days in England. Always has stuck with me as being – it's rather nostalgic to me, as a matter of fact. We had quite a few in the old days – we had quite a few cockneys and so forth around the organization. It was marvelous to hear them, you know. You could remember some of them.

Anyway, it would be simply this. We'll probably write up some sort of a drill or some sort of a test. I've got a couple of them to get together, and this would be the second one. The other one is a straight Security Check that out-rates this 7A, 7B. I haven't written them finally yet. I've got the notes on them is all. And that is simply this: is after the fellow is all set up, and knows – has been jumped through the TRs and has been given rudiments and Model Session and that sort of thing, and he's supposed to sit in there and pitch and deliver this, you see. Now we're going to take an E-Meter and we're going to find out what disagreements he has with these elements. Good idea, isn't it?

He must have some disagreements with them, he won't do them, or he must have some basic ARC breaks with some part of the modus operandi. And of course, I've enumerated a couple of practical aspects of this. Some days you can get some auditing in and some days you run rudiments – the lucky and unlucky aspects of it. But the dissatisfaction must stem from the fact that rudiments processes do not easily handle the situation which you find in the rudiments. So that would make it kind of tough to handle rudiments. So there must be some kind of a disagreement with handling rudiments. But there might be some more fundamental disagreement than this, such as, "Well, he shouldn't have to be audited." That would be an awfully sweeping disagreement with the whole thing, you see. This expresses itself in numerous ways, such as, "A pc shouldn't act that way."

In Upper Indoc drills – we have had the remark made in an Upper Indoc – I was running one ACC when the remark was made "Pcs never act this way." Little did she know! [laughter] She, by the way, ran slam-bang into a pc, abruptly and immediately afterwards, who did act that way. And was she surprised! She thought that we were running Upper Indoc much too rough, don't you see. So she was in basic disagreement with this much roughness in an Upper Indoc, because "pcs didn't act that way."

Now, that's a very fundamental disagreement and yet it works this way: that you, using the elements of auditing, could take anybody, and I do mean anybody, and by running them with the rudiments out produce a confused, ARC breaky pc. You could make anybody into an ARC breaky pc, that I'm very sure of, just by running with rudiments out. Now, if you don't run an ARC breaky pc, you're liable to run down into a propitiative pc. So don't look for just violence. How about propitiation? You run with rudiments out, you get propitiation.

Now, I'm about to send a cable after the lecture here to – it'll be a very historically noteworthy cable – I'm about to send it to a certain area and say, "So-and-so is expected at
Saint Hill for training." This will be a vast shock to one and all, because everybody insists that this so-and-so is a very fine auditor, and he's not. He's not. Because I've had the unfortunate experience of meeting some of his pcs, and they've just been beaten with out-rudiments into a heavy propitiation with regard to this particular chap. And they all look caved in. He's not making any Clears and he's having a heck of a time with auditing, but everybody says he's a marvelous auditor. You got the idea? We're getting a lot of advertisement going on here. So I'm going to send a cable and say send him in here. And we'll get him over this trick and he'll be a good auditor.

But there would be some wild impatience with rudiments or the mechanics of auditing. And I know already that this particular auditor never flattens a process – never. I mean it's almost a modus operandi; never flattens a process – never! And this leaves everybody stuck on the track, you see. So that's a bum show, and just for the good of the game, why, I'll send a cable. Now, I'm not bringing that up for any other reason but to show you here's somebody who never has an ARC breaky pc because dead men can't protest.

This guy, you see, the fellow says, "I have a present time problem". And the auditor just comes down on him with a horrible crush and a crash and so forth and bowls it through. And the pc says, "Well, I don't really like being bowled through." And the auditor knocks that out of the road, you see. And then he says, "I have a..." – pc says, "Well, I do have a little bit of a withhold." And the auditor says, "Well, that's not important to the session." And if he runs any rudiments at all that's about the net result of it, you see. And the and product is not an ARC breaky pc, but a highly propitiative pc, you see. So you see, you could go in the other direction, too. And of course the guy has to come up through all that auditing – that's easy to do, too, but – in order to go anyplace. You see how it could work?

So the rudiments could be out and you could produce several different phenomena, which I won't bother to list, by having the rudiments out during session. So a disagreement with the rudiments or a difficulty in handling rudiments or an actual technical lack in the field of rudiments then could produce a considerable bit of randomness. It could prevent clearing; it could upset things; it could prevent case advances and make Scientology fail in all directions. See how that could be?

So we'll shape this up. Now we've already had a breakthrough and the key rudiment is the present time problem. That is the key rudiment. This is a sneaky one, because it very often doesn't fall on first inspection. You say, "Do you have a problem?" Fellow has a very immediate present time problem, you get your instant fall. But you ask him if he has a present time problem, and classification and dispersal and "It must be something else", and that sort of thing enters into it, you see, and it isn't even reactively in view. He has no reality on his migraine headaches being a present time problem to him. You audit him a little bit, and so forth, and you suddenly are facing a long duration present time problem that wasn't really there before.

And on a little inspection of present time problems as you go along, you suddenly start finding out why this case hasn't been snapping and popping. It's because he's just getting a reality on the fact that he does have a problem. And this other factor enters in and this is an interesting factor. This is probably a sneak limiting factor on all cases. The pc goes into action
by reason of auditing, and being now in motion on this planet, accumulates problems, and is 
now being audited with present time problems. Do you get the idea?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right, sitting there quietly in the corner like a mushroom, he didn't accumulate any 
present time problems. You audit him, he gets up a little bit, he goes into motion in the soci-
ety and you have a universe absolutely triggered up to furnish more problems than you can 
easily count. He gets a whole bunch of problems, and then his continued auditing, then, is 
auditing against these new present time problems and so he doesn't continue to make a case 
gain and you get into a grind.

In other words, all the auditing benefit he got was enough auditing benefit to pull him 
up into action. And I've noticed it now for about thirteen, fourteen years, that one of the pri-
mary characteristics of a case gain is the person going into action.

See, I've tried this business of just sitting in an ivory tower and processing people end-
llessly. Didn't work well, because I kept losing everybody. See, they didn't think there was any 
game, and there was nothing doing, and it was just Ron, he was supposed to do these things 
and he did them. And then they went out and they got into action, and they'd go over the hills 
and far away.

And I'd very often run into a case that I couldn't complete. Fellow was now too inter-
ested in life and he was getting going in all directions and so forth. Well, it's just as well that I 
didn't continue to pressure auditing as far as that particular person was concerned, because I 
would have been auditing uphill against all these brand-new accumulated present time prob-
lems, don't you see.

But where you continue to audit somebody who has gone into motion in life, you are 
probably auditing up against new present time problems. So the cycle that you could expect 
on present time problems is, as the case went along, he would get more, not less. You could 
expect as auditing continued, if it were being successful, to run into not just more and more 
withholds – which you know he comes up to the responsibility of knowing he's withholding – 
but this other thing: he accumulates and has in a session, more and more present time prob-
lems to handle.

So you're liable to get some cyclic aspect. You're liable to get a cyclic aspect of a pc 
who is relatively ARC breaky, and it would look like this: You audit him up the line and then 
he goes into action and he gets a lot of new problems, see. And then we have some ARC 
breaks of some kind or another and his auditing ceases. And then these settle out, don't you 
see. And he gets – and then we audit him again and at the time we pick him up for auditing, 
why, he doesn't have many problems because he's not doing much, you see. And then he 
moves up into a bunch of present time problems and then he ARC breaks, and then we get all 
ARC busted in the sessions, and then he knocks off auditing, don't you see. Only he's not 
crawling up three inches and falling back one, he's crawling up two inches and falling back 
two inches, and crawling up two inches and falling back two inches, just endlessly, you see. 
This would be the way it would be. So that is probably the sneak limiting factor on cases. 
That's a sneaker.
It is your very auditing gain which brings the pc new present time problems, because going into motion of course in this universe, he accumulates more present time problems if he is in motion. He was all right as a vegetable; he didn't have any. It's true, too! He didn't have one!

We've run into somebody who was on a pension or who was getting a disability payment. And if we'd cured the disability payment he would have had problems, you see. So we cured the disability payment and then all of a sudden we had an ARC breaky pc and we'd lose him as a pc. You see, it looked like because we'd gotten rid of his pension, you know, he was upset with us, or that he wouldn't give up his bad heart, or something, because this'd mean he'd give up his pension, or something. So auditing sort of stalled there someplace.

Well, actually he had everything taped. Here's what really happened. He had everything taped. Life was absolutely by the square, diagonal, and perfect circle. You see, at the first of every month he drew a check and he went home and read the comic books, or whatever he did, you see. And this was all that ever happened. All that ever happened. He just went through this cycle. And now all of a sudden, why, we move him up the line, he goes into a little more action, and as he goes by the comic bookstand, he makes – a triangle is put into his life, you see, he walks by some girl's house and sees her. That's guaranteed to give him problems! [laughter]

And then because we've been running a quiet preclear who didn't have any problems, we then, of course, don't expect to have a pc who does have any problems. So we are a little bit taken by surprise. So therefore, we are lulled into not looking for them. So a little datum for you, as you go by. Probably you – not a surgically important datum, but one that's well worth noting is, as auditing progresses there are two tests of progress, independent of all other tests, which an auditor can note. Does the pc have an increasing number of withholds? Does he have new withholds on the Security Check? That's a very good test.

If you give your pc a Security Check and you went through it all very, very nicely, even though it took quite a time, and there were – oh, seventy-five percent of the questions had no fall on them. And then you gave him another Security Check and seventy-five percent of the questions had no fall on them. And you gave him another Security Check and he had no withholds of any kind, watch it, because this boy is not getting better. Betterment is represented by increased responsibility, which brings about new withholds. And what you should finally work up to on a Form 3, really, is every question live, particularly the way you're running them now. You see, they go on the whole track.

You mean to tell me – do you mean to tell me – are you actually willing to sit there and tell me that in the last two hundred trillion years you have never committed any single one – or is there one of the crimes, see, that you haven't committed that is listed on the Security Check, you see? Well, I doubt it. I doubt it. I'll go into doubt for you about that. [laughter]

And the other one is, an increasing number of present time problems which have to be handled at the beginning of session. Those are the two: Increasing liveness of response to a Security Check and increasing liveness of response to the question, "Do you have a present time problem?"
Now, there is another factor which mitigates the horrors of that exact situation. And that is as the pc increases his ability, he blows these things faster. So although you have more by maybe triple, you have less time being occupied because it only takes a quarter as long to clear them, you see. So if he's making progress at all, they clear faster. So that would be another little cross-check. He has more present time problems, he has more withholds, and they clear up faster.

And if that isn't happening to your pc as you audit him, then you're probably auditing a pc with the rudiments really wildly out. There is something wildly wrong in this auditing session, and the most wildly wrong thing there can be is just wildly out-rudiments. Simple. Rudiments aren't in. Pc isn't making progress – rudiments aren't in.

You're dealing with processes today which can only be stopped by the rudiments. And the only thing that could happen is that the rudiments aren't in, that's all, or the pc didn't report for the session, or the auditor isn't giving one.

Now, on the general subject of auditing, an auditor who expects the pc to be doing something besides being a pc, of course, is inevitably in trouble. If you expect something else of the pc besides pc-ing, you of course, are in trouble. It's like auditing somebody who is supposed to be doing the cooking at the same time, you see. And you have to – this is an odd beingness to grant and it sounds very difficult. It sounds very – it doesn't sound difficult, it sounds Simple Simon to say that this is a beingness that has to be granted.

But an auditor, in running a session, has as one of its essential parts, granting pc beingness to the pc. You know, the auditor is not willing to have a pc so much as the auditor is willing for a pc to be sitting there, you see. Willing to make no demand on the person sitting opposite him beyond that of being a pc. And if you check it over you find out some auditing difficulties you've had in the past very possibly may trace to an expectancy of the pc being something else beside a pc.

Now, all a pc is supposed to do – there isn't any such thing as laying down a code for a pc because he's just a pc, but actually what does a pc do? Well, a pc does the session which the auditor is auditing. You see, he does the session. He does what the auditor says, and he answers what the auditor says, and so forth. This is what the auditor expects of him. We're not laying restrictions on the pc. But this is what you as an auditor expect of the pc; that he follow your auditing commands, that he do the things which you said, that he furnish the information which is required of him. That's what you're demanding of him.

Now, if you grant this beingness of being a pc to the pc, and that is all you expect him to do, why, you will find out that your auditing enormously simplifies. Because you, then, don't expect him to volunteer information, or be a walking encyclopedia of something or other, or tell you if something is going wrong, or something. This is nothing. This is no part of his bargain. It's not up to him to tell you this thing is going wrong. You see, that's up to you. It's up to you to find it out. You've got a meter and you've got your pair of eyes and your observation and the pc, types of answers. You've got innumerable ways to find out. But it isn't up to him and there is no rule anyplace that says he has to tell you what to do. Nor is there any rule of telling you what is happening, unless you ask for it.
In other words, it's just grant the beingness of being a pc to the pc, and he's sitting there being a pc, and that's it. You don't expect anything else of this pc but to answer your questions and to furnish information, that is, answer the questions and follow the auditing commands and stay there in-session and do what you say. That's all you expect of the pc. Now, if that's all the beingness which you're granting, and that's all you expect of the pc, you see at once that it is necessary for you to find out what's going on, because there's no responsibility on the pc's part to tell you what's going on. Got the idea?

I notice you're looking at me a little puzzled, but I think that's because you're not puzzled, it's you're just digesting a fact. I wonder if you've ever expected a pc to be something else beside a pc. At any time have you looked to a pc to be anything else but a pc, while being a pc from the beginning to the end of the session? Because if you have, I will guarantee that at that point your session broke down. In some mysterious way it would break down.

Now, Scientologists are very prone – understandably, and nothing wrong with this at all; me too – prone to run a big ought-to-be. Well, run an ought-to-be on anything under the sun, moon or stars. Run it on the revolutions of planets, the evolutions, so-called, of governments, or anything else. Run any kind of an ought-to-be you want to, except in an auditing session. See, just delete that ought-to-be out of the auditing session and you'll be much happier.

I know, because – I know this personally, you see, because you run a horrendous big ought-to-be on me. I'm the most ought-to-be'd character. [laughter] It's marvelous! It's absolutely marvelous! And I'll tell you, if I was no saint, you're going to make me into one! [laughs, laughter]

Anyway, an ought-to-be actually doesn't belong in any part of the auditing session. It's like the Upper Indoc student who was saying, "Well, pcs don't act like that, so therefore, I shouldn't be doing this wrestling around the floor", don't you see. Well, a certain feeling like that could get into a session, you know. There are your horrified aspects. Sometime some pc comes up with a string of withholds that would lift the hair of a priest, you know, with all they listen to. And "Coo!" you know, you say.

Well, you're actually running an ought-to-be. You say, "This person ought to be a well-disciplined, well-behaved person, and should have been well disciplined and well behaved for the last two hundred trillion years." Well, if that's the case, how the hell did they get in the pc's chair? [laughter] And this ought-to-be is joined up with a "probably-is". It's not only an ought-to-be, but there's also a probably-is. You have a supposition about this pc and then you operate on that supposition. And this supposition, of course, is liable to find you way out in left field, or it's liable to find you sailing without sails in the middle of the Antarctic. You're not quite sure what happened to you or how you got there.

Give you an example: Perhaps, two weeks of auditing were wasted on a course once, on a dear lady who was the most disarming-looking probably-is you ever saw. She was a real probably-is, you know. Because she looked like a dear, sweet, unassuming lady, just the very kind that you would cast for "Aunt Mary" in some super-saccharin play of 1900, you know? Just marvelous! The most marvelous casting you ever saw in your life, you know. And every-
body for two weeks audited her that way. And it just never occurred to ask her for any blood
and guts. Most marvelous thing you ever saw.

And when the curtains finally fell on this particular case, an auditor had just simply
become sharp enough to go past the probably-is, you see. And instead of buying this mock-up
complete as a package, noticed that all of the efforts to get this person to improve in any way,
shape or form were all failing, so there must be something else there, and began to really
sweat over this case. I think Mary Sue was behind this push.

Get some of the withholds off and, of course, this dear, sweet, perfect casting for Aunt
Mary had made a specialty for the last fifty years of stealing everyone's husband that could
possibly be stolen, and engaging in nothing per se but flat-out adultery in all directions. And
there are probably something on the order of four hundred different incidents of this particular
character on this case. [laughter] It's marvelous! When they finally got that Security Check
going, man, it went like a prairie fire! This read like something "Bouncing Betty the Gun
Moll", you know?

And I remember another one in an HGC one time, and they had looked in vain – this
was when we were doing dynamic assessments – and they'd looked in vain for any kind of a
terminal on this lady. And she was dear and she was sweet and she was everything, but she
was a rough, tough space commander. And that was her valence. And for some reason or
other when people get into the position of the loneliness of space, they tend to keep the va-
lences. Because of the coldness of space, and that sort of thing. But how about the loneliness
of space, and then the isolation of command added in on top of this, you see. And that really
makes a honey!

But everything about this case belied this valence. There couldn't possibly have been
any such valence of any character whatsoever. So nobody looked for it. And I'm sure she
must have said it. I'm sure that meters must have said it. But nobody could believe it. Don't
you see? This was a rough, tough, blood-and-guts, bucko master, you know. Why, she proba-
bly made Captain Bligh look like a patsy! [laughter] But the only role any auditor could see
her in would be making cookies for the kiddies in the neighborhood, you know? So they just
bought the mock-up and never asked for anything else.

Well, I'll tell you, if the mock-up is factual, and the case isn't advancing, don't blame
Scientology, just blame the estimate of the situation. This (quote) "factual" presentation must
have some fantastic unknowns concerning it which must be in wild disagreement.

Now, for instance, I'll give you an idea here in technology, how wild a wild disagree-
ment can fail to resolve things. Jealousy immediately and at once must have to do with the
terminals of men and women. Because men and women are jealous, obviously, so if we run
men and women we solve jealousy. That's for sure. Only it won't. So it must be something
else.

Cases resolve on the isness of the case. No matter how hidden it is, it's still the isness
of the case, not the might-be's, ought-to-be's or probably-is's. See, it's the isness of the case.
And the isness of the case must be totally unknown to one and all, if it fails to resolve at once.
It must be just totally unknown. It is not what the pc is telling you, if the pc is making no pro-
gress.
If the pc is sitting there saying complain, complain, complain, complain about this, that or the other thing – his lumbosis is just killing him and you handle his lumbosis, and his lumbosis is just killing him and you handle his lumbosis, and his lumbosis is just killing him and you handle his lumbosis. Well, now you've bought one of these probably-is's, you see? You said it's probably his lumbosis. But obviously, if you haven't cured his lumbosis don't blame your auditing skill, just blame this one fact alone: You haven't gotten down to the isness of the situation, that's for sure.

Let's begin a very tight series of questions that isolate what this is. Is it lumbosis or what? This person says to you all the time, "My feet are cold, my feet are cold", so you audit him for cold feet. "My feet are cold", so you audit him for cold feet. He comes up with this problem: cold feet, cold feet, cold feet, and you keep auditing cold feet. And I can tell you by actual test that you could do that for seven years. I know such a case. You could do it for seven years without ever making a happy pc or getting much of a gain. And we must assume after a while that it isn't even cold feet. We have to assume after a while, it just isn't cold feet. Because we're not auditing the isness, see. We must be auditing something else. We must be auditing some kind of an alter-is of some kind. If auditing cold feet then doesn't resolve the pc's cold feet, that he's complaining about, then the pc doesn't have cold feet.

What does the pc have, for pity sakes? So your line of questioning should go in on the line not, what makes cold feet, cold feet, cold feet, cold feet. Your line of questioning should go in on the basis, "Just exactly what are you complaining about? What is the isness of it?"

And you generally find out, well, it wasn't cold feet anyhow. The person just said cold feet, and really it isn't cold feet. It's because they burn all the time, and it isn't his feet, it's his ears. But he's afraid it'll go into his feet and so forth, but that isn't what's really wrong. It's because of the disconnections of the spine that they're liable to cause cold feet. Because you can't get circulation in the feet, you see, if you have difficulties with the spine, and that sort of thing. And you get right down to it, and you find out it's – they're afraid they have a disease. And that's the isness of the situation. How fascinating! Yet they were complaining about cold feet. You get how far afield this thing finally went?

So your test is simply this: If something isn't resolving, you haven't got the isness of it. It's just, if a case isn't going Clear, the first isness of it that you would test is the session. You wouldn't be worried so much about the valence before you had the session straight. Got the idea? You got to have the session. That's the first isness, and the next isness are the rudiments, and the next isness after that would be what you're addressing in the case. And those would be the isnesses in more or less order of importance.

Now, if you've got in the isness of the session, and you've got in the isness of the rudiments, and the person continues to complain, and you continue to try to help them with a certain (quote) "isness", it's just a "probably." It is never it if isn't responding rapidly. It is some other isness. Because you're looking at an alter-isness of some kind. So if the valence is wrong, well, it's wrong, that's all. Find the right one.

The most problem you're going to have with a case is going to be in the realm of the long-duration present time problem. And that is going to be the most suspect as far as its isness is concerned. Is that the problem? And the best test is, if it doesn't surrender rather rap-
idly as a problem, then you haven't gotten the pc to state the problem. That isn't what the problem is. In other words, it isn't necessarily true that you are handling it all badly. It just might be true that you are actually handling something which isn't there. And that something else is there to be handled, and you just don't happen to be handling that. But this isn't a good enough reason to change processes.

We now have a test that tells us whether or not a process is working. Anything aside from two-way comm which is totally limited to just asking — this is the three things I gave you yesterday — it's just you say to the fellow, "How are you doing?" and "Tell me", and "What is it?" and that's the end, you see. There isn't any more to that. You can ask those many times, repetitively, in numerous ways and so forth, but that's the end. You're not running anything. Anything else is a process.

So don't try to say you're two-way-comming somebody's problems out while you're asking them to describe the problem, because you're running a process called "Describe that problem to me, please. Thank you." Got it?

You say, "Describe the problem." You would say — you can ask a pc, "Well what is the problem there that you're worried about?" And the pc says it's so-and-so and so-and-so. And you say, "All right, I will take that up", or something of the sort. You're right on the border between two-way comm — and you're still safely inside two-way comm — and running a process. And that's where the border crosses — right at that point. Because if you once more say, "Tell me the problem", you're in a process and you're committed to flattening what you've started. And the moment you leave two-way communication you are committed to flattening what you begin whether you began it in a process form, Model Session, or not. If what you began produces tone arm motion, you're going to have to run the tone arm motion out of it, whether it is a rudiment or anything else. You got it?

And therefore, you should not be very adventurous about what you begin. You better get a good grip on what you're going to start before you start it. Because the careless woofity-bap launching madly into — . Well, the guy says, "Well, I'm stuck in — I'm stuck in, uh — I'm in — stuck in this, see, 'Mother'. It's all about Mother. And I'm stuck in this about Mother."

And you say, "Well, is there something unknown about that?"

"Eh, yes, as a matter of fact, yeah, I never knew my mother." And needle moves.

And you say, "Good. Is it all right if we go on?" Boy, have you goofed! Oh, God! That is a goof, you know! Something on the order of the biggest British dreadnought firing on Windsor Castle, you know. That is a goof, man! That's shame, blame, regret.

I used to know this, that you could run three commands of a process without getting into serious trouble. But that was yesterday's processes! Today's processes commit you, right now, with the first command because they are hot. They are hot. You're auditing with sabers and it's hot. You start something — finish it. Don't go shifting it off. And if you find yourself in the unlucky position of three days later still running, "Which side of a girl is up? Thank you", [laughter] just look back at that moment when you unluckily started it. That's your only choice. Your only choice is to complete what you begin. Otherwise you leave a pc with unfinished cycles and these begin to hang up and make auditing itself a problem.
Now, when there's too many unfinished cycles on a case you've got the remedy of Prehav 13. You can take auditors and that sort of thing, some such generalized term, do a Terminal Assessment of some kind, run them on the Prehav Scale. That's got a liability, too.

Supposing you only had four levels live on the Prehav Scale and you decided – you know, and you were assessing auditors. You only had four levels live, and then you run "Fail to abandon." "The auditor failed to abandon the case?" "What auditor didn't abandon your case?" "What auditor did?" you know, 'What auditor did you fail to abandon?' you know, and back and forth and we got it all set. And we run that kind of flat and there's no more needle action because you run those out on needle action, and then you assess again and you have seven levels live. Where do you go now? What do you do now?

Well, this is the one exception which I will give you. You get off of that train even though it's going 125 miles an hour, you hear me? You just get right off of that train. You go down to the bottom step and throw yourself into the brambles because that's the time to get off! Because obviously you are running a terminal which is in wild disagreement with the pc's case and you are assessing up the whole Prehav Scale. And if you continue to do that on your next assessment – having run "faith in auditors", – on your next assessment you've got twelve live – twelve live. And if you ran it again now (this is just a funny peculiarity, you see), and you ran serene, "What auditor was serene?" and "What were you serene about auditors?" and so forth, you're going to have twenty live – twenty live levels.

Well, don't get the whole Prehav Primary and all the Secondaries live before you find out that it didn't pay. You get it? Because the difficulty with running rudiments, and running random processes of any kind whatsoever, the difficulty of it sums up only and totally to this: If they are in opposition to the pc's goal and terminal setup, the case will not progress at all.

Now, that's very interesting, isn't it? So that any process that you adventured upon in the rudiments, any process that you adventured upon to straighten out the pc so he could be audited, any process that you adventured on, if it happened to be counter to the goal and the terminal of the pc, of course was something that is better deserted fast. You got the idea? So it does have that reserve on it.

In the first place you're trying to set up somebody to be run on Routine 3. There is no other clearing process, you might as well make up your mind to it, that is broadly working. I can think of several processes that would undoubtedly clear people and all that sort of thing, but these are not on the assembly line, and remember these processes in the hands of other auditors have not cleared people. So you are left with Routine 3.

So the job in running anything and getting the pc into session is just getting the pc up to the point of where he can be assessed and run on Routine 3. See, that's all you're trying to do. So all other actions are preparatory to this action, because that's what's going to clear people. And as long as that one is followed out and as long as you eventually get up to Routine 3, and as long as you get Routine 3 well done, you're going to clear people. And anything else is dross. It could be thousands of hours of dross, and it could all be entertaining, but it would not resolve the case or produce a Clear.

It could cure psychosomatics and it'd make bank managers into bank clerks and you could do almost anything. Make janitors into presidents. You could do all kinds of things with
These things, you understand, and have – rather spottily and sporadically, because sitting there all the time is the goal and valence. And it's the valence situation.

So, get a good reality on this Routine 3, and get a good reality on where it goes and what happens and what stops it from running. And of course, what stops it from running is basically the pc, before he's audited, is not in-session. So you've got to get him into session, you've got to have a session, you've got to have a pc, you've got to have your rudiments in and the thing well straightened out, and then you've got to do a Goals Assessment, and then you've got to do a Terminals Assessment, and then you've got to get over there to the Prehav Scale, and you've got to run it. And doing anything else, skip it!

Anything which you do – I can tell you bluntly now – anything which you do which is not contributory to completing Routine 3 is a waste of time.

Now, there is only one process type and class which does not violate the goal and terminal and Routine 3. There's only one that does not violate it, and that is Routine 1A which is very, very contributory to it.

Now, there is another one which probably won't, and which runs on very low-scale cases, and that is Routine 1. And there's another one which won't get you into too much trouble, and that is Routine 2. And that gives you your total bag of tricks. And there's the total bag of tricks. And beyond that there is none.

So you got Routine 1 – runs very low, and probably doesn't mess up somebody too badly as far as their goals and terminals are concerned, and certainly progresses them, and is very slow, and it's the only thing that you could run on an unconscious person, and a lot of other stuff. This pc won't talk to you and the pc can't be put in-session at all. Well, you got Routine 1. And it's long and it's arduous and it's hard for auditors to do, but it is successful and it shouldn't be thrown out of the bag of tricks. It's too good. It probably won't interfere with the goal and terminal.

Routine 2 – well, you can normally get away with that. You can do various broad general runs on the case and you're normally running against the terminal. Think this is quite amusing. And you're sort of running the terminal blind. You don't know what the terminal is, and yet you're running the case anyway. And that's very functional. There's nothing wrong with doing that. But it certainly is no substitute for finding the goal and running – and the terminal and running them, see. That's no substitute; there's no comparison. It improves your eventual run, but not to the degree that you might think it might. You don't lose. You don't lose on it. That's about all you can say about that.

Then you've got Routine 1A. And Routine 1A is the one thing that will not interfere with the Goal and the Terminal Assessment, but will improve it enormously. Routine 1A. This also improves the living daylights out of your rudiments situation. And if your rudiments keep going out, why, you had – really haven't got much of a choice, except Routine 1A, that's all.

Routine 1A processes could be entered in upon the first time that the pc is found to have a present time problem that didn't clear with the three types – questions of Two-way Comm. You know, all right, Routine 1A, that's it. Well, you'd never get in any trouble if you
did that. It's a rather arduous look at the situation. Then you bring up Routine 1A to a flat point and twenty-five hours later continue on to the point of asking, "Well, do you have an ARC break? How do you feel about my auditing you?" See. Twenty-five hours later we get to that rudiment level. You get the different look at this situation. Never did run a session on the fellow. You're still there on the brink.

Well, that would certainly be a safe way to go about it. And I can tell you if you did this you'd almost never have an ARC broke pc. It would be a thing that would become very foreign to you. Somebody doesn't have any ARC breaks, auditor. Well, obviously if this auditor never had an ARC break with the pc, the pc never ARC broke on the auditor, you'd have to assume about the auditor that the auditor took care of every problem that came up. See, so therefore the pc was very solidly and always in-session. You see how this fits together as a pattern?

Well fortunately, it does fit together, which is quite remarkable in itself. That's interesting, isn't it? That there is a road out. That's what's interesting, that there are some blazes on the trees. And of course, these blazes now – there's getting to be a pretty well-trodden path past them, and it leads straight out into the clear and has been doing so, consistently.

And picking up all of the elements of the, oh, God, hundreds of thousands of elements, and millions of them perhaps that I've reviewed in the past thirteen years that just about sums it up. And as far as processing is concerned, those are the safe things to do and those are the various things which are reliable, and those are the things which get you there, and those are the things that produce results.

So this leaves you with what? This leaves you with the fact that on anybody, anyplace, at any time, you could run and flatten any Problems Process – great security. Never had any difficulty holding them in-session or anything else. Flatten the Problems Process, just flatten it, and run it out. Unless you do something really wild, like run two commands of it and skip it or something like that, you know. But you run – just run it and start your session, "Do you have a present time problem? What was that?" Fellow says, "Well ..." You say, "All right, good. We're going to run a little process now." And you just pick up one of the processes from Routine 1A.

All right, your dissatisfaction with trying to clear rudiments would evaporate if you laid down this particular rule: that there were no rudiments processes. That's fantastic, isn't it? If you just said, well, there were no rudiments processes, when you got the fellow up to a rudiment and so forth, then you audited the case toward Clear, and that wouldn't be no waste of time at all, would it?

Well, how to do that? How to do that? Well, that would be the way to do it. You'd start the session. You'd say, "You have a present time problem?" You'd find the guy has got a present time problem. Well, you've had it. Now let's just go on with Routine 1A. Eventually it flattens – twenty-five, fifty hours later it flattens – and that's out. That's gone now, you're not going to have too much trouble with problems. Now you say, "Is it all right if I audit you?" It sounds kind of odd to introduce it at that particular stage of the game, but that's actually where you've arrived to. Guy looks up for the first time, you know, and he says, "All right to
be audited – ? Well, what do you know? I thought it'd be a problem, you auditing me and it isn't", and that's that. So that clears that rudiment. Got the idea?

All the time you're doing this however, you could be clearing Security Checks. Takes care of a lot of ARC breaks and withholds. So a Security Check could be done at any time and Routine 1A could be done at any time, and how to keep out of trouble, well do 1A and Security Checks. See? And pretty soon you can't even squeeze anything out of the E-Meter on the subject of problems – in all of its various ramifications and unknowns and everything else that goes with it – you can't squeeze a yip out of the E-Meter. The guy is consistently sitting at the Clear read and the needle isn't clear, it isn't swinging – don't expect that it will, either – but it'll be fairly loose. There it is. You say, "Well, it's time we took up me as an auditor." Might be adventurous up to that time, mightn't it?

Sort of non sequitur. The fellow's sitting there in this little cage of problems, you know, with all the demons of existence poking despatches and sabers and small atom bombs in through the bars and this disrelated item suddenly emerges: "Is it all right if I audit you?"


And this just looks like another despatch, or another saber, or another small atom bomb which is shoved in the cage, don't you see?

So if rudiments are that important, if you're having trouble handling rudiments – which is obvious – all right, just take a broad, long look at the rudiments. And say, "Well, the rudiments aren't three seconds long at the beginning of session, the rudiments are fifty hours long at the beginning of session" and you'd certainly have it. And your dissatisfaction with a bad rudiments process, such as Responsibility and so forth, would vanish of course, because you're going to run the best processes that can possibly be run on problems in general. And you've had it. There it is. You're not going to have any trouble with that rudiment afterwards, I'll guarantee. You're not going to have any trouble at all with that rudiment. This fellow's up to a point where he can confront unknowns and wrap problems around his heads and give people problems and take problems, and he's no longer sitting in this cage, don't you see. He's no longer in a totally interiorized state, even though this has been run against his valence.

Well, you see, the valence – the trick behind this is – the valence was adopted to solve a problem and therefore any valences the person is sitting in tend to resolve when you lessen his concern about problems and you lessen the tension of the valence. You don't even have to know the valence to do this. See? All you have to do is lessen these things.

It's very funny. I wrote over to Washington from London, I think, in 1956, and told them to lock it up in the safe that the road out certainly contained "problems", and that was the most reliable road out on the subject of it. And that's just a valuable piece of technology. Probably still in the safe in Washington. But anyhow, I just didn't want to lose sight of that one because this obviously measured up to the various things that a person had and which way they were going.

All right, it is very true that it is very difficult – very, very difficult – to handle problems at the beginning of a session and then go on to something else. This is true. Unless you
can say to the pc – if you can't say to the pc, "Well, tell me about it", "What is it?" and "How you doing with it now?" You know, that sort of thing. And you ask him, "Do you have a present time problem?" and look at the meter, and there's no response on the meter whatsoever – unless that condition could occur, then if this can stop the whole parade and if this can submerge the goal and if this can submerge the terminal and if this can make assessments impossible and if you can waste weeks on doing a Goals Assessment, and all this thing, why then, we have to come to the inevitable conclusion: If it was that important, well, we'd better roll up all of our very best guns and just take care of it right there. You know, just the whole thing.

And therefore if the pc begins to have a large spate of problems, or a pc apparently has problems, or there's bunches of problems around, or if a pc after being audited for a while all of a sudden starts to run into lots of present time problems, you know, he goes out and gets busier. Well, you go back and flatten 1A. How long does it take to flatten 1A? Oh, it's not – it's been taking about seventy-five hours, fifty hours, thirty-five hours, time periods of that character. Yeah, but look, all that time is saved off the assessment. And if you're going to waste a hundred hours on assessment, you certainly better spend fifty hours on 1A. That's all that amounts to. And then you know where you're going and you have a certainty on it and you're not fumbling with the dissatisfaction of running an inadequate process on present time problems. Look good?

Audience: Yes. Yeah.

All right. That would be a way to approach this situation.

Now, we get up to the auditor, as the second rudiment. And of course, if the fellow can have problems and he isn't going to have a lot of trouble with problems, certainly ninety percent of what would be charged up on this particular auditor would have vanished by that time. Certainly, even though the auditor's been auditing him, it'd just be vanishing all the time. But there might be a little bit left, so you would take up the subject after 1A; you could take it up, and hit your next rudiment. Do you see? And you've already been hitting withholds, and so forth, consistently and continually. And in that you should be running the Havingness and Confront Process of the pc, you have been reme defyng the fourth rudiment all the time. Oh, I haven't necessarily got the sequence straight; I'm talking about end rudiments. But you've been handling this so that's out, so you haven't got to worry about that. So it looks like these things could be handled rather easily just on their own ground, but given an importance.

If these things are that important to a case, then they are all of them worth handling. If you find a fellow who is flat on problems, he isn't going to have much trouble with the auditor. And also an auditor who's been sitting there pulling withholds off of him, he's certainly going to be willing to talk to the auditor, so that's solving that, too.

So you could go at it in these various ways, and you would wind up at the other end with your rudiments in. And I would say only after you've beaten them totally to death – since we've been having trouble with this. I haven't been, but you have. And let's look at it on the reality of the situation and not curse and scream in our beards and break the china, and so forth and say, "You aren't doing your jobs." Let's get practical about the thing, and let's just take up rudiments as a preliminary to clearing and say that rudiments are not a preliminary to
the session but a preliminary to clearing and just upgrade them. Until such time as all rudiments are in and will stay in, and so forth, why bother to assess.

Now, as far as somebody staying interested in his own case is concerned, you can be absolutely certain he will be on Problems, because that's what's got him mainly interiorized. So that'll answer up, as well as assessment. This is a way of approach, isn't it?

_Audience: Yes._

All right.

These things, the whole subject of auditing, is a subject of practicality. It is not a subject of theory. It is what works. The philosophers of the ages had been trying to drive shiny coaches down nonexistent boulevards. And the screams of the dying multitude were dinning in their ears, because their philosophies didn't work. But they were pretty. There's no doubt about it – no doubt about it. We should take our hats off to Nietzsche. It's certainly pretty – until you go over to Germany and France and start looking at all the graveyards and things like that. You'd say, "Well, that isn't quite so pretty, you know. Looks messy!" And you start looking at the pillboxes that still are extant around Nantes, Nancy, and so forth, and you say, "Well, I don't know, they're not good architecture. There's something missing. There are no subtle curves. But it was awful pretty." Thus spake Zarathustra. [laughter] But he didn't give a damn whether it worked or not, you see. Never entered his mind for a split second. Workability, _pooh!_

The gorgeous example of the nonexistence of the eighth planet. For years! For years and years and years and years, the eighth planet did not exist. It had been observed in a telescope. It'd been plotted. People in astronomy knew its name, rank, serial number, mass, density, course and spin. But Hegel had said that there were only seven because seven was a perfect number. Beautiful coach! Lovely! Had big springs, so forth. Only the road it was traveling on was built on nowhere. And the end of the road went off to ignorance. There was no workability with regard to this.

Whenever you look at auditing, whenever you look at Scientology, you should just look at that one fact. Does it work? We have actually been condemned because we're interested in whether or not something works. And current extant philosophy knows this has no bearing on the situation whatsoever. It is a crude attitude. It is absolutely crude. I've had a person object to Dianetics simply because they said, "Well there was more to life than survival." Well, nobody said there wasn't! I certainly said it was a common denominator of existence. Yes, but they couldn't take Dianetics because there was more to life than survival. They liked to think that. They liked to think of this other, and also it was obvious that man was not good. And so of course that washed up the whole subject.

And you say, "Well how did you come to these conclusions?"

The fellow says, "Well, I just thought it over." He didn't bother to look at anything, you know. He didn't bother to go outside, open the door and take a look at the world. No, it was perfectly adequate, utterly adequate to sit there, you see, and have a couple of errant thoughts, be distracted by the ticking of the clock, and say, "Well, no. Well, I'd like to think of higher things."
Well, man has been very interested in thinking about higher things until he began to suffer from anoxemia. He's up there in the rarefied air. But it certainly has nothing to do with – well actually, it doesn't even have anything to do with man. I think it would be a sad day – I think it's been a sad day every time they've tried to connect ancient philosophies with man. They have nothing to do with man, they have nothing to do with life. They're just pretty.

The Greek, of course, in his terrific worship of the integrity or the thinkingness of man, himself went into a terrific figure-figure. And his various schools and so forth that he formed were all more figure-figure and more figure-figure-figure. And Greece lost her empire, lost this, lost that, everything was caving in in all directions and coming down. The Greek race was becoming less and less effective. Things were going to pieces. The Turks finally came in, took over the whole lot, burned practically everything, destroyed the Greek language, knocked everything all out, and Greeks still figure-figure – 1961, he still will figure-figure. It's quite interesting! Nevertheless he did have an idea that man was a subject of study. And to that we owe him some hat-tipping.

But I'm afraid I don't owe very much hat-tipping to a lot of these philosophers, because they would say that it was a total betrayal of a philosophy to alter anything in it that had been laid down. And I'll tell you, of course, that you're perfectly ... All you've got to do – all you've got to do – is make a Clear by some other route, which is workable and practical and other people can do, and that follows up to all the tests of Clears of course, and we'd abandon every trail we've got, you see, if that was much easier and faster. But it hasn't happened. Hasn't happened.

Thirteen years, everybody's had a large, wide opportunity – the last ten, eleven, certainly, they've had a wonderful opportunity to figure out brand-new routes, ways and so forth. And I've had them mailed to me and telegraphed to me and cabled to me in far parts of the world. And I've seen them on boards and fixed up, and they've been applied this way and that, but they didn't clear people. All right, right now we're clearing people so my whole attention is upon the workability of this one fact because I am a man of ambition. I am a man of very, very vast ambitions. And the vastest of my ambitions right now have this particular zone and area: is every time somebody walks in the front door of the Central Organization or up an auditor's front steps, that, at the end of the auditing he will turn around and walk out Clear.

That is a considerable ambition. And we are right there on the threshold of achieving that ambition. As a matter of fact we're more than on the threshold of it, we're actually taking the practical steps to effect that very thing. When we whistle up somebody from a Central Organization and say, "Come on in here", we're not kidding. And when I send a cable to somebody in some far place and say, "So-and-so is expected at Saint Hill", we're not kidding. See, it's not nonsense that we're talking, because that's what we want to have happen. I think that'd be a very interesting thing to have happen. And when you see these Clears, and they start into their immediate areas and they start polishing everything up and everything goes into action and everything's very busy and so forth – the horrors of the ancient philosopher. I imagine the man could have nightmares over this! He knows what a Clear is supposed to do, he's supposed to sit on a mountaintop and regard his navel. [laughter]
But anyway, we're interested, therefore and thereby and only, in the practical steps necessary to it. And my conclusion as of right this minute, is that if you are having trouble keeping rudiments in, in order to do Goals Assessments, and if you were totally capable of actually using up two or three months in trying to find somebody's goal, well it'd be simpler to get the rudiments in first. And it would be simpler and timesaving if each rudiment required something on the order of fifty hours and was simply taken separately, one after the other, and fifty hours were devoted to each one. It would still be a time economy. Because naturally at the other end of it you'd wind up with his goal, bang! Right now, you see. You'd wind up with his terminal, bang! Right now. You'd do his assessment, bang! And you wouldn't lose a single minute of his run. And probably if you took two hundred hours to get in the rudiments, you'd probably clear a fellow in five. You got the idea? I mean it's that ridiculous. And as I look at it, that is the practical way of approaching the thing.

So watch those rudiments and turn up that sensitivity and if your pc has got one consistently out, go back and flatten 1A. Okay?

*Audience: Mm-hm.*

Thank you.
All right, what's the date?

Audience: 24th.

Twenty-fourth of August, AD 11. And you better ask some questions... Come on, ask some questions. Nobody knows anything, huh? You haven't got a single question in your mind? Here you've had a whole rash of new data and there hasn't been a single question crossed your mind concerning any part of this. Yes, Kay?

Female voice: When you're running the Prehav level on the terminal, does the Confront and Have alone stabilize your person for Clear?

Mmm. When you run the Prehav on the terminal does the Confront and Prehav alone...

Female voice: No, the Confront and Havingness. Is that what stabilizes your Clear?

Yeah, but you've said the Confront and Havingness on the terminal stabilizes the Clear?

Female voice: No, when you're running the terminal.

Another female voice: When you're running the terminal on the Prehav Scale is it the Confront and Havingness Processes that stabilize the person?

Absolutely not. They have practically nothing to do with it. They just make it easier to run sessions. They just have nothing to do with it. The stabilization of a Clear consists one hundred percent of checking out goals, finding more goals, doing terminals lists (long terminals lists) for those goals, assessing the goal found – the terminal found on the Prehav Scale and trying to find the command for that and getting a command for that and running that level of the Prehav Scale. And when you've got that terminal flat, why, go back and check the goal. And if you can't find anything left of that goal, make sure that your rudiments are in one hundred percent. And then check it over again and go back to the original goals lists. Find out if one of those goals are now alive, try to get some more goals. When you finally got a new Goals Assessment clearing all over again, you find a new terminal.

In other words, you just do that same operation of Routine 3 over and over and over. You assess for goal, assess for terminal and run on the Prehav. Assess for terminal, assess for goal. That's all. Once you've got a goal, well, let's get every terminal that applies to that goal flat, as long as the goal itself registers.

I mean you don't go back and find a new goal every time you flatten a terminal. You go back and check the goal. The goal is still alive, you find a new terminal for it, and run it on the Prehav, see? It's just a continuous cyclic process. And anything else you're doing, such as running rudiments, such as running problems of any kind, and anything to do with Security...
Checks, anything like that is simply aimed straight at keeping the preclear in-session. And if the pc gets out of session, if the rudiments go out, if your Security Checks are not kept up-to-date, and so forth on the case, the goal will disappear, the terminals disappear, and the person won't go Clear. Then you get endless runs to Clear. Endless runs to Clear. And they all add up to rudiments out, rudiments out, rudiments out. And in case you haven't noticed, there are broader processes now for the rudiments.

One of the broader processes is at the level of withhold – the pc registers on withholds – you've got the whole of Security Checking. That vast panorama of action all fits at that level of the rudiments. And you keep the rudiments in, in other words. You keep them in. You keep them in, you keep them in. The goal disappears, you find out if the rudiments are in. All right, now see if the goal still disappeared. All right, if the goal hasn't disappeared – you flattened one terminal for this goal. Make sure those rudiments are in, in, in. Make sure that terminal is, is, is flat, and then make sure the rudiments are in, in, in, in. And then check the goal again.

And with the goal: All right, is that goal still alive? Find another terminal for it. If that goal is now gone and your rudiments are in, in, in, why, you've got to go back to your original goals list and add whatever goals now occur to it and do a new Goals Assessment. And then do a new Terminals Assessment. And then do a new Prehav level for it. And then get your command and do the Prehav level run. And there you go, you see?

It's just – the process of clearing somebody actually only consists of this and nothing more. It consists of getting a list of goals, and assessing that list to find one goal which is constant and continuous with the pc, which of course means that goal has to be run. So you take that goal, and you do a Terminal Assessment for the goal – the cause and effect end of the line – and then you'll find a terminal which stays in, in, in, in and doesn't go in and out and fluctuate around, but it's just in. And that is the terminal. And then you assess that on the Prehav Scale, and then you form up a command for that, and then you run it. And you run it until it produces no more tone arm action, all the while keeping the rudiments in, in, in, in. And you're all set.

Now that thing is finally flat. It doesn't respond anymore, you can't even get a fall when you mention it. It is all run off of the Prehav Scale and when that is finally accomplished then you'd better make a special activity of making sure the rudiments are in. But now, let's check that goal, find out if that original goal is still alive. If it is still alive and it still gets a fall then you had better do another Terminals Assessment, find another terminal for that goal, move the terminal found over onto the Prehav Scale. Assess on the Prehav Scale. Form up a command and run, run, run. Assess on the Prehav Scale, and run, run, run, and assess on the Prehav Scale and run, run, run. And then no more action for that terminal; now go back and make sure your rudiments are in, of course. Go back and find out whether or not the goal is still alive.

All right, you can't get a peep out of this goal now. Now make sure the rudiments are in. Now try and find out if you can get a peep out of that goal. No, you still can't. Okay. Now you've got to go through a whole cycle I've just said, once more. And you start in right there at the beginning and you find out whether or not the individual has a new goal that won't hang
up. And he does have, he will have, and that moves over into the terminal list and you get
your new terminal and then you move over into Prehav Scale, and it's just the same cycle over
and over and over – it's just exactly those steps.

Now, anything else, running Prehav – running a Havingness Process on the pc, running
a Confront Process on the pc, doing a Security Check, running problems, doing rudiments,
other things to keep the case running, anything that you do to keep the case running
and cleaned up and so forth, is totally and completely auxiliary to clearing. Clearing only
consists of Routine 3 and nothing else. And nothing else will make a Clear known to man at this
time except that exact process I just gave you. And that is really taped.

And the only thing that booby-traps that particular operation is, one, a bad command
of technology on the part of the auditor. That's the only thing that booby-traps it. If the auditor
knows his business, if he knows his TRs, if he can follow a Model Session, if he's willing to
run a session, if he's willing to flatten the processes that he runs into, if he can read an E-
Meter, keep these things going, so forth, the rest of this is just nothing.

Well, where the auditor has gaps and goofs, and where he's very, very poor on this, or
very, very poor on something else or where he isn't quite sure whether you read the sensitivity
knob or the trim button, you're not going to get Clears.

So all of these other things, such as learning how to do a Model Session, learning the
TRs, learning the E-Meter, knowing that when you contact processes you flatten them, and
on, on, on, on, on, on, everything that you learn about auditing – even going back to Axioms,
the behaviour of the pc, what are engrams, anything in Book One, anything in Scientology 8-
8008 – all these things are simply contributory things. And there aren't very many an auditor
today really has to know. He has to know his TRs, bang! He has to know his E-Meter, boom!
He really has to be able to make it talk Arabic, Greek, anything, you see, or Marcabian. Only
I notice that the Sullivan type individual tries to make it talk Marcabian, but it's actually just
talking Sullivan.

When you get into this kind of action, knowing these various things, and so forth –
those things known – now clearing works. And I can tell you right now that clearing works on
every individual, every person, man, woman, child. And if you could talk to the flowers it'd
work on that, too.

It hasn't anything to do anymore with case level. Has nothing to do with case level.
Not a thing! But it has everything to do with an auditor being able to run a session. And the
degree that an auditor can run a session, the excellence with which he can run a session, to-
tally monitors how fast and how many he will clear.

That's an extravagant statement but what proves it is this: I've been able to make
Clears on offbeat processes. There's a process way back ... You see, in vignette, doing the
Dynamic Assessment, doing the old Dynamic Assessment, and finding the terminal and run-
nig Help on it, and so forth, it got Clear – and as clear as Help would make anybody Clear –
those people who did have Help as a hot button on the Prehav Scale, see. That's how many it
cleared. That was right there. But that still depended very exclusively on the ability of the
auditor to audit.
But let's go back to the oldest clearing process there is, which is way back when, and that process is so esoteric, it can't be handled! Requires such as – insight, such sensitiveness and takes so damn long, and is so questionable and a whole bunch of things like this. It's like, well, building a watch in the dark blindfolded with a couple of elephant's feet for hands. [laughter]

It wasn't even very reliable, you know. But it's taken something on the order of all these years, here, of about – whee, it's getting something on the order of about thirteen years now, something like that, to develop technology which was handleable, which was predictable, which didn't require all these super-unknowns and this super-insight and all of that sort of thing, and to develop the auditing technology which we have today.

Now, the only thing that slows down clearing is the command of the auditor of that exact technology. And when I say that exact technology, I mean simply the ability to do the TRs, the ability to do a Model Session, the ability to handle an E-Meter and the incidental knowledge of doing a good Security Check, of running an assessment and that's it. You see, it just stacks up into that very small package – your importances.

And you possibly still have some idea of this vast panorama of unending sea of data going out in all directions that you have to know. Get rid of it. It's a very finite little area. And frankly, when you look over *E-Meter Essentials*, there are only two data missing in *E-Meter Essentials*. There are two data missing in it. One data is instant read – the difference between instant read and latent read, and which one you use (of course, you use instant read), and what it looks like and so forth. That's missing in there. And there's one more datum that is missing out of the E-Meter manual. What is it? It'd be fatal for me to say there was one missing and then not tell you what it was. It's something very incidental. Twenty minute rule? I don't think that's in.

*Female voice: No, it isn't.*

But otherwise it's a complete book. And we'll print up an errata sheet and paste that into the copies and so forth, and that'll be that. It'll be up-to-date.

All right, your TRs – they're all up-to-date. You've got them right here. Model Session, you've got it right here. As far as rudiments are concerned, you've got an awful lot of rudiments processes, but because rudiments have mounted up to such importance, we're kind of throwing them away, using beefier processes, giving the rudiments more attention, giving it more umph. And, once more, you've got those right on these lectures: 1A and Unknown. And actually you've had this data consistently and continually now since about the 10th of August – the tape series going right straight on through bout this "unknown," use of, in Security Checks, and all that kind of thing.

But that's just beefing up the rudiments, beefing up the rudiments, beefing them up, beefing them up, making them stronger and stronger and tougher and tougher. And then finally we'll get down to this kind of a desperation, I can guarantee you, that after you've got the most powerful process of Scientology to bear on the pc on any given rudiment, and when that rudiment is totally vanquished, then you assess, or something like this.
Actually, this amount of rigor is not necessary at all. It's precautionary. From – I am operating with you now in an unreality. That would be a withhold on my part to tell you otherwise, but I am in an unreality. I don't see how you can miss, you see. And therefore, I'm just making sure you don't. Only I am now something on the order – it looks to me as though from an engineering standpoint that we're taking this bridge, you see, and it's built totally out of concrete by this time, and it's got girders which had nothing but sixteen-inch thick steel, you see. And it's totally weatherproof girders, and these things are hung together, you see, with huge clamps. They're not even drilled to weaken them, you know. And this is going across this little tiny brook. [laughter] Isn't very wide, wouldn't hurt anybody to fall in it, but this huge, massive structure, you see, is going over there. And then the bed of this bridge, you know, is all fixed up with huge Roman-road-type construction, you know. Nine feet of ballast, you know, and then match stone and then match stone on top of that, and then we of course have put final, modern, hammered concrete in it, see.

And that's the kind of a bridge we've got, and I kind of feel like you're asking me to put up some staying rods to make sure the steel won't fall down, you see. And to repave this thing in some character with a thicker pavement, and so on. That's kind of the way it looks to me. I'm not running you down in any way, but this is the record that is being run up at the HGC from this unit and other classes and so forth. Apparently this is what it demands, don't you see.

Now, I'm trying to find these additional holes in the fence, where it looks to me like there aren't any, you know? I'm trying to find out where this bridge breaks down. It makes me feel as though you drove across a wide plain blindfolded, you'd run into this bridge; you just couldn't help it, you see. And then the bridge has got guide rods on the side of it that even though you hit at a slant you'd still go across it, you see. That's the kind of the way it looks.

All right, from this point on, we're superbuilding. Because I'll tell you this: Any one of you could run an assessment in two-and-a-half hours on a pc and find his goal and find his terminal and find his level on the Prehav Scale, see, right to the start.

And we're running a real goofy one right now. We're going to make a Clear for you. We're going to make Tinny-Tin Clear, little Quentin. And Suzie's busy auditing him for a few minutes each day. And this little kid, he's got his full goals list, amounts to about thirty. One of them is "to run a candy store" [laughter] and he's got the lot. And it's assessing right straight on out. And he's down – I think he's got about six, seven of these.

Female voice: Eleven left in.

He's got eleven left in on this list. It's moving on down. He'll do a Terminals Assessment. When we get a Terminals Assessment, going to assess it on the Prehav Scale, and going to run it, you see. His needle's loose. It's getting looser. You know. Well, of course, there's good altitude at work here and the rudiments are in, but that's what's happening.

That isn't being done as a show-up or something like that; it's just his turn to be processed. So instead of running him on CCHs or something like this or trying to straighten up something – nah! let's go for broke; let's clear him! Not take too many hours at it, either.
All right. Now, that's possible. That can be done. But, let me call this to your attention, it is – this is the controverting fact. It is not being done. Now, you can't argue with that, can you? Now, I could get down and scream and howl and beat the floor, and Hitlerize the room. But let me tell you something, that isn't going to do any good. That isn't going to do any good at all. That's in the line of reason, or something like this mounts up.

If you looked at it very broadly you could say, "Well, just nobody can audit." I mean, that's the first thing you'd say. "Nobody can run a session in the whole world, except just this little handful of maybe five," you know. Something like that. But that's an unacceptable datum that isn't true, see.

So it must be, it must be that there were some great big broad bugs on this, and the biggest bug – and I finally located what it was, a very simple bug – it's just the fact that the goal and the terminal easily disappear in the face of an out-rudiment. And I know what I have to convince you of, is what is an in-rudiment, see. You don't recognize a rudiment when it's out. And you think that this machine here is going to fall off the pins, and that there's going to be a neon light, which isn't in the machine, appear along this whole red band of the dial on an E-Meter. And it's going to appear on there, and it's going to blind you when a rudiment is out. Well, let me point something to you, there is no neon light back of that to do that, see. And you expect maybe a bell to ring in this thing or something, you know. But there's no bell in it, see. I've got to show you what is an in-rudiment. I know what my job is, you see.

Now, in addition to that, we've got to analyze why a pc doesn't stay in-session and why he isn't in-session. And what happens that he doesn't remain in-session long enough to be audited. All of this becomes a very important study. See, but it has to become one of these studies of adding the additional five coats of concrete to this already superpaved road, see. But it's got to be done, because there's obviously something awry here.

I know you can audit. I have no doubt about this whatsoever, and so forth. But I think what you don't do is recognize an out-rudiment. And then I think maybe you don't handle the out-rudiment. And then I look over our tools, and I find out the tools are rather inadequate, perhaps, for the handling of an out-rudiment.

All right, well, let's go for broke! Let's give you some tools that work, invariable, and that you have great confidence in. That seems to be a good solution, right? All right, so let's be able to set up a case at any given moment. And we at this moment do not care how long it takes you to clear somebody as long as you're progressing, see. We don't care how long it takes you to clear somebody, so long as you are clearing them. But we do care if you are auditing somebody and just wasting time. If the case is not advancing under your auditing, aw, that's just nowhere.

You see it could easily, profitably take fifteen hundred hours to clear somebody and you would clear somebody in fifteen hundred hours. Well, people would still work at it. They would actually still work at it and they would still go in that direction, if they were progressing all the time and all that fifteen hundred hours was useful auditing, don't you see, the case was making gains during that period of time. All right, that would be within man's finite limits of observation.
Well, it isn't anything like that. It is something on the order of about a hundred. See, we're dealing with about a hundred hours. If all the auditing is effective, you have a Clear in about a hundred hours.

All right, therefore, you can afford one hundred percent margin of error. You can have a hundred hours of wasted auditing and a hundred hours of effective auditing, and you're still going to wind up at the other end with a Clear. Well, now that's very well within your ability to deliver, don't you see. Only a couple of hundred hours.

All right, what we're chipping at now is trying to reduce off of the hundred wasted hours. That's what we're trying to do. Because the cases which you are auditing are making progress. But I can tell you now what is wasted. And perhaps you'd like to know that. What is wasted time?

Goals Assessments that go on and on and on are wasted time. You can just peg it down. Let's set an arbitrary figure, something on the order of six hours. If your goals, terminal, Prehav Assessment is requiring longer than six hours, then from the seventh hour on, including the seventh hour, is wasted. There's waste here. It's just being wasted. There's something wrong; your auditing was something wrong. It is not right. And the something wrong is, a rudiment is wildly out. So time from that moment thereon, that is just wasted time. It's just a waste of time.

I've got enough cases now and I've racked up enough cases and done enough observation and let enough people flounder long enough, studied enough graphs of the flounders, that we have proven conclusively that it is a waste of time to go more than six hours with a Goals Assessment. Interesting, isn't it? Beyond that point it's not therapeutic. Doesn't damage a case but it doesn't help anybody. It isn't advancing the case and the case is not going toward Clear from that point on. Interesting, isn't it? It's just not going toward Clear from that point on. That is a stall.

So, number one of your waste is excessive time consumed in finding the goal. Time is wasted.

All right. Next item of wasted time is running a Prehav level on the found terminal with the rudiments out. That is wasted time. Running it and it's taking too long to flatten, it isn't smoothing out, it isn't changing. You're getting a tone arm action, and so forth, but the pc is not coming up out of it.

All right, you can apparently grind one of those things forever. And I've got records on that, too. Because you're running the pc with a rudiment out. Actually, the terminal has disappeared, and you are not running anything that is real to the pc. It's just like the goal disappeared and you couldn't find it. Well, during the Prehav run, if the rudiments are out, the terminal disappears, and you're running nothing.

So you can go on and say, well, "How far over the hill would a little girl go?" and so forth, or whatever the auditing command is, "To leave home," or something. And "little girl" – "little girl" is the terminal, but the rudiments are out and this terminal is not real to the pc.

Just as it disappeared on the assessment, so, by out-rudiments, it can disappear during the run. Therefore, the Prehav run isn't biting on the pc because the rudiments are out.
There could be the biggest span of wasted time. Because that could go on forever, and the auditor is just hopefully going on auditing "little girl," "little girl," "little girl," "little girl." Great day! "Little girl" submerged back there in about the third hour of run. Auditor never sits there and says "little girl" to the pc and notices that there is no fall on the meter. What you're doing is running a Routine 2. You're running some kind of a Routine 2 with a wasted phrase in the auditing command now called "little girl." See how that would be?

Well, it's obvious – this is just extrapolation, but it's very logical – that if a terminal can disappear from the E-Meter read during an assessment because the rudiments are out, certainly rudiments out can make it disappear during a Prehav level run. That's obvious. If it can disappear one place, it certainly can disappear another place. And that's a good enough explanation to me, backed up by a bunch of evidence – not as solid as the first, but acceptable.

This will account for an enormous period of run on a terminal. Terminal long since ceased to be real to the pc. Not because it disappeared or was flattened, but because the rudiments are out. And you're not really running this terminal. So therefore you're not running the case to Clear. And the answer to it is, keep the rudiments in.

That – so those are the two biggest areas of wasted time in clearing. And they are both summed up to running with the rudiments out. So, when we keep saying rudiments out, rudiments out, rudiments out, well, we haven't described the reverse side of the coin. The reverse side of the coin is, of course, rudiments in.

What is an in-rudiment? Well, I saw an auditor not too long ago, had too much action on the needle at sensitivity 16, so turned it down to 8. And then asked several combinations of a phrase on withholds and thought this was all right. And was willing to leave withholds.

But the definition of in-session is this: interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. And of course "can't" was the missing – "can't talk to the auditor." This produced a very wild drop. But do you have a withhold from the auditor? No, pc didn't have a withhold from the auditor. Pc couldn't talk to the auditor. Why couldn't the pc talk to the auditor? The auditor wouldn't listen. This was a conviction and this added up to a "can't-talk-to-the-auditor," so obviously the pc was out of session.

So that's an out-rudiment, but a rather oddball out-rudiment, isn't it? Pc feels he can't talk to the auditor. Why? The auditor never receives a communication. So therefore it's a withhold. That's kind of a strange one, isn't it? See? "I can't say anything to this auditor because it doesn't matter. It isn't that I can't speak. It's that the auditor can't hear." So if you have an "I-can't-speak," that would be a different kind of withhold, too. Well, "Do you have a withhold?" Well, that therefore, is not an adequate guarantee that the rudiment is in. Because that rudiment guarantees talking to the auditor. Doesn't even guarantee willing to talk to the auditor, but it has to do with the ability to talk to the auditor.

Well, I better go at this in a very orderly fashion. Let me tell you what an in-rudiment is. That's another – that's branched off of your question. You got that answered.

*Female Voice: Mm-hm.*

Would you like to know what an in-rudiment is? All right.
In the first place you are processing a valence. Even though the valence is hidden and unknown, you are processing a valence. The valence does not well respond to conditions. So all rudiments are monitored exactly in this bracket: that any rudiment process, no matter how beefy and how strong is relatively ineffective. Just put it down in your book! By definition!

You are processing a valence. See, this pc is in a valence. And therefore, the answers he is giving are valence answers. You cannot change the conditions of that valence short of Routine 3. That's the only thing that'll find and discharge this valence. So that all rudiments are monitored with this particular limitation: that to change the conditions of a valence is next to impossible. And yet your rudiments processes are addressed to changing the conditions of the valence in which the pc is sitting. "Fascinating," isn't it?

That puts you a hurdle that Epsom Downs steeplechasers up here would balk at. See, most of the horses would pile up right there. Unless we went just a little bit further. But you must recognize that as a fact, that no matter what process you run on a pc short of actually separating off valences – spotting them with goals and running them as valences – short of that, you are not going to get very sweeping results. We have been at it for years and we might just as well recognize the truth for what the truth is. If you run anything on a pc other than the location of his goals, the separation of the valence which is the solution of the goals, and knocking that out on the Prehav Scale, then you have this condition resulting, and this is going to be the condition which follows through, but the results are very limited. So anything that has to do with keeping rudiments in is monitored by this fact.

Now, let me give you an example. I'm just going to show you how rough it is to keep a rudiment in. I'm not going to paint any golden picture and say, "Well, if you weren't so stupid you'd be able to keep the rudiments in very easily. And it's just because you're stupid that you can't keep them in, and you're really doing a very bad job of auditing." You see, a fellow – one could go off on this wild tear, if he didn't know this other point. It is next to impossible to keep them in. Because, by definition, conditional processes on a valence are trying to change the characteristics of the valence and those characteristics are not owned by the pc, and therefore are an other-being's characteristics. And you are changing an other-being's characteristics which are none of the postulates of the pc.

Do you see then why that is? And do you see then why no matter how many fancy processes were dreamed up over the years, if these processes did not immediately separate off the valences and orient and restore the person to himself, they, of course, had a limited workability.

Now, that series of conditions applies to all rudiments processes. So you handle rudiments processes with your eyes wide open that they are not easy to keep in. Because by definition they are going to be very limited.

So, how do you get around this? How can we get around this? Now, we've got Epsom Downs and tons of horses piled up all ready for the meat packer, see. Because I tell you frankly that it's an impossibility. Now, it's an impossibility only to this degree: Remember as part of this definition – this is very tricky technical stuff I'm giving you here; you get it very straight. If you haven't got it, go over it again, because it's – otherwise you're going to break your heart on it someday.
To change the characteristics of a valence without removing the valence from the pc is almost impossible. You got that? But you get the modification that is in that? "Change the characteristics without removing the valence."

Now, right in that, the booby trap, you see, there is a road out, right there. A rudiments process which does not tend to shift valences is nonfunctional. So the functional rudiments processes would be those processes which shifted or lightened valences. And rudiments will go in very easily if you pay attention to that particular rule. And that is probably the most important rule of keeping rudiments in: that the rudiments process that works must tend to shift valences, and the rudiments process that doesn't work is one which seeks to shift the conditions of a valence.

And the pc as he sits before you being audited, pre-Clear – and this word takes on enormous significance right at that point – is of course a valence. He's in a valence and he cannot shift the conditions of this valence or change the conditions of this valence, and it's been driving him to despair for eons! He cannot change himself. He doesn't know quite how he is going to act. He's an unpredictable being to himself. That's because once, long, long ago, he lost faith in himself as himself and so adopted other beingnesses and reposed his entire hopes of survival in these other beingnesses. And now these other beingnesses are unchangeable in their conditions.

All right, I'll give you an example: "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Well, let's look it over! Has a very limited workability, doesn't it? Why? Because it seeks to change the condition of a valence. It seeks to get a valence to be responsible for the problem, but remember the valence had the problem and if the valence had been responsible in that zone or field he wouldn't have had the problem.

Now, that it works at all is absolutely a fantastic tribute to Hubbard and you! [laughter] You see what I mean?

Now, let me give you an even more gruesome example. Goal of the pc, unknown and hidden to the auditor at this stage, see – he's trying to get rudiments in. But he doesn't know this goal, see. He doesn't know the terminal. He doesn't know anything. But let's say it was this: "To make problems." Let's just say it was that. All right, you've got Mr. Pc, Mr. Preclear, sitting there, and of course you're talking to a valence, and this valence will be something that carries out this goal. Now you're going to get problems straight?

Why, the person's going to have a problem every few minutes. They're going to have problems. They're going to start with the beginning of the session, and you're going to clear up the problems and you're going to go ten minutes deep in getting something you want done, and you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have oh-nun-nnn. And pretty soon we just say "Whoa, it's impossible! You can't clear anybody! Because look, you can't get past the present time problem. So we'll just ignore the present time problem of this particular pc and we will just carry on anyhow." And eight thousand goals later you suddenly decide you can't find the pc's goal. Why? Because the rudiment is obsessively out. Because that's the goal of the pc. But that isn't known to you at the time you're trying to get that rudiment in. You see the example? Hm?
All right, a person who creates problems all the time and the terminal is going to be "agitator." See, he's going to run "agitator." All right, you're talking to an agitator. Well, look, if the British government and the electricians union, and so forth, can't function in the basis of the agitator, why, how in the name of common sense do you think, in the auditing chair, you're going to function with an agitator? Well, you're just going to have to what? You're going to have to soften up this goal and soften up this valence before you handle it.

So therefore, this process would have a prayer. "What problem could you confront? What problem would you rather not confront?" Ah, ha! Why? Why does that have a prayer? It hasn't got much of a prayer, but it's got a prayer. It's a workable thing because of course all valences are accepted by the pc originally as a solution to some overwhelming problem – by definition. That is how he got the valence. He himself failed, so therefore he had too many problems. He had so many problems that he failed. So he adopted a solution called a valence.

Well now, the possibility is that two thousand hours later, 1A would run him to Clear if you took every single possible slightest cockeyed version of problems, you see. You just almost set them up on electronic computer to get enough versions of problems, you know, enough... and you just flattened everything, just flattened everything about the problem.

Of course, because you're flattening them in the teeth of a machine that is making problems, see, all the time, you'd be going slowly! See, but you nevertheless would have a slight uphill grade all the way. You'd be making it as you went. Why? Because the valence is being separated.

So, therefore, every rudiments process which separates valence as its primary action will handle the rudiment. And every rudiments process which seeks to handle a condition will be of minor importance. Win a little bit, go flat, lose from there on. You can't keep the rudiments in. You see how that is?

All right. Let me give you an example of this. This fellow who has a thing "to make problems" – that was his goal. An agitator is going to be his terminal but you don't know anything about this yet, because you couldn't get this goal and terminal, you see, because the rudiment of "problem" is out. Kind of an auditing problem that you stare in the face, you see. All right, now you're going to run something on "What problem could you confront? What problem would you rather not confront?" You're going to win. But, if you ran this kind of a thing – if you ran this sort of a thing – and you said, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" of course, you're just asking the fellow to pick up his whole case and say, well, "responsible for the formation of it." But, of course, he isn't the person who is forming it. He is a valence and the valence is forming it. And, of course, he has no responsibility for the valence, it just goes on operating, so of course he can't do it. Follow this? So it would tend to knock something down momentarily and then this thing wouldn't be very successful and it would pop up again.

All right, but let's take a much worse problems process. Let's think of a much worse problems process. Let's say – I'm set up so that I only think of good processes. I have to get in practice thinking of bad ones. Let's see. Well, let's take, "Now, what condition" – this problem is about his wife – "What condition of a wife would you be able to tolerate?" "What condition of a wife would you be unable to tolerate?"
Well now, of course, this is asking a valence called "an agitator" to run plus and minus toleration on a wife in order to handle a problem. And, of course, we are not going to get anywhere with it. Because, of course, he'll make another problem that has nothing to do with his wife the second that you come off of the other problem, you see? Even if you did manage to somehow or other ARC break the thing down to a point where it no longer fell – which is not an accepted method of handling a rudiment, but which has been used [laughter] – that is addressed straight to the condition and is trying to alter the characteristics of a valence directly and so, of course, won't operate as a process. Okay?

All right. Now let's move on down the line. And let's take up the auditing room. Now, let's say the pc has a goal "to help mankind" and the terminal is a cow. [laughter] You get the package of characteristics which would go along with this. And now we are auditing him with a meat chart on the wall. This takes a wild example of it, you see. "Is it all right to audit in this room?" you see. Hell, no! It isn't all right!

But you have – the goal and the terminal of the pc is totally obscured, you cannot find it until you get the rudiment in. You cannot, of course, get the rudiment in because the goal and terminal of the pc are totally opposed to it. If you could find this out directly and immediately that he was opposed to that chart that was up on the wall, you see, you naturally could get it in, but then you would have had to have cleared the case before you could audit him in the room. You see?

All right. So the type of process that wouldn't work on that sort of thing or would have very, very minor workability would unfortunately be TR 10. Very minor. It'd run for a long time and it'd run with somatics, see? And the person would kind of get familiar with it and find out there wasn't anything really going to bite. And the thing would cease to fall, but the rudiment wouldn't be well in. See, because you just kept – every time he – "Notice that chart." "Yes" – of course, he couldn't confront any part of that meat chart. You get the idea? "Notice the fireplace. Notice the table" – table-eat-food, you know? "Yes, yes." And just be more and more somatics.

Well, the fact that any familiarization with any piece of mest produces a gain in a case, come hell or high water, because it itself – the common denominators of all valences is mass, energy, space and time. So the familiarizing with mass, energy, space and time on a very, very long look might possibly do it.

Therefore, TR 10 has had some workability. It has had some workability, as you know and I know. But that is the degree of workability and that is the length of time it would take to do anything for the case, because it's altering – trying to alter the condition of a valence and of course you're not going to alter the condition of the valence until you clear the guy.

So, I'll give you a good valence process, and it would have to be a valence process in order to handle the auditing room. And you'd have to say something on the order of "who." Valences – "who." The magic button back of all this is merely the "who/what." The list, the "who/what." You're doing some kind of a Terminals Assessment long before you should be doing a Terminals Assessment, don't you see.

You say, "Who couldn't be audited in this room? Who could be audited in this room?" You get the idea? Or you say, "What could be done in this room? Thank you. What couldn't
be done in this room? Thank you." Some such approach as that, of course, is an effort to separate the terminal. And what you're doing is just keying the thing out, momentarily, so later on you can get a hold of it and key it in.

Now, some such approach – I'm not giving you those as pat, perfect auditing commands but I'm just giving you the key of it. You'd have to handle it on a valence proposition. "Who would you have to be to be audited?" "Who would I have to be to give you a session?" See, that was an old one. And that was a nice working process. "Who would you have to be to be audited?" "Who shouldn't you be to be audited?" All of this starts listing terminals and to list people, you see, and beingnesses and objects and – pcs can be objects, you know, valences can be objects.

By the way, in your assessments (just as a side comment) if you omit objects you're going to miss some pcs, do you realize that? You keep saying, "Who, who, who, who," you turn yourself into an owl! And you better say once in a while, "What, what, what, what," see. Goal: "to go fast." "Who would go fast?" "Who, who, who, who," just on and on and on, doesn't seem to be any sense to it, you know. It's, "What would go fast?" Pc's in the valence of a vehicle, see, and actually might slip the valence of the vehicle during the session and give you a "who." See, so it's "What, what, what," and "Who, who, who," and "What, what, what," and "Who, who, who," and that sort of thing, and you'll get more terminals that way on an assessment. All right, well, enough of that.

Let's get back to this other thing. Anything that you dream up, then, to shift valences on the subject of the room, or desensitize momentarily valences on the subject of the room, or let him have some more valences that could be audited in the room, or anything like this, that would have a better degree of workability and should work faster.

All right. Now, let's take up another one here. "Is it all right if I audit you?" Well, "I" is a valence, remember – in the valence column, you know. As far as the pc's viewpoint is concerned, it's some kind of a pat beingness. Well, the same thing applies about the auditing room, you know. It'd be, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" and get him to make a list of terminals. 'Tell me who could audit you? Good. Who else could audit you? Thank you. Who else could audit you? Thank you. who else could audit you? Thank you. Oh, thank you very much. who else could audit you? Thank you very much." And you'll find yourself a screwdriver, an oil can. You're liable to find almost anything, you see. But nevertheless, you make some kind of a thing if you say, "What would I have to be to audit you?" see, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" You'll find a lot of people would be perfectly willing to be audited by a tape recorder, but not by a being. You get this?

So once more the "who/what," and we've got a valence approach here and you will find that ... I'm not telling you this will work in three minutes, you know, because you're working uphill, all the time you're running valences, you're working up against the key valence of the case. And you haven't got it yet. All you're doing is shaking up valences or remediying his havingness on valences or doing something about valences and you'll move out the other end with some kind of a result.

But don't expect that this won't occasionally be spectacular. It'll be very spectacular. Sometimes quite painful, sometimes quite upsetting, because you're really kind of doing a
Terminals Assessment on the guy, you see. And you just have to run it across the bumps and have to wear ship while you're running the thing. Keep your other rudiments in, don't make flubs. Run a very, very good technical approach to this thing. Have an auditing environment that the person would have some confidence in. In other words, it's "Who/what would I have to be to audit you?" and that pretty well should take care of the stuff he is immediately and directly stuck in. He's liable to settle down. "Who am I?" is the earliest successful auditing command that solves that rudiment. You'll find that in the Model Session, by the way, present Model Session processes.

All right, let's take the next one. Withholds. Well now, actually, it's withholds that caused him to hold the valence, so withholds work. As you get withholds off you do shift valences. And you do have the answer to that in the Security Check. But you can whipsaw back and forth on questions as you ask in the rudiments, "Do you have – are you withholding anything?" "Is there anything you should tell me?" "Is there anything that couldn't be said to me?" "Are you trying to communicate anything to me?" "Do you feel you can't talk to me?"

Now, I'm talking about whipsawing all possible varieties with this, because we are trying to restore the ability of the pc to communicate with the auditor. Now, that is a brand-new statement in Scientology. It's a brand-new phrasing. We're trying to get the pc able to talk to the auditor, not willing and we're shifting a word there. Although willing and able are very close together and one depends on the other, we want ability to talk to the auditor. It's just a matter of more bluntly "Can you talk to me?"

Once more, you don't seem to be able to clear it up – you don't seem to be able to clear it up – you've got your "who" and you've got your "what." "Who could talk to me?" "What could talk to me?" You've got your whole routine of Security Checks which are right where they belong and as important as they are, you see. And you've got the lot of those and they're all devoted to getting this rudiment in, see. So in a session, as you pass it by, you nevertheless should get it squared away. You find out if there's anything he's withholding and all that sort of thing, just as you have been, but in addition to that, you can also find out if he feels able to talk to you and if there's been any part of any session that you've given the pc that he has felt or she has felt unable to talk to you and why. And you'll reestablish these old cut comm points. And if this doesn't seem to be producing too much results and you still can't get that thing clear, you'd better find out "Who would be able to talk to me?" "What would be able to communicate to me?" You'll be surprised sometimes: "What would be able to communicate with you?" "Well, a bullet." And you'll get a lot of the misemotional feeling of the pc off with that type of an approach. Have you got the various ways to handle that?

But remember you have a whole battery of processes devoted to this withhold, called a Security Check. You've got a big broad thing called a Security Check, and that is terribly important. So if the rudiments seem to be consistently out on this pc at the level of withhold, then, of course, you should be devoting the bulk of your time to Security Checking the pc with the various HCO WW forms. And until you've got him pretty doggoned well security checked one way or the other, even though it took fifty hours to get all these Security Checks straightened out. Voilà! You nevertheless have won all the way and the pc's feeling better and better, and so forth. It's a winning process and a winning approach. You see how this would be?
All right. Now let's take havingness. There is no substitute for havingness except finding the Havingness Process of the pc. And we've got thirty-six Havingness Processes, and it's a very good thing to find the Havingness Process of the pc. And instead of randomly remedi- ing havingness, find the one that does remedy havingness. Because it's quite a trick to remedy havingness on the pc.

Now, a common denominator of all valences is matter, energy, space and time, so that any approach to matter, energy, space and time has some slight – as I was telling you about TR 10 – has some slight power of shifting a valence. And in view of the fact that it does – we have demonstrated it for a long time – you go on and use havingness just the way you've always used havingness, but I would prefer that you had the Havingness Process of the pc early in processing, okay? Now, that seem rather sensible as an approach? All right.

Now, the willingness of the pc to be assessed is great. The pc will be interested in his own case under assessment. But the pc gets terribly interested in his own case on these other things I have given you, too. They get very interested in their own case. It becomes very curious to them, some of the phenomena which occur. And if you think a person you're trying to security check successfully is disinterested, you're wrong. They're never disinterested. They're in a sort of a games condition, because it's a withhold sort of a basis, but nevertheless they're terribly interested in it, and they can become very upset if you fail. The only way they can get upset with you on a Security Check is if you fail to knock a question totally out. If you pass a question and they know they still have a withhold on that line, their respect for you as an auditor goes down, down, down! And that is the fastest way in the world to lose altitude with a pc, is pass a question in a Security Check where there is something still on it that you have- n't got.

But now remember, a Security Check is done in Model Session. So a Security Check will most aptly function with the rudiments in. But the power of a Security Check is so great, and in view of the fact that it is one of the rudiments, that the particularities of keeping the rudiments in to do a Security Check are nowhere near as great as they are in an assessment and a goals terminal run on the Prehav Scale. You see it's just you haven't got the same value for rudiments in doing Security Checks as you have apparently in assessment and running. There's a lesser value. But still keep them in.

The way you can bust up a pc on a Security Check is just as I said. This is one that has not been well learned in HGCs. Somebody says, "Well, I'll just report this pc is terribly unwilling, and he ARC breaks very easily when I run a Security Check on him." That auditor has said in effect just this – they've said one, two, three, four: They've said, "When I first started in the list of questions I found that it was hot and I went by it and I didn't buy – strip it down and it didn't go null and the pc has been in a mess ever since." It might as well have been written in that terminology because that's what the auditor has said.

Now, it's a surprising thing, you wouldn't think how many people will sit down and take a Security Check right off the street, which just is a Security Check, not even a shake-down type of check. You just go down the list. And if they are left with the impression that they have passed the Security Check and you have found nothing, whereas they know very
well a couple of the questions were hot, the odd part of it is that they're disgusted with you and consider that your whole operation is a fake.

So you must always at least tell the pc that the question is hot, broadly, whether you clear it or not. Always tell him it's hot. And that is the one restriction I'd put on you. Not necessarily, it isn't mandatory then in doing Security Checking for employment to clear every level. But it is mandatory to say "That one is hot." "Question is" – well, you say to the fellow (you're on question thirteen) – you say to him "still falling, still reacting," and so on. "We'll go on to the next question but that thirteen is still reacting. All right. Anything you care to tell me before I go on to the next question? No? All right, okay. Here's question fourteen." This guy says, "Wo-oh-oh-oh-oh. He knows!" See?

And your altitude can suffer faster doing a Security Check than any other single operation in Scientology. You can lose altitude as though you had dropped in a bomb case. Just by failing to do that. And you yourself might have spotted it, you see. You might know very well the pc is withholding; you still might have a reaction, but the meter is facing you and you haven't informed the pc. And all of a sudden you find yourself in a bad ARC break situation of some kind or another. You can't quite find out how you got there.

Well, you got there very simply. You went by a question without informing the pc that it was hot and that you knew there was something on it.

So if you can't in one session strip down a particular question and get all of it, at the end of that – now, I'm talking about a therapeutic Security Check – at least say, "Well, we'll have to work on that one tomorrow because it is still hot." Don't leave him with any kind of a remote idea of any kind whatsoever that he has cleaned it if he hasn't. Otherwise, he's liable to go home and say, "Ah, well, I can get away with that." And next day he comes in and, by golly, you can't get anything off of him at all. He's ARC broken and he doesn't think you're so good and, you know, it's all messed up.

But although it's a games condition, apparently the individual is totally convinced that he loses if you lose. Now, isn't that odd? That holds good. That holds good with the men in the street and the cop in the park and it holds good to anybody. If you the auditor lose in failing to get one, why, they know they lose. The mind seems to know what the mind is doing. They know that it wasn't so good that they didn't give that up.

So that's the proviso I would give you on a withhold while handling them in the rudiments. If you want to have no altitude for the remainder of the session, go by your rudiments point of withhold and leave one warm, hot or undetected, or not searched out. If you really want to lose altitude for the remainder of the session, why, just flub on that.

So be very careful that you ask this question in a whipsaw fashion, and it just must go left, right, center. Any possibility of ability to talk to the auditor? Anything they're withholding? Anything they haven't communicated? Anything they've failed to communicate? Anything they've wanted to communicate and didn't communicate? Anything they felt they couldn't communicate? Any effort they have made to communicate which was not received by the auditor? You get the idea? Any type of questioning of that character. Now, when you get that all of the fall out of that, your altitude goes up. And there is a primary altitude factor, you see.
All right. Now, in handling rudiments there is another thing: "Who should I be to audit you?" (let's go back to that one for a moment and take another look at this thing) comes into the basis of "Who would you have to be to be audited?" – this sort of approach. And you still consistently, here and there – I say this advisedly – have a pc who is doing something else. This is the old one. Now, it's not quite a part of the rudiments – not quite – but is apparently something that is slowing up things. And it comes in there "Is it all right if I audit you?"

Now, we had an earlier rudiment at some time or another that had to do, "Who would you have to be to be audited?" or "Who are you?" or "What are you doing?" I think that was the original one, wasn't it? "What are you doing?" That was 1955. And to some degree that has dropped out of the lineup. And don't be too surprised if on the next release of rudiments you find that back in the lineup again, because we have just caught a case out. And we catch too many auditors out on running a pc who is doing something else. Not being a pc; they're doing something else during the session. And because it's personal I'll operate on that as a withhold. There's a couple of these are screamingly funny. And it's too bad I can't give them to you, but I won't be able to. They're doing something else. They're not being audited, see.

So "What are you doing?" – some version of it – belongs in a rudiment setup. And possibly its missingness is accounting for some of the difficulties. "Is it all right if I audit you?" Somewhere in that vicinity, you would have to have this other question of "Are you willing to be audited?" or "What are you doing?" or something of this sort. But what you want to find out – what you want to find out: is the pc willing to be a pc and willing to follow the auditing commands? That is what you are trying to find out. Or is the pc all set to do that and something else? That's what's the most amusing part of this. Is the pc going to do something else while he's following the auditing command, don't you see. And you want to know all about this.

And somewhere in a session if you notice any peculiarity about a pc, an in-rudiment makes it necessary that you enquire occasionally about that rudiment and we get middle rudiments, or running rudiments. And we get the same rudiments. If they look like they're going out, well then you're wasting session time. So you had better just break down, just right there at that point, and just interject a rudiment. Handle that rudiment as you're running.

So that would be an in-rudiment and that would be keeping the rudiments in. And something like this, you notice that this pc is sitting there obsessively crossing and uncrossing his feet, crossing and uncrossing his feet, crossing and uncrossing his feet. Well, you'd run this rudiment about "What are you doing?" or "Are you willing to be audited?" you know, or that sort of thing. The pc's crossing and uncrossing his feet and you ask him what's he doing. Well, he's going to be in a track race tomorrow and he's getting some exercise while he's being audited. You'll find some wild ones, man!

And of course, this is all in the package. This would all go back to the package. He's got a present time problem: he's spending his time here being audited when he ought to be out on the track. Only he didn't bother to tell you this in the beginning of session, and so on, and you better handle this right away, you see. And there's all kinds of oddities then. He obviously is not only not willing to be audited but he has a present time problem, and this is going to
amount very shortly to an ARC break and here we go. We're going to have all the rudiments out here before we can say "scat." Why? Because we didn't observe something peculiar.

Now, a pc does not mind particularly being nagged. They don't mind it. It is all interest. It's all havingness. "What are you doing?" "How'd you do that?" and so on. This is one of the oldest wheezes that I use and one of my heavier failures in getting auditors to do it, is "What are you doing?" occasionally. "What is that all about?" "How are you answering the auditing question?" "What else are you doing?" "Now, tell me now, exactly what happens?" You notice that this is getting pretty grindy. This is getting awfully grindy. You say, "Well now what are you doing with the auditing command?" something like that?

Well, he'll say, "Answering it, of course! What the hell are you talking about?"

"Good." You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes, I sure do!"

"What is the present time problem?"

"Well, I – I haven't been able to understand the auditing command since the beginning of session. What am I supposed to be do ...?"

You'll find this session was going, you know, kind of grind, grind, grind, grind, apparently wasn't going anyplace, pc wasn't ARC breaky, he's just in a constancy, you see. You're getting some tone arm motion, because you practically can't stop an auditing process these days from working somewhat. And about that time you've all settled down for the long grind of some kind or another, you just apparently are not getting anyplace. Well, you shouldn't upset the session, you shouldn't suddenly depart from what you are doing wildly and never come back to it and leave pc in a big not-know about it, but you say, now, "How are you doing the auditing command?"

And the pc says "Well, I'm uh, hmmmm – well how the hell am I doing the auditing command?"

"Well, is there one of the legs of this bracket ...?"

"What did you want to know?"

"Is there one of the legs of this bracket you're finding a little bit rough to do?"

"Well, yes, you can't do the third leg of the bracket at all."

"Well, have you done the third leg of the bracket since the beginning of the session?"

"No."

"What do you do?"

"Well, I just say, 'Yes.' "

"All right, can you recall the first time you did that? All right, that's fine. Next time you did that. Next. Ah, good, good, recall several times you did that. All right. Now, how do we phrase this third leg of the bracket so that it is answerable?"
And you rephrase the third leg of the bracket so that it is answerable and just carry right on, not stopping anything, starting anything. You haven't stopped anything, you see. And you just give the auditing commands you were on and get the thing answered and keep on going. You had to be pretty smooth to keep from upsetting a pc who is deeply interiorized into some fantastic problem.

Usually there's something going wrong, however, when a pc is not experiencing gains and it'll be a rudiment out. And the basic rudiment, we haven't paid enough attention to is "Are you being audited," see. Person isn't being audited; the person is sitting there figuring out the command.

All too often you'll get an old-time Scientologist sitting there auditing.

Happens every once in a while. He'll be putting a curve on the auditing command so it works. Because he can't answer the auditing command. So you better straighten that out, see, straightaway. Is it a feasible command?

Another thing you often run into and maybe don't handle is self-audit. And you say very coolly to somebody, "What self-auditing process have you been running that isn't flat?" Well, this is not the same thing as asking him "Have you been self-auditing?" He'd say "No," or something. You might or might not get much of a reaction. But "What self-auditing process have you been doing that isn't flat?" That's an awfully good way to start a session on an old-time Scientologist. "Which of these self-auditing processes now, haven't you flattened? Yeah, well, let's take a list of the things here. Now, that's good. You got several of them here. All right, and so on. Good enough. Well, when did you have a lose on self-auditing?", you know, that kind of thing.

"Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Well now, all right."

See, this is just chatter. You're just asking for information and make a list of it one way or the other. You could ask him, "Well, have you ever been without an auditor when you needed one?"

"Oh, yes."

"Well, when was that?"

"So-and-so and so-and-so, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Oh, yeah, all those times. All right. Well, that's good." And, "Who would you have to be to audit you?" [laughter] And, of course, you're right into the middle and could kick right straight out the self-audit crisscross valence.

These are the various problems you run into that'll slow down clearing. These are all handleable things. What is an in-rudiment? It's somebody interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor. That's by definition. But, of course, it is also somebody who is doing the process. And this, of course, is also somebody who is being audited, and that's up to the auditor. So all of these things count, all of these things list up, all of these things are important to an auditing session.
Now, if it's very difficult to keep the rudiments in, you shouldn't particularly become self-critical about it. But there's the old R-factor – the old, old R-factor, way back in the Fourth London – is you want to ask yourself if you're being real with this pc. Because the first thing a pc smells – "Is it all right if I audit you?" This comes under rudiments, you see. One of the first things he smells is a missing R. The reality of the situation is not present. The auditor is not leveling with him. There is something else here. There's an ingredient in this auditing session that he knows nothing about. And it may be quite innocent, but nevertheless it had better be leveled with the pc.

An auditor who sits down, who hasn't had any lunch, who's had to rush back for the session and so forth and who doesn't say to the pc, "Well, I had to rush back to session so I didn't have any lunch. It's all right with me that I don't have any lunch," and so forth, "but nevertheless I haven't had any Lunch and so on. So bear with me" – and the pc's fine. That's all right. He's not really at a position where he wants to be guilty of the overt or anything like that. You make it so that he doesn't feel he is guilty of the overt, but you rive him a reality.

You'll find a pc will ARC break, go out of session, have a present time problem. What is the present time problem? The present time problem he's groping for is the auditor doesn't seem real. This is up to the auditor. It isn't something the pc is doing, it is something the auditor is doing.

(page missing)

the next time it comes up, that the pc suddenly looks up and he says, "What's wrong with you?" or "What's going on?" or "Did that shock you?" or "Are you nervous?" or "Are you upset?" or something like this. Any type of question of this character that concerns the identity of the auditor. This is what? This is a symptom of being out of session, isn't it?

All right. And your action right at that time should be, "Well, is there anything?" Think it over, you know. "Is there anything?" Take a moment out. "I don't know. Am I disturbed by all this? Have I got something on my mind?" And if you have, for God sakes, tell him! If you've been disturbed, for God sakes tell him. "Yeah." You say "Boy, about eight withholds ago I started to get absolutely dizzy. I must have one like it."

And the pc says "Oh, is that so?" you know, and he gives you the next withhold, just like a soldier. Perfectly all right.

And pc says "What's wrong?" and eight withholds ago you've started to feel very dizzy. You say "No, nothing is wrong. No, nothing's wrong," just go on and next auditing command, next auditing command, so-and-so. "We'll just carry on here." Watch all those rudiments go out, man. One by one, they will just go by the boards, because there isn't a person auditing the pc. Got it?

So these are what makes rudiments in – what makes rudiments in. And they are actually very simple to keep in, they're very easy to keep in. But you'd better not, with the type of auditing you're doing today, except on a Security Check when you can be a little bit careless, except with a present time problem – when you're doing sessions, boy, you'd better be thorough. You'd better be thorough as thorough as thorough as thorough as thorough. I don't care if you occupy three quarters of the session to get the rudiments in. End rudiments of course
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are nowhere near as important as beginning rudiments. But they have an importance, too, because you're doing them for the next session. This pc is going to come back and be audited well and it all better be smooth, well, you better get the session out of the road.

End rudiments are normally devoted to getting the session out of the road. Beginning rudiments are normally devoted to getting the atmosphere and environment out of the road so that you can audit the pc, and middle rudiments are rudiments used one after another, inquiries about various rudiments during a session, of course, are used to keep the session progressing and keep the rudiments in. Okay?

Well, I want you to get your hand in about this, because you've got to get smart with this. You've got to get awful good with it. Okay? All right.

Thank you.
BASICS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on 29 August 1961

Thank you. [laughter]

This is the 29th of August 1961, and I'm often gagging about using notes in lectures. But this particular lecture I have some notes for, believe it or not. That's because this is a very, very tricky subject. And I'm going to talk to you about something that is going to make you more auditing gains in less time as an auditor and make us more Clears than any other single subject we have opened up on in recent times.

Now, this is quite an important lecture. This lecture should be a basic on HPA and an absolute necessity at the level of HCS/BScn. And if a DScn is missing these points, we ought to revoke his thetan. [laughter] But this is quite important, this material; not to give it an over-stress of some kind or another, because I don't think it could be overstressed.

Now, you see, earlier this summer I was confronted with the fact that with all the materials in hand as to how to clear people, very few Clears were being made. Interesting, huh? But every time we have borne down on the subject of auditing and accuracy of auditing, all of a sudden we have people finding their goals and terminals on, you see, finding goals and terminals on pcs and we have more Clears being made.

This is very direct. We have had this experience here. We are all, I'm sure, agreed that it was a matter of the rudiments were out. And just as soon as I said, "Well, we've got some kind of a games condition going here, and the rudiments are out, and you'll find it in the first 150", it's proven true. I think maybe we got, maybe, something on the order of one or two goals out of fifteen cases that are still not found since that was released just a few days ago, right?

Female voice: Yes, two cases ...

Just two cases.

Female voice: ... who are hanging.

See? Interesting. And in every case, the goal was within the first 150 and yet they had assessed for weeks and weeks and weeks after that first 150. See, they'd added it up to a thousand and all gone up and on and on and more and more goals, and longer and longer assessment. And I said, "Well, go back to the first 150." I think that's where you found them, isn't it? Interesting, isn't it?

So that all the time after the first 150, certainly, goals were taken, then the rudiments were out during auditing. Obviously the rudiments were out.
The goal was buried. And as soon as the rules were put right, the goal came back in, perked up and *pangity-pangity-pang*, and everything was going along gorgeously. As my friend Paul said the other day, we were all off at a smart trot.

Now, there's a point, then. Here's a point of some interest: that by improving auditing technology and the skill of individual auditors, we then come closer to very broad clearing. It is *not* case difficulties that are restraining the pc *now* from getting Clear. All the evidence is in, and that's what it adds up to. All right.

Therefore, the stress must be on auditor technology – the handling of technical aspects of Scientology. Now, the better that is, the more Clears you're going to make. We've got the weapons with which to make Clears. There aren't any bugs in it. I haven't written up your last Prehav Scale, but you mostly have it right now. There's no missing items of any importance that would restrain this from happening. So therefore we come back on auditor technology.

Now, I don't want you to accept anything I am saying as accusative casewise, or anything like that. I'm simply going to give you data here and this data is very well worth having. This data was arrived at the hard way. It'd be a withhold from you to tell you otherwise than that it was arrived at at a hard way – on a hard line. I've been getting some auditing. Sessions have been going out. We sat down and analyzed, and we have analyzed now, all the points where sessions were going out and so forth. I got a good reality on that, and Suzie got a good reality on it, and we were straightening out these points. Because, frankly, we weren't doing it particularly to find out more about auditing; but it's just stuff that came up and we analyzed accordingly. And apparently what it boils down to is not auditing attitude or anything as nebulous as this. It boils down to very concrete data, which you'll be happy to find out.

Now, as an auditor, perhaps, you say, "Well, there's so many rules of auditing, and which one of these rules of auditing should I be following, and how much memorizing of rules and all of this sort of thing should I do?" Well, basically, first and foremost, if you are worried about the rules of auditing, there is something wrong with your auditing approach. We can count on that, then, as a stable datum; that if somebody is worried about the rules about auditing and the zigs and the zags and so forth about auditing, and terribly concerned with these things and so forth, then there's something basically wrong. Because auditing, fundamentally, is simply this – it goes back to *The Original Thesis*: The auditor plus the pc is greater than the pc's bank. And the auditor is there to direct the attention of the pc and get the pc in there and get these objects confronted and straightened out, and the unknowns off and the bank straightened out and the track straightened out, and so forth. And he winds up at the other and with a Clear. That is what it amounts to with the technical knowledge of what you do with a pc.

It all boils down to that. You are there to get auditing done. The less auditing you do which is effective auditing, the more upset your pc is going to be.
Now, let's take the first object lesson here. The auditor sits down in the auditing chair; the pc sits down in the pc's chair. What is the contract? What is the understood contract as of that instant? That understood contract is a very simple contract. The pc sat down to be audited. What does the pc understand by being audited? He basically understands it as getting on toward Clear. What he means "toward Clear," we're not sure a lot of the time, but even that – he senses it is there, he senses he's got a direction to go, he senses that he can arrive at a certain destination, and he's there to get that done.

Now, he's not there to have ARC breaks run, present time problems handled; he's not there to straighten out the auditing room; he's not there to have any of these things done at all that we call rudiments. He is there to get audited toward Clear.

Well, the first observation we can make, that rudiments go out to the degree that auditing doesn't get done. That's a direct ratio. Rudiments go out to the degree that auditing does not get done.

Now, this poses you a problem. If you are using no session to put rudiments in, if you use up no time at all to put rudiments in, of course, you're apparently around the bend as far as handling the pc, because the rudiments are out. You see, here's a puzzle that we face at once. If you're not spending any time putting the rudiments in, of course the rudiments are going to go out. But the more time you spend putting the rudiments in, the more rudiments you've got to put in. Have you got that?

So, somewhere here there's an optimum amount of rudiments putting-in and it's not very much. It's on the order of five minutes. You know, five minutes and the rudiments are in; the pc will bear with that, but not much more. And when it goes to a half an hour, his present time problem is actually, basically, the fundamental problem of getting auditing.

Now, he'll say the present time problem is something else, is something else, is something else, is something else; but his basic problem: is he going to get any auditing? And after he's had half to three-quarters of the session thrown away on a bunch of things that he didn't care about, why, of course now, he has a new present time problem called "getting auditing." In the next session, he comes in with this new present time problem: "Am I ever going to get audited?" because he doesn't consider any of these other things auditing.

Now, that's quite fascinating. He doesn't consider them auditing. So therefore, he doesn't consider them auditing. So therefore, of course he's out of session. From a pc's viewpoint, auditing is a direct press forward, getting himself straightened out so he can get a good Goals Assessment, and finding his terminal – if he knows anything about it at all, this is what he demands – and getting auditing straight along on the road to Clear, and knowing he's getting someplace and all of that sort of thing. This is what he really settles for. This is by experience.

They will even hang on for months, as we know now, getting assessed for goals. Even though the goals are all invalidated and everything else, they're still interested and they'll still go to session, don't you see? Even though the thing is being run completely crosswise, you see, they'll still go to session and still be assessed. You got that?

Well, they won't be run endlessly on general processes that don't approach them any closer to Clear. They'll only go for maybe seventy-five, a hundred hours, and they'll leave the
HGC, and they take a lot of persuading to get back, and they won't want to be audited by you anymore, you know, in private practice, and so forth. What are all these things from? – from the basic present time problem of not getting auditing. So actually your main chance is simply to audit the pc.

If it comes to a question of whether to audit the pc or go through some arduous flipperoo on straightening out some kind of a super-relationship, or something – audit the pc first. See?

Now, you've got to find out what the pc's attention is on and what he considers auditing; and he very often considers it a chronic present time problem of some kind or another – or a long-duration problem. And he judges everything as to whether or not he's making process [progress] by whether or not this problem is getting stronger, getting weaker. The hidden standard sort of thing; he's got all that sort of thing. Well, he'll be interested in that. Why? – is his attention is on it. So that's auditing.

So auditing could be defined, to the pc, as anything which is handling the things his attention is fixed on. That's what he considers auditing. If his attention is superfixed on it and it's being handled, he considers that auditing. And of course his attention is superfixed on goals, so you can get away with assessing practically forever. He will stay in there being assessed longer than he will stay in there being run on oddball, bit-and-piece general processes that don't lead toward Clear. Isn't that fascinating? That's an observation that I think you'll find is quite valid.

Now, if it came to a choice as to whether or not we went about it endlessly, endlessly, endlessly running rudiments to get them in, or auditing the pc, you would always choose what the pc considered auditing. You would always choose what the pc considered auditing, and let the rudiments go to hell. And the next thing you know, they'll disappear in importance.

Remember, what you validate becomes important. You start handling too many present time problems and ARC breaks too arduously and too long and believe me, you get more ARC breaks. Why do you get more ARC breaks? You get them simply because auditing itself is a present time problem, because he isn't getting auditing. In his viewpoint, he is not getting auditing, he is not sure he will get auditing; therefore, his contract is violated so he is in disagreement with what is happening in the session. Do you follow that?

Now, a pc will sit there and endlessly run 1A. Why? Well, his attention is stuck on it. His attention is stuck on all these problem points, you see? He considers it auditing as long as you are auditing in the direction of his problems – of course. So he will settle for 1A. It's amazing how long he will run how many versions of 1A. See? This is amazing, too. If you were to flatten 1A, then – as we already have talked about – and gotten problems and Security Checks totally out of the road, you would find your pc would stay in-session and think he was going someplace, and of course he is going someplace. And if you were to flatten 1A, giving the rudiments a lick and a promise before you did a Goals Assessment, you'd find out your rudiments were in when you were doing the Goals Assessment. Because, you see, the pc now can confront problems. You've already brought him up to the point of being able to confront the rudiments before you started fooling with the rudiments. You got the idea?
Although you run rudiments every session, although you try to find out what they are, although you try to knock them out, although you do run some Havingness on the room – and you keep the rudiments in, nobody is saying just forget rudiments – but don't consider rudiments anything like a session. Don't ever make the mistake that the pc will think he is getting a session when rudiments are being run.

You'll find pc after pc, when you ask him, "Do you have a present time problem?" will groan. Because he knows now that his session is going to be endlessly chewed up with the John and Mary of life, and he doesn't consider he's getting anyplace. Why doesn't he consider he's getting anyplace? Because he knows he's getting no place with his wife, and so forth. Well, you say, "Well, that's a problem." But he doesn't consider this the general problem of his case by any means.

You have found a problem. He is worried about having to write Blitz and Company. And you say, "Well, we'll have ..." and you just start to make the motion toward handling this problem of having his attention on Blitz and Company and the letter he's got to write to them, and you get "Oh, no! My God!" [sighs] You've heard him, huh? [laughter]

Well, why do you get this? He doesn't consider Blitz and Company auditing. He doesn't consider Blitz and Company as any difficulty. But he does consider that not getting auditing will produce an enormous difficulty.

The value which a pc assigns to auditing should be appreciated by you. It is terribly highly valued – very highly valued by the pc. And this is a great oddity, because actually, psychoanalysis was never highly valued; hypnotism is not highly valued; psychiatry, they spit on. They go back for their electric shocks like wound-up dolls. But you say, "Well, what do you think would happen to you if you didn't have any psychiatric treatment?"

"Oh, I'd probably be just the same as before. What's the difference?"

You say, "Well, would you walk across the street for psychiatric treatment?"

"Hell, no."

Well, that's an oddity in itself. See? This is an oddity. You're dealing with a commodity which is very highly valued and which the society has been trying to put into the field of psychotherapy, but psychotherapy is not highly valued. So what you're doing basically is very highly valued by the pc. So the more you don't give him of it, the more difficulty you're going to have with him.

If there's ever a crossroads of decision as to whether or not we're going to endlessly get on with this, even a crude remark of this character, "Well, I see you've got a present time problem. Yeah, have you got a little bit of an ARC break? All right. Well, okay. To hell with those. We're just going to run now ..." And you give him the process and you go on and run it.

And you'll be amazed how often the pc will say, "Hey, you know, he's right in there pitching." He might grump for a minute, you know, and say, "Well, it's not according to Hoyle, you know?" [laughter] But you'll just be amazed how many times that will win where the endless handling of rudiments won't win.
The endless handling of rudiments is a limiting factor in auditing, because it produces eventually the ARC break of obtaining no auditing. So the decision is, audit. You'll have less ARC breaks the more auditing you do. And of course, if your auditing is flawless from a standpoint of Model Session, and if some of these other things I'm bringing up are also present smoothly in the session, your days of having ARC breaky pcs end as soon as you recognize that point – that he is there to be audited, and his basic contract is the basic contract of being audited. And the more you audit him on the things his attention is fixedly on – I mean fixedly on, on the long track basis, you see – and the more attention you give to that and the more you handle that, the more he knows he's being audited, the less ARC breaks you're going to get.

It's amazing what a pc will put up with to get auditing, quite amazing what they will put up with to get auditing. Why make them put up with anything, but at the same time go on and audit. So the best, hottest message I can give you on that exact subject is audit! Don't fool with it; audit! See?

What a pc responds to best: "Oh, well. All right. You're here to be audited. Good enough. Fine. Now, we're going to go over the rudiments. All right." And you rip on down the rudiments line. And you notice there's a bad flick of some kind or another. You say, "What's that?"

He says, "Well, that's so-and-so."

You say, "Good," and you ask it again. "All right. That's good, good. It's still flicking. Is it still worrying you? Anything else about it worrying you?"

"Well, so-and-so's worrying me."

You say, "All right. Good." Get the next one, bang! the next one, bang! You say, "All right. Now, now let's get down to business. Now, this is the process I'm going to run, and here it is."

And he says, "Well, I don't much care for that process." (I'll take this up in a moment.) And you say, "I don't care." you say, "I care for it. Do it." you know, that kind of an aspect.

And he says, "But so-and-so technically, and it said in bulletin so-and-so..."

You say, "Well, all right. I read it, too. Do it." [laughter] you find the guy doesn't go into apathy. Quite the contrary – he goes spark, spark, spark, spark, spark, and you'll get good gains.

All right. There are some more aspects in that. But that whole first section of what I want to talk to you about is: for God's sakes, just audit the pc. Don't fool with it, just audit. You see? Just go right in there and saw it up and chew it up and push his attention around and get him through to the other end and ... Well, get 1A all straight and handle whatever you want to handle. I don't care what you handle, because this would hold, possibly, if 1A ever became ancient history this would still hold. Run the pc toward Clear and have minimal chop behind your back, you see, minimal unkind thoughts, minimal ARC breaks, minimal difficulties in sessions. These all just tend to disappear.
Because he might say, "Well, that auditor of mine is a cross son of a bitch, but, jeez, he sure audits!" You know, this would be kind of the idea. You got the idea? "He sure audits." It might be terribly profane, the opinion, you see? 'Well, you don't do right in a session, she's a real bitch, that auditor, you know?" You know, that kind of an aspect and that kind of conversation. "But I'd rather have her audit me than anybody else I know." you know, that kind of song.

The HGC – as soon as that became prevalent in an HGC, and as soon as HGC auditors… You just try and change the auditor on the pc. They had this auditor last year or something like that; and well, they just don't want to be processed unless they can be processed by the same auditor, because they're very sure that auditor can audit. But it's not can audit, although they always use can audit. The secret is will audit. And the auditor who kind of won't audit, they don't want. That's the secret of "being wanted by" as an auditor – is how much you get down to business and how much business you get done.

All right. Now let's take up something a little more esoteric here under the heading of "escape" as a philosophy. This is a very complicated subject. This is the orientation of an auditor – has to do with his orientation. This is the only point where an auditor's orientation can seriously get in his road. As long as he follows Scientology and goes on auditing and using the principles of Scientology, this one can get in his road. All those levels of the PreHAV Scale that have to do with escape – that is: Abandon, Leave, anything like that – if these are in any way, shape or form "hot" or if they're not thoroughly flat on an auditor, you'll get two aspects.

You'll get the auditor letting the pc escape. He wants the pc to escape, because this is the auditor's modus operandi of handling situations. And this is as wrongheaded as you could get, because the only way a pc will ever get Clear is by turning around and fighting down the devils that pursue him. And if the auditor's philosophy is "the only thing the pc should be permitted to do is escape," the auditor will never control the session. And this is why an auditor doesn't control a session when the auditor doesn't control a session. He thinks he's being good. He thinks he's being nice to the pc.

Now, let's go about this on a little wider basis. And oddly enough, under that same heading comes case reality necessary in an auditor. And we've got the same heading. It's "escape" as a philosophy. Case reality is necessary in an auditor.

Exactly what is this that we are looking at when we find that a Scientologist has never seen or gone through an engram? When we find that a Scientologist has never collided with a ridge? When a Scientologist is not aware of the thenness of incidents? If the Scientologist is not aware of those things, he will continue to make mistakes and no amount of training will overcome it. Knowing this – just knowing this – will overcome it, because it all of a sudden sees lots of light. Lights begin to flash in all directions.

If a Scientologist has never been through an engram, if a Scientologist has never been stuck on the track, if a Scientologist has never seen ridges or any of the other mental phenomena, it is because his basic philosophy in life is escape. Now, there is all the wisdom there is in it. I will go ahead and tell you all about it, but there is all the wisdom there is in it.
Of course, if he's never seen an engram, what is he trying to do? He's trying to escape from engrams. So he escapes so hard from engrams that he sees a little flick of a picture and he's away, man, he's away. He's off like a rocket. He's off like the Russian never went. See, he's over the hills and past Arcturus. There's a little twitch of a somatic and *pshew!* he's gone. Why?

His basic philosophy is that if you can run fast enough you never get bit. So, of course, he doesn't have what we call case reality, because of course he's running from his case. His basic philosophy is, "The best way to handle a case is get out of it!" So that's all he ever does with the pc – takes the pc out of his case. So therefore a pc will never be in-session with him.

Oh, lights begin to dawn, huh?

It is pure kindness. This auditor will find the pc getting interiorized a little bit and he'll know that this is the wrong thing to do. So he will take the pc's attention out of session. Some of them do it very flagrantly and some of them do it very pleasantly. It is nevertheless true. one of the ways of doing it is change the process. Another way of doing it is Q and A.

Pc says, "I don't want to be here."

The auditor says, "Of course, you dear fellow, you do not want to be there. Let's be somewhere else at once."

Pc shows the slightest inkling of digging into it in the bank and the auditor pulls him out. The auditor is selling him freedom. At what cost? The cost of never getting Clear. But the auditor sells him freedom; and it's a good thing. It's kindly meant.

This same auditor well might have a penchant – doesn't necessarily – but might have a penchant for going around opening all the canary bird cages in the world. But then, by George, never follows up the fact that the canary birds are inevitably eaten by cats or killed by hawks, promptly and at once. Don't you see?

The auditor is saying, "Escape, escape, escape." The auditor is actually saying, "Don't confront it, don't confront it, don't confront it, don't confront it." The processes he's running are saying, "Confront it, confront it, confront it," don't you see? But the auditor, with his auditing technology, prevents the pc from confronting it, and so therefore runs rudiments forever, does other things, doesn't quite let the pc go into session, (quote) "makes mistakes," (quote) "changes the process often;" (quote) "ends the session irregularly"- does something odd. And all of these oddities could be said to be backed up by this one philosophy, the philosophy of escape. The kind thing to do is to let him out.

The guy is settling down on the track in some fashion or another and he's going out of present time – oh! let's not let him do that, because that's the wrong thing to do.

Now, this is compounded – this is a complex subject, which is why I said this – earlier in the lecture it was. The auditor who has no case reality, of course, dramatizes this point. You cannot see engrams while you're running from them.

Let's take a model engram that this person is in, and let's take some of the things that this person has happen to them. The model engram he is in-he's being whipped. The Jesuit fathers, or something of the sort, have decided to really lay it into him on the backtrack, you
see, at some time or another; and they've got him tied to a post, and he's being whipped. So he cannot leave that post, so he fixes his attention on a section of sky and says, "It isn't happening." That's escape, isn't it? So what does he find when he gets into that engram? He finds an invisibility called "sky." He doesn't find any whiplashes; he doesn't find any post. He doesn't find anything; he finds a section of sky. That is the final mechanism: escape.

Now, he escapes mentally. He doesn't just run away, he escapes mentally. Don't you see? All right. So that worked; he didn't feel them after that. So it was a workable philosophy, perfectly workable philosophy. Unconsciousness is also a workable philosophy. So he's being tortured on the rack – ah! – he fools them all. He goes unconscious; he can't feel it anymore. We don't have, then, an engram of the rack, we have a period of unconsciousness. You see that? He's actually in the incident, but he's only unconscious.

All right. Now, let's go a little bit further here, and let's take a look at this – a little bit further – and we'll find this person has odd somatics and odd difficulties that he cannot account for. And if he never sees any engrams or sees them very rarely, of course he can't account for these difficulties at all. In Book One, it says they're all contained in pictures, and he doesn't see any pictures; and yet here are the somatics, and there's no pictures. Of course there's no pictures, because his attention on any given point is the solution "escape." Escape mentally, escape mentally by forgetting it, escape mentally by looking at nothing, escape mentally by saying it isn't there, you know? The various mechanisms of not-is.

Yet the somatics have not been not-ised. And this person, every time he (quote) "contacted an engram" actually contacted a nothingness, and then was left with a nagging somatic or a sensation that he could not then account for and which seemed to be very mysterious to him. And therefore didn't connect any of these sensations much with his bank, don't you see? And knows he feels uncomfortable, but can't really connect it with any given engram. Got it?

All right. Let's take an actual case in point. Person does in running on the track, contact an engram. And there it is, all 3-D and so forth – people standing on the bank throwing a spear. All right. Spear comes across the river, goes through the pc's ribs, and the pc has a hell of a somatic and that is the end of the picture.

This person, now auditing, says, "Well, why doesn't this pc handle incidents like that? Well, nothing to it. Spear went through you and of course phsst – momentary, you know? Flat and gone and you're out of it, and that's it. I don't get this idea of being stuck on the track," you see. "Hooh! Nobody should be stuck on the track. Why doesn't this pc just flick his attention out, you know? Well, I'll fix this pc up so he can flick his attention out. I'll pull this pc's attention out." Don't you see? This is the best mechanism.

You ask this same person (this is an actual case), you say, "Do you ever have a somatic in that area you just indicated that the spear went through during that incident?"

"Oh, yes, all the time."

"Well, does it have anything to do with that spear?"

(Person didn't say "all the time"; person said, "Yes, very occasionally, but ...")

"Does it have anything to do with the spear?"
"No, uh ... Well uh – or does it?"

"Well, do you have a lot of odds and ends of somatics of this particular character?"

"Oh, yes. I do."

"Are they connected with pictures?"

"No." (Actual conversation that took place.) "But I thought all that went out with Dianetics, and in Scientology you no longer had to confront all of these things."

Well, here immediately, of course, you have the tag end of every engram that the person has contacted is just stuck, stuck, stuck, and where are they all? They're all in PT. So what is PT to this person? PT is certainly just PT, but actually it's a jam of engrams; so therefore the pc should be in PT all the time – because the auditor is. The auditor is never out of PT, so therefore the pc is never out of PT. And this auditor will not actually guide the pc's attention through an engram, because there's no reality on it. The best thing to do is to yank the attention out of the engram. So the auditor will not control the pc's attention because escape is the better philosophy. Don't you see why this is? So there's the reality.

Now, there's a direct cure for this. And if you wanted to get anybody who didn't have (quote) "any reality on the past track, no reality on engrams, no reality on this and that" as far as these things are concerned, and was thinking people are being unreasonable who go into engrams and get stuck and whose attention are not in present time – this person, then, is not operating on a reality. They can't quite tell what the pc is doing, don't you see? So they're always worried about what the pc is doing. Because they themselves have never been in this identical situation, they get a little bit impatient with the pc, don't you see? So they're not actually doing a guided tour of a bank. They're doing a guided yank of a bank.

And if you were to run this process on that unreal case – it's just one process, a one-shot process – you would suddenly find that they would have an enormous shift of reality on what we've been talking about all these years. And the process is: "What unknown might you be trying to escape from?" That's the process. And at first glance, that would become a very brutal process, of course, because it'll just start unstacking this. And one of the first things this pc would see, who had this brilliant reality on the people on the bank who threw the spear, would be to find out the water was cold. And the pc, I happen to know, has cold feet all the time. Of course, there's that piece of that engram, see? So, that piece of that engram would be contacted. And you just keep contacting these pieces of the engram, because of course you're running the reverse mechanism now, not the philosophy of escape. But the only philosophy that works in Scientology is "confront it."

It isn't that you have to erase it; it is only that you have to become familiar with it. All you have to establish is familiarity with the bank; you don't have to establish an erasure of the whole bank. It would take endless time to do that.

And all of a sudden this auditor who's been having trouble guiding a pc's attention will not have that trouble anymore. They will recognize at once, "Oooh-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho, I've been trying to get the pc – oh, I see. My – my – pardon my red face! Oh boy, is this what it's like down here!" You know?
Now, what happens is every time this auditor yanks the pc's attention, the auditor is not aware of the fact that he has got the pc in one time stratum, called engram time, and is pulling the pc's attention to present time, and locks the incident the pc was in, in present time by an attention shift. Any kind of a mechanism, whether you call it faulty technology, changing the process, changing one's mind, doing something of this sort – whatever you want to define it or whatever rationale went with it – this is actually occurring. And of course, it is painful to the pc to have this happen; so the pc, of course, protests and this is a basic difficulty with ARC breaks. You get a basic difficulty at once, because the pc was there and now he's here, only he's not here and he's not there and where the hell is he?

It isn't that a pc should be regressed on the track and totally impressed by this past-time incident to a total point of overwhelm, but the pc is in another time stratum, usually, when he's being audited, even on a conceptual or permissive process. Pc isn't... appears to be sitting in present time, and the pc is not in present time. So, of course, the pc can neither be talked to nor handled as a person would be handled in present time. It is not a social tea party – auditing isn't. The pc is not there, really; the pc is in another time stratum. And if you practice the philosophy of escape on somebody who doesn't have to escape but is trying to do the bank, the auditor's goal is different than the pc's goal. And the pc is saying, "Well, I'm confronting it and I'm getting familiar with it, and here it all is."

And the auditor is saying, "Come away, come away, come away, it's dangerous." Reactively, this is what is happening.

So the auditor is saying, "Come away," and the pc is saying, "Let's stay here," and between the two, you get ARC breaks and arguments. You would inevitably, wouldn't you?

And as soon as the auditor takes a guided tour of this thing called an engram bank, you see, with the spears whizzing from both banks of the river – this particular person has probably never noticed that not only were there spears coming from one side of the river, but that probably there were whole volleys of arrows coming, too. Those somatics haven't appeared yet. You got the idea? There's other things missing in all this, and of course it all looks very mysterious. But the person gets down there and they're trying to escape from it – that would be their first action – spear goes through them, they say, "Escape." Boom! "Let's go."

Well, it's one of the basic thetan mechanisms. It's why he never as-ises much track. It's why he doesn't become familiar with his bank. So look how prevalent this thing is – very prevalent.

And a thetan would be in a bad way if, when you killed his body he couldn't exteriorize, see? So it's an absolute survival mechanism for a thetan. So, you see, it's not a bad thing to have escape philosophy or to be able to escape. But let me tell you, when a person is compulsively escaping, he of course never escapes. And when you get a pc that you're getting to escape all the time, of course he never escapes, and his case just winds up in a little black ball. You got the idea?

So, therefore, we can say that escape as a philosophy very much gets in the road of auditing when the auditor has this as a total philosophy, you see? And we can say also, then, that a case reality is very necessary in the auditor. But of course, what do we mean by "case
reality”? Well, "case reality" is willing to stay there and take a look, you see, instead of running out on the incident when it comes up.

These two things, then, are under the same heading and they are the same subject. A person who doesn't have a reality on the bank has consistently escaped from the bank; and then that person, of course, does odd things in auditing. And we say, "Well, that person is a bad auditor." "That person is not so good," or "That person doesn't get results," or something like that.

Well, we can say that much more succinctly and much more kindly now, much more effectively. We can simply say, "Well, this auditor has escape as a philosophy and hasn't got much reality on the bank. So therefore, when he audits a pc he doesn't know what the pc's doing." And when the auditor doesn't know what the pc's doing and can't fathom what the pc's doing; and the auditor thinks that the pc shouldn't be looking at all that stuff, too, of course we don't get any clearing. Because clearing depends on a familiarity with the bank.

I'm not telling you, you all stick on the track; I'm merely saying that it's necessary to have a familiarity of what can happen. You know, there you are in the middle of the river and the stuff is coming from all directions; and you're confronting it and you got it and you've got a sensation of fear or something, or confusion, already that's going with it, and all of a sudden the auditor says, "Well, that's the end of that process. Let's run something else." God, you don't know whether you're on the track or in present time or something like that. You've been betrayed, in other words.

But you could educate this auditor endlessly – just endlessly – without producing a single change in that philosophy, unless you hit the philosophy itself. Got it? You cannot educate an auditor who has that as a philosophy into giving what you would consider a smooth session of keeping the pc in-session and his attention on his bank. Do you follow that?

So that's exactly where that button sits, and that's exactly what button you press. And when an auditor makes consistent mistakes; when an auditor yanks the pc's attention; when the auditor is doing a lot of Q-and-Aing – there's more about Q-and-Aing – but when he does a lot of this, a lot of shift, we just assume that – that the auditor has a total philosophy and fixation of escape, and therefore is letting the pc escape.

And he isn't being vicious, he isn't trying to cut the pc to pieces. He knows what's best for the pc: "Get out of there, man!" Not even "Get rid of it," just "Get out of there." Pc starts to look a little bit indrawn, go into session, the auditor will pull him out every time.

You probably couldn't even list the number of mechanisms auditors use to effect this. So there's just no sense in putting up counter-laws to each one of these mechanisms that's used, is there? There's no sense in doing that, because we have the basic mechanism for it.

All right. Now, let's go a little bit further here. Here's another subject on this: Responsibility for the session. In The Original Thesis, way, way back when, you had the rules, the laws, the basic laws of auditor plus pc greater than the pc's bank. Pc less than pc's bank. Obvious, a pc must be less than a pc's bank or the pc would never be troubled by the bank, don't you see?
So that's why self-auditing doesn't work, by the way – the pc is less than his own bank. Also, he never can get in-session, because a bank won't go in-session. You can audit valences and that sort of thing. Oh, don't mistake me; I mean, there's... You can't say that self-auditing does not produce a result. It does produce a result but the result is quite minor.

And actually all self-auditing is, is remedying havingness on auditing. Self-auditing always, always, always begins on scarcity of auditing. A pc would always rather be audited than self-audited. But they could get to a point finally where auditing is so scarce... You know, people have been (quote) "auditing them" (unquote) without auditing them, and auditing thereby gets scarce. So, pc starts auditing and can come up to a point where the scarcity becomes so great that they begin to assume virtues, like the fox who loses his tail, you see? The great virtues of having no tail, the great virtues of self-auditing. Simply the lack of havingness of auditing can result to the fact where self-auditing can become quite a virtue.

Occasionally, once in a while, rarely, you'll have somebody say, "Well, I want to do it myself" – as far as self-auditing is concerned – "I really want to make the grade myself." And you look back over the history of the case and you'll find out they didn't feel that way a year before. They just didn't have auditing.

So you can actually have somebody sitting there, and an "auditor" (quote, unquote) there, and the person getting no auditing, don't you see? And this denial of auditing, denial of auditing – by being yanked off the track, by endless rudiments, by never getting anything on the road, by never really getting in there and pitching, you see, one way or the other, the person is being denied auditing. And the person will be denied auditing to a point where they self-audit. That's what self-auditing is.

You find a pc self-auditing, you can be sure that the pc has such a scarcity of auditing that your auditing is having considerable difficulty arriving. You don't have to do anything about it except just reestablish the pc's confidence in the fact that he is being audited and will be audited. That's basically what you do, is just audit, and the pc will come out of this. But it requires auditing.

But the pc less than the pc's bank – otherwise the bank would never be giving him any trouble. Yes, I know he's creating the bank, on how many vias and that sort of thing. But he's created a Frankenstein monster – and it's about to eat up Frankenstein, you see – called the bank. And Frankenstein's monster inevitably will eat up Frankenstein. He's created a bank. He's created all these various valences and that sort of thing. He's denied full responsibility for having done these things, and so on. And the result is that he's having difficulties with a bank.

This is not self-auditing now, I'm just talking about pcs in general. I'm talking about Homo sap; I'm talking about the farmer that's walking down the road; and I'm talking about this guy and that guy and the other fellow, you see? And these chaps are all in this sort of a state of less than the bank. When we say a man is aberrated, we say he's less than the bank. When we say somebody is psychotic, of course this person is not just less than the bank; this person is nonextant and is the bank. You see, he's done a... There's a total overwhelm, and that's all psychosis is: total overwhelm by own bank.
Now, the gradients of cases is the degree to which a person is overwhelmed by the bank. Now, recognizing this, that you're auditing somebody who is a bit overwhelmed by his own bank, and recognizing these laws in Original Thesis (simple and elementary as they are; they are, nevertheless, they're very sweeping in their truth in auditing), we get this kind of a condition here. The auditor has got to be cooperating and running the pc's bank, you see, and running the pc at the bank in order to get auditing done, inevitably. When the auditor withdraws from doing this, he collapses the pc's bank on him. You see?

When an auditor is auditing and suddenly stops auditing – like, you know, a shift of attention, spills the water glass, tips over the ashtray, something of this sort – he, of course, has to some degree withdrawn his control of the pc's bank, and you get a minor collapse. But there is a way to get a major one. And this has never been articulated before in Scientology and it's terribly important. Whenever you take a direction from a pc and follow it, you collapse the pc's bank on him.

[These poor guys.6] I know two or three fellows who will only let some weary, very weak auditor audit them, you see, and give the auditor all sorts of directions as to how to audit them. And of course this is just a self-audit. They don't make much progress. They make some, but they don't make very much progress. They're usually in misery. They've set up a booby-trap situation here, because of course the auditor is taking directions from the bank and following them. That's part of it. And the other part of it is, is the auditor has subtracted himself from the basic equation of auditor plus pc is greater than the bank. You see?

So, when the auditor takes the pc's directions, then it looks to the pc at once as though only the pc is confronting the bank; and he loses the illusion of the auditor's confronting the bank, and of course the bank then collapses on the pc. Do you follow this carefully? It's one of these simple arithmetical propositions. It's one plus one is greater than one and a half; but one is not greater than one and a half. And what you've done is subtract a one from the one plus one, and of course you get immediately the one and a half greater than the one. You've only got one left, you see?

You haven't now got a pc sitting in the pc's chair; you've got an auditor sitting in the pc's chair. So the pc is now both the auditor and the pc, only it doesn't add any ones. So instantly and immediately you, of course, get the bank greater than pc, and so therefore the pc is promptly and instantly overwhelmed.

Pc says, "I think you really ought to ask about that present time problem another time." Oh yes, pcs can do anything they like and they will say things like this, you see, in a perfectly good situation. They have sort of taken over – because of anxiety for auditing and other things – they've taken over the idea of auditing and they're afraid some auditing is not going to occur And so they sort of merge up and something in the bank is this and that and they sort of say, "Well, I think you ought to ask about that one more, because I think there is one." And the auditor does ask that one more. And instantly, pshew! the bank collapses promptly and instantly on the pc.

---

6 Editor's note: This sentence is not on the 1991 audio tape, but at the same time is contained in the 1991 tape transcript. It is not clear if this is a mistake or if it was in the original recording and was cut out.
Got an ARC break. You never notice it, because it takes an hour or so to swell up, but the pc thereafter is running on auto. All you've got to do is take one direction from a PC and you collapse his bank on him. You must understand exactly how that occurs, you see?

Here's the PC and the auditor and the pc's bank. And the auditor plus the pc are greater than the bank. Now of course, the moment that the PC becomes the auditor, even to just any tiny degree, you no longer have the equation of auditor plus pc. You have the equation of PC plus pc-being-auditor, which of course still adds up only to one person – the PC. And of course this is not greater than the bank. So you get a collapse of the bank. And I do mean a collapse of the bank. You can make the bank go psheow! – just hit him in the face. Blango!

Now, just look this over, because it's the first time we've ever examined this mechanism, in spite of the fact the laws are some of the oldest laws we have. I think the only two laws earlier than that is: Survival is the dynamic principle of existence; and the purpose of the reactive mind, purpose of the analytical mind – those are the only laws that are earlier than these laws – I mean, in terms of time and development.

So, let's take another example. Auditor says, "Do you feel all right now, or do you feel too tired to go on?"

And the PC says, "I feel too tired to go on."

And the auditor says, "All right. We won't go on." At that exact instant, you've collapsed the pc's bank on him. I mean, it isn't a simple thing, that the Pc is suddenly dismayed or goes out of session or something like this. An actual mechanical fact happens – whether the PC perceives it or not – the bank collapses on the pc. Of course, because the bank is being held out, basically, and the PC is being held in position and the bank is being held in position only by the equation of auditor plus PC. The presence of the auditor drops and the auditor ceases – that's what we mean by "ceases to take responsibility for the session."

Now, that's an esoteric statement; it hasn't any mechanics with it that give you any explanation. But that is the primary method by which the auditor does not take responsibility for the session. And that is the exact mechanism by which an auditor gets into trouble – the exact mechanism. It's down there to a hairline.

All the auditor has got to say is, "Is it all right with you if we run this an hour and a half?"

And the pc says, "No, I don't think so."

And the auditor says, "Well, all right. Then we won't."

Well, on the surface of it, it is the socially acceptable, kindest thing you can do. The poor fellow feels tired, so we just won't go on with it. And at that moment, we just picked up the stew pot and hit him in the face with it. See, we collapsed the bank on him. The bank will collapse – can be counted on collapsing – instantly that this occurs. He'll get a reaction from the bank, bang!

That means actually, probably, that the Model Session should be rephrased on a discovery of this magnitude. But worry about it until you see it in an HCOB, because it may be
and it may not be. Because basically the Model Session is written up just to get the illusion of courtesy. [laughter]

I say, "Well, is it all right if we end this session now?"

And the pc says, "No, it's not all right. I'm having a great deal of trouble here and I'm struggling around," and so forth.

I say, "Well, all right. I've made a mistake, and we're now going to end the session." It's always all right with the pc. I decided to end the session. If I decide anything else now merely because the pc told me something else, I've had it, because the bank just will go splat! Now, if I don't want this pc to be butchered up, I certainly better stick by my own ideas of what I should be doing, no matter how wrongheaded or inopportune or upsetting those ideas may appear to be.

So you just have to take fate in your own two fists on such a situation. You say, "Is it all right if I end this session now?" It's courtesy.

And the pc says, "Well, yes, it's all right. Except I'm pretty far back on the track." All this is, is a comment to the effect that "Well, you knucklehead, you didn't ask me where I was on the track before you sprung this other one." Don't you see?

Well, if you now say, "Well, all right. We will run it ten minutes longer in order to get you up to present time," you've had it at once! You'll never get him to present time. Why won't you ever get him to present time? Because you just collapsed the whole track on him, that's why! And then you probably didn't do anything to reassume the control of the session. Do you see what happens?

So you just never, never, never, never do what the pc says. You just never do what the pc says. You just never do what the pc says. I don't care how logical it is; I don't care how wrong you are. If you've given him a totally wrong, upside-down, incorrect instruction, you can do something more wrong than that.

You know, English doesn't permit the deepening of the word wrong. You can't be "wronger," apparently, according to English. But boy, I'm telling you, you can be wronger. It doesn't matter how idiotic the auditing direction was, how noncompliable the auditing direction was – it just doesn't matter. If the pc now gives you some advice concerning it and you take that advice, you are promptly and at once wronger. You have just lost the control of the session, but that isn't what's important. Mechanically, you've collapsed the pc's bank on him.

You just must never do it! That's just something an auditor must never do. He says, "All right if I end this session now?"

And the pc says, "No, it isn't all right. I'm stuck down the track."

And the auditor says, "All right. I'll run the process for ten minutes longer." Well, this is the kindest, most sensible, decent thing you can do, isn't it? And it winds you up every time in the soup. Then you probably will spend the next five hours trying to end that session.

Why? Because you are no longer auditing the session; the pc is. You haven't got an auditor plus pc greater than the pc's bank, so the pc of course can't come up to present time, so
he just struggles. See? The mechanics are just dead against it. That's the way the reactive
mind is, not the way I think it is.

So that is a primary method of getting into trouble. A primary method is to violate that
original equation. Auditor plus pc must both be there in order to be greater than pc's bank, and
when the pc says to the auditor, "Advice, advice," and the auditor takes it, of course then at
once, immediately, instantly, then, the pc becomes quasily the auditor. He is running his own
bank on a via, he's no longer greater than the bank; it only takes a split second to happen –
he's in the soup. Got the idea?

Well, it isn't that pcs mustn't give advice to auditors. By all means as a pc give the
auditor all the advice in the world. [laughter] You understand? Give him all the advice in the
world. If he takes any part of it, he's a lousy auditor. That's all. Because he at once passes over
control of the session. It's something tantamount to walking out in front of the troops and
handing your sword over, see? I mean, it's something of this order of magnitude. Promptly
and at once you've lost the war and that is it. There's going to be reparations charged and the
United States will be sending three-quarters of the national income over to rehabilitate the
country. But if the United States doesn't hear about it, then nobody is going to rehabilitate
anything.

Now, there's the whole situation in controlling a session. And there's the primary diffi-
culty an auditor runs into. Once more, it looks like pure kindness and it turns out to be total
viciousness.

All right. Let's take up one more point here. You can also put a pc at responsibility for
the session by a bunch of "pcs ought to;" and individual considerations about what ought to
be going on. This is a little more esoteric, but becomes less so when I say something like this
(this also comes under escape as a philosophy): "Well, he ought to be able to get out of that
very easily." See, the auditor says, "Well, he couldn't be in any great trouble. He ought to be
able to get out of that very easily."

Well, you see, what did he do? Even if he did it silently to himself, he says immedi-
ately, "Well, the PC is responsible for the condition he's in." And you will find the one plus
one greater than the bank also operates. That promptly operates, and the bank will cease to
behave. It's quite esoteric; it's quite odd.

You say, "Well, pc shouldn't be in that much trouble. A man of that age shouldn't have
all of those difficulties with women. After all, after you've lived for forty or fifty years, you
certainly should know something about women." You know, something like this. You have
some kind of a little unkind thought of this character. But it's an "ought to be," you see? And
you have just shifted responsibility for the session over to the pc, just as neatly as though
you'd suddenly crowned him with laurel wreaths. You see how you'd do that?

The Pc "ought to;" the pc "shouldn't ought to." Now, here's a whole class of things,
you see? "The pc shouldn't be screaming at me." Well, that would be the best way in the
world to bring the scream up four more decibels. Don't you see? That would operate at once
to put this PC at cause. So, of course, immediately eliminates and deletes the auditor plus Pc
over bank. It eliminates the auditor and of course, collapses the bank on the pc. You get how
this would work, you see? The pc "ought to;" "shouldn't ought to."
"Well, men are always like that." That isn't so bad, that type of consideration – it just
denotes an inability to do something about it, so an apathetic acceptance of a condition which
one is confronting. Well, this merely lowers control over the pc's bank slightly; it's not a very
great thing. Well, that doesn't amount to a great deal. It's when you really drop it out; when
you really say, "Well, the pc should be" or "the pc shouldn't be," or something of this sort –
Bang! You see, you've gone into the same old violation of this original rule.

No, a pc is doing what the pc is doing. And the pc ought to be doing what the pc is do-
ing. You see? And the pc oughtn't to be doing the things the pc isn't doing. And the pc does
what the pc does. You get the idea? And considerations as to what the pc should be doing up
on top of this, of course, interrupt responsibility for making the pc do something. You get the
idea?

Now, of course, so long as your intentions are totally wrapped up in what the pc ought
to be doing with inspecting pictures and so forth; you, of course, are making this occur! You
are doing this, you see, so it isn't an "ought to be" or a "shouldn't be" or something like this,
see? The pc is going up and down the track and around the bank. Well, he ought to be doing
these things, you see? And you know that he should be doing these things and he knows that
he should be doing these things. He should be following the auditing command and you know
that he should be following the auditing command, and all that sort of thing.

I'm not talking about that class of thing. I'm talking about another class entirely; that
instead of making the pc do or become what you want the pc to do or become, you add this
sneak one into it, you see? The pc "ought to," you know.

And you sort of said faintly to yourself, "Well, I'm not doing anything about it, and he
shouldn't really be upset about that ARC break. That's really nonsense. He shouldn't be upset
about it. He shouldn't be – oh well, it's a... Well, he shouldn't have that present time problem,
not now. We've only got two hours here and, God, he shouldn't have this present time prob-
lem. No, no. Heavens on earth."

No, the pc has got what he's got, don't you see? You just look at what the pc's got, and
then you can go ahead and you and the pc can make him "got" something else, don't you see,
with greatest of ease. But if the pc "ought to" without any further action on your part, of
course what do you wind up with? You wind up with a collapsed bank. Is that clear to you?
That is not as serious or as general as the other.

Now, Q and A – Q and A. Every time the pc says something you follow it, is the most
prevalent method of Q and A.

You say, "Well, how's your mother? How's that about your mother now?"

And "Well, it's not my mother now, it's my father."

"Well, how about your father?"

"Well, it's not my father so much, it's ... My father's okay, but it's actually my Aunt
Bessie."

"Oh, well. Well, all right. Now, how does that apply to your Aunt Bessie?" And by the
time you've done this of course, you of course are doing two things. You're letting the pc spot
what you ought to be auditing – you've dropped responsibility then – and you of course permitted him to escape from the original questions and you haven't followed it through. You're permitting the pc to escape. And the pc will go along a whole sequence and series of escapes. And if you follow along this sequence of escapes without ever once saying, "Whoa, now, pc! I asked you about Pop. I want to know about Pop and I'm not interested in Aunt Bessie. Now, Pop!" You can say it as rough as you want to. It won't affect the pc, because he knows confoundedly well that's what he ought to be doing.

And he says, "Oh, oh, oh, oh, I – ha-ha-ha-ha. Fly cops are on my trail, and I didn't get a chance to duck up that alley. Well, I guess I just better not. So that and I better come back here and take a look at Pop. Okay. Well now, what did you want to know about Father?"

You say, "Well, all right. I just wanted to know how that was about Father?" "All right. Well, it's all right about Father."

"Now, what else about this? Yeah, well, how is it all right about Father?" "Oh, kill the son of a bitch as quick as look at him, that's how all right it is about Father," and so forth, see.

"Oh," you say, "well, all right. Now, you got a picture there or something"

"Well, sure I got a picture there! What else do you think I have?"

"You've had a picture there?"

"Oh, yes, of course I've had a picture there!"

"Well, all right. Now, what don't you know about it?"

"Well, I don't know this and I don't know that and I don't know that and don't know that and don't know that and don't know that, there, there, there, and ..."

"What else don't you know about it?"

"Well, I don't know so-and-so."

"All right. That's fine. Now, you still got a picture there of your father?" "No."

"All right. Now, how about your father?"

"Well, all right. Take him or leave him."

"Okay. All right. Now, we'll go on to something else."

Got the idea?

The pc never wants to handle what you want him to handle. You can just put it down – he never wants to handle what you want him to handle. I don't know a pc yet that will handle exactly what you want him to handle! When a pc sits there smiling sweetly, I get very, very suspicious.

I say, "What are you looking at?"

He said, "The same incident you told me to look at."

"Yeah, well, what incident was that?"

"Oh, this incident about picking these flowers out here in the field."
And I say, "No, we had an incident there about burning down a house. What happened to that?"

"Oh, you caught me. Oh, well, all right. Burning down a house," and so forth. And somewhat grumpily they'll go back in and look at it. But they don't like you when you let them escape, because they know way down deep that it's wrong. They know way down deep that it's wrong. They know the road out is the way through, and the road out is not a bounce.

The guy has been running away for two hundred trillion years; and he's looking for somebody to stand and hold the ground and say, "All right. Let's pick up these devils one by one and fight them down."

He will say, "That is the most horrifying, shuddering thought that anybody has ever pushed in my direction, but I know damn well he's speaking sooth." [laughter]

Now, it actually hasn't worked for the last two hundred trillion years – running away. So, he says, "Well, here's a picture."

And you say, "Good. Got any other pictures?"

"(Ah, these guys are going to let me run away.) All right. Yeah, I got some other pictures."

"Good, you got any other pictures in there?"

"Oh, yes, I've got some other pictures in there."

"Oh, yeah. Well, how's your father?"

"All right, fine."

"And how's your mother?"

"Okay. Fine. Oh, yes," and so forth. And the fellow says, "Well, it wasn't my mother I was thinking about, actually. It was my Aunt Bessie."

"Oh, well, how's your Aunt Bessie?"

And the pc right at that time says to himself, way down deep someplace, "That's all we're going to do now is escape, and I know that it isn't the road out." So he has ARC breaks because he knows he's not getting auditing.

It's a very funny thing. Not overwhelming a pc, not pounding him down.

Pc says, "I have to go to the bathroom."

You say, "You damn well sit there and don't go to the bathroom," and so forth.

And the pc says, "Well, I have to go to the bathroom, it's a present time problem," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, I'm not going to let you go to the bathroom till 4:30. That's the end of session and that's the end of it," and so forth.

Well, you keep this kind of thing up forever and eventually the pc gets an overwhelm. He's pounded into a position. See, all of this stuff is moderated with reason, don't you see?
That isn't any kind of a session direction. Pc says he has to go to the bathroom. All right, say, "Go to the bathroom." All right. Now go into session. You'll find he's slightly out when he comes back. So put him into session again; put him into session again with a crunch.

But five minutes later he says, "I have to go to the bathroom."

You say, "I've heard that before. We're now going on with the session." He'll be back in processing again.

Invalidation is the basic overwhelm. The pc says, "Oh, it was my father doing all this!"

And the auditor says, "It couldn't possibly have been your father." You get the idea? Now, there's where overwhelm comes from: invalidation.

Pc says, "I think it's an automobile mechanic. I think it is."

"Couldn't possibly be an automobile mechanic," you know?

You could run a whole case, possibly, by saying, "Who's been invalidated?"

See? What's death? Death is invalidation – invalidation of a terminal. What's sickness? Invalidation of a terminal. What's punishment? Invalidation of a terminal. I mean, all things add up more or less to the invalidation of a terminal, don't they? And as a result, why, you've got a button there that you've got to lay off of, which is just invalidation.

Pc says, "It's made out of green soup."

You say, "All right. Solid green soup." As far as he's concerned, that's the way it is. It's just that's the way it is.

And this sort of a matter-of-fact situation is – in a few minutes the pc says, "I made a mistake. It is not green soup." The wrong thing to do is to tell him, "Why, I could have told you that earlier." [laughter]

You're taking him on a tour of a bank. You're getting him familiar with various things by various mechanisms. He'll wind up in the other end not afraid.

Now, what basically then, would best answer up these conditions? Certainly not escape. Don't let him escape. Make him face it up. You're always safe.

Pc starts using rudiments for escape – omit them. Always the better choice is to audit – always the better choice.

If the pc gives you directions as to what you ought to be doing in the session, give him the cheeriest acknowledgment he ever received and go right on doing what you were doing. Don't ever shift. Now is the time not to shift, because you've run into some kind of a valence or a machine which tells you "Change, change, change, change" and you start going change, change, change with the pc, it's a Q and A, and of course you're going to get no place at the other end.

Now, these are very important considerations in auditing. And if an auditor were to do these things, pay attention to them and handle those things, he actually could be quite ignorant of some other facets of technology and he'd still win. He'd be right in there pitching.
No, there is no substitute whatsoever for having a reality on the bank. There is no substitute for it at all, because now you know what's happening to the pc, you know where his attention is, you know where he's going, you know what he's doing. And you don't make the mistake of believing he's in present time and this is all a social chitchat that we're indulging in. We've known auditors who have thought auditing was that, and they always, of course, wound up with pcs with no gain and tremendous ARC breaks and rudiments out all the time and that sort of thing, because the pc's attention was never in session.

The basics of auditing, however, require that the pc feel able to talk to the auditor, so you don't necessarily shut the pc off about things like this or directions like this. You let the pc tell you. But it's a great oddity that when the pc has told you that the process is wrong and that he's having difficulty answering it – it would be a great oddity if, when you acknowledge this, and you say, "All right. I'm sorry, but that's the process we cleared, and here is the next auditing command." And the pc will say, "Oh, hell," then he'll go on and audit it. And you'll wind up, oddly enough, without any much of an ARC break.

But you say, "Well, now let's see; let's just shift the process. He says he can't answer this, so let's change the wording of the process." And of course, don't be amazed that for the remainder of the session, and maybe for the next couple of sessions, you get absolutely no change of case. Why? There's no auditor there. Why? Because the pc did the auditing.

So these various considerations are right there amongst the fundamentals, and they're things to pay a great deal of attention to. And if a pc is moving through a bank you should have some idea that people can get stuck on the track. And you'll get an idea of "other time-ness" than here and that things can happen, and that somatics and so forth are directly connected with pictures (which they are) and that sort of thing. There's no substitute for that sort of thing.

And in training auditors, one of the things you should always ask an auditor is, "Well, do you have any reality on an engram? Do you know what an engram is? You ever seen one? You ever had a somatic out of one?" Not necessarily "Have you ever had sonic?" or something like this, but "Have you ever seen one of these engrams?" and so forth. "Well, have you ever had a moment there when you were on the track when you did not quite know what was happening?"

"Oh yes. Yes, yes, I have. Yeah, ooh-oooh, yeah, ooh, well, sure, yeah. I was running this one about elephants and these elephants were walking all over me. Goddamn it. And I don't think it ever got flattened. Feel an elephant's footprint on my chest right now."

Ah, this is a safe auditor. Why? He's not running a big philosophy of "escape, escape, escape is the road out," don't you see?

If you asked this auditor, you say, "Well now, have you had any reality on the track?"

"Well, I've read about it in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health."

"Well, have you ever run into an incident? Have you ever run into an engram?"

"No. No, I know they exist, intellectually. I have good intellectual reality on them. Ron wouldn't lie to me about that." [laughter]
No matter how kind this auditor appears, this auditor is not safe as an auditor. Why? Because this auditor practices escape. That is the only reason why the auditor has never seen an engram, you see? So if they've practiced the escape from the bank, they have practiced the escape in auditing, and they will yank pcs out of session. Okay?

These various considerations are very pertinent to training, to auditing, to understanding; and I give them to you at a time when they're easily remediable. There is no difficulty with these things. I'm not citing you any 120-foot board fence that you have to climb over with your fingernails. That process which I gave you is the most revealing process to somebody who has no reality on the track. That is most revealing. They say, "Ooh, wow," you know? "This is what I've been pulling people out of. And it was a good thing I did, too!"

[laughter]

Okay. Well, possibly many interpretations could be made of this particular lecture. But just remember that it, too, just means exactly what it says, which is do the auditing, get the show on the road, get the most auditing done in the least time that you can – your pcs will be very happy with you and they won't ARC break, either.

And you'll be amazed how seldom you have to put the rudiment in. When you come into session, you bang yourself down in a chair, you move the pc's chair slightly. You tell him, "Sit there. Hold the cans. All right. We are now going to start a session. Start of session. Good. Now, process we left unflat yesterday was so-and-so and so-and-so. The first auditing command is..." – bang! Pc will say (pant!) [laughter]... He'll say, "But wait a minute. I'm not even in-session. You haven't run any rudiments. You haven't done any this or that." "The first auditing command is..." – bang! "Answer it, answer it, answer it. Answer it!"

The pc says, "Well, let's see. What is it again?"

"You heard it. Answer it." [laughter]

"N-ohhh-uh... Yep, what unknown stomach. What unknown stomach."

You say, "Good. What unknown stomach don't you know nothing about?" [laughter]

The pc answers the auditing question. Chops back at you maybe a little bit here and there – says, "Boy, this is rough, man. You're rough, rough, rough, you know? Do you realize I'm stuck all over the track here; I got everything all messed up; I don't know whether I'm going or coming. And you just keep pouring these auditing commands at me."

You say, "Good. Here's the next one."

Pc, at the end of twenty-five hours – he may or may not tell you anything about it – goes around and tells the D of P or another student or somebody like this, "My God, that person certainly gets a lot of auditing done! We've certainly had a lot of auditing done. Yes sir, that person really will audit." And the whole aspect of the thing changes.

Now, I'm not recommending that you let the rudiments be out; I'm not recommending these various things. I'm just giving you the frame of mind in which sessions run well, and they do run well when they do that.
When the pc says, "I think I ought to be running something else," you say, "You probably should be. But right now we're running so-and-so."

Pc is all ARC breaky about not running something else: "But my last auditor... But my last auditor was running a five-way bracket on Mother, and it was never flattened. And I just keep telling you this, that it was never flattened."

You say, "Well, all right." And at this point you might think to yourself, "Well, maybe I ought to ask what part of it isn't flattened. What was the auditor's name?" Something of the sort. And, man, you are handling a twelve-inch stick of inch-thick dynamite with the fuse lighted. This is a booby trap; don't fall for it.

You say, "Well, good. Good." Even cheer him up. Say, "Well, I hope it gets flattened someday." [laughter]

I think you'll find that this is the winning card. And if you look this over and you follow some part of this and you get an understanding of this, why, I think you will get some fantastic auditing gains, and your days of loses will simply be in the long-distant past. Okay?

Thank you.

_Audience: Thank you._
AUDITING QUALITY

A lecture given on 30 August 1961

Thank you. Well, this is the what?

Audience: 30th.

Let's see if you're right – by George, you are. 30th of August, AD 11. The year of the Clears.

All right. There's probably a lot of questions you'd like to ask. The first question you should like to ask is whether or not if running an auditing session is so important, why, then that omits all of the rudiments, doesn't it? Well, I said yesterday, you see, that if – the – if you had to choose between the two, why, you'd run a session. And if the pc rudiments were very upsetting to the pc, and so forth, and he felt he was getting no place with rudiments, and so forth, of course you have a pc out of session, but I said there is an adjudicative thing here.

There is a point where you can have far too much rudiments, you get the idea, and far too little session. And there is also – and I said this yesterday and I want to point it up again – there's also a point where you can have far too little rudiments.

Now, if you expect 1A... I just got a subjective reality on this just a little while ago. If you expect 1A to handle all the present time problems and, therefore, not handle a present time problem which the pc has given you to be handled, every now and then you're going to make a terrible mistake. Every now and then you're going to make a terrible mistake, because you can put it down that a present present time problem – you know, short duration present time problem – is not necessarily handled at all by any process in 1A. You got that? You got that?

Here's an example. I just had this, matter of fact. Pc comes into session, gives the auditor a goal. He wants to get rid of a present time problem – and life and livingness – says, "Well, I'd like to get this particular person out of my hair," you got the idea? One, two. Rudiments are run, needle falls off the pin on a present time problem. Auditor goes ahead and runs 1A. Net result, no session. Why? Well, 1A is not addressed to the present time problem, so one doesn't feel that the auditor is participating at all in the auditing of the case.

The permissive wandering around looking at unknowns or present time problems or something of this sort – particularly a 1A version in which no problem is ever mentioned; you know, just "Look at unknowns, look at unknowns, look at unknowns" – and a pc could very well go out of session, very thoroughly. You see, he's really got it bugged. He doesn't want anything to do with this present time problem, so actually he's sitting there in a state of no-confront. You got the idea? So, of course, you run a permissive process, he will not then confront the present time problem even though he wants to get away from it. You see, he just bounces off the problem, and he's running a – you're running a case who has a present time
problem in wild restimulation. Got the idea? But of course, the reason he's got a present time problem is he doesn't want to confront some part of it.

So, naturally, you're permitting the pc, then, to do a non-confront on the present time problem even while you think you are busy running a process which handles all problems, so we won't bother it. You see, the very problem that he will not have anything to do with is a present time problem which he told you he wanted to get rid of and that you found in the rudiments.

Therefore, 1A does not scoop up a present time problem. You got it? Present time problem of a short duration, something like this, or actually a present time problem of long duration has a great deal of no-confront mixed up in it. And you got this tremendous quantities of no-confront. All right, you run a permissive process on that exact subject, the auditor is then not controlling the pc. And the only thing that comes through to the pc is that the session is not controlled.

You see how that would be? Quite interesting. Quite interesting. But, all of these things are subject to judgment. The safe way to play any auditing session, of course, is to have all your rudiments in, to get all of your rudiments in.

Now, I didn't say that you couldn't run a 1A-type process immediately against that exact present time problem. But the auditor is in there making the pc confront it, see. So that isn't then 1A. You're using a 1A-type process to handle a present time problem with a pc, which is what fell on the meter, and, of course, the pc'll be getting someplace if you did this.

Well now, a pc never feels he's wasting his time if the auditor is fulfilling one of his goals. It's when the present time problem, the handling of it, is absolutely no goal to the pc, and the pc sits down and hopes to God he doesn't have a present time problem. He isn't really aware of having one, but he hopes to God he won't have one. He wants to get on with his Pre-hav run on the goals terminal and get the show on the road, and all of a sudden the auditor looks up and he's got that moving-needle-look in his eye. [laughter] And the pc says, with faint heart and despair creeping over him, "Oh, no, there isn't a present time problem here?"

And the auditor says, "Oh," he says brightly, "yes, there is."

Well, the pc says, "Well I don't know what it could be."

And the auditor says, "Well, let's see what it is."

Now, the only thing that'd get you over that barrier is smart auditing. Pc says – he knows dimly they're going to repossess his car tomorrow or something of the sort and he doesn't want to think about it.

Well, I'll clue you: If you pass that up or if you pass up any falling rudiment, or any reacting rudiment, you've just set yourself up for no session. That's why there's judgment involved in this thing. It's one of these horrible facts of life. Every once in a while, why, Mama will get daughter and take her down, and sit down in the kitchen, pour her a cup of coffee and let her in about men. The horrible facts of life, you see. Or tell her about Father.

And this is – this is an analogous sort of thing, you know. "Yes, Gwendolyn, you were actually born in a cabbage patch. You weren't born, really, at all. You were found there." And
it's just one of the brutal things you have to face about auditing, is that as you come down the line you've got rudiments to cover. If your rudiments are out, assessment cannot occur, and also you're going to set up problems and trouble in the auditing session. Pc has a present time problem. Present time problem isn't handled, the immediate next result is an ARC break. I mean it goes one, two. ARC breaks always stem from a present time problem. The present time problem, however, should not be looked at by the auditor as always exterior to the auditing session.

If you preconceive what a present time problem should be, well, that's just an ought-to-be that you're running on the pc, don't you see. What is a present time problem?

I remember in one ACC I startled all of the students by finding that 50 percent of the class had present time problems known as an auditing session. It was the auditing session which was the present time problem to the pc, but nobody had ever inquired about an auditing session. I think it was the 18th. Nobody had ever inquired about an auditing session.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"Well, yes, and yes, and so...." and they didn't know, and the auditor would guess at this and that, and the pc didn't know and the pc would be saying, "Oh, my God, don't tell me we really have to run a present time problem here. I want to get on with this Help on the Rock," and so on, and this was the way it was going, you see. But factually, the session itself had some present time problem factors in it and none of the auditors ever sorted these things out.

I looked over a few shoulders and realized that what was going on here is, the idea of asking for a present time problem sometimes restimulated a present time problem which was dormant up to the point it was asked for. And that can happen, too, you know. The pc's sitting there, he's minding his own business, he's being a pc, everything is going along just dandy, and splendidly, and he hasn't got a care in the world. And all he wants is an auditing session, and then the auditor says these fatal words, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "Let's see, now. Oh God, yes, yeah, oh-oh, yeah."

But he – would it – he'd tell you at the same time, "I wouldn't have unless you'd have asked me." You see, present time problem wasn't worrying him, and he sort of postulates it into view as a present time problem. You get the idea? Actually, he probably could have gone on to the end of the session and straight on out, and he never would have thought of the fact that he's supposed to take cake home to his mother-in-law, you know. It's always a present time problem to give something to your mother-in-law.

Well, I was very shocked one day. I was around and found out that this ancient joke about mother-in-laws wasn't necessarily true. I found a husband who was very enamored with his mother-in-law and hated his wife. [laughter] He and his mother-in-law got along fine, you know? Used to go around to the dances and everything. Anyhow, wife was very disapproving of the whole thing.

Anyway, he's got to take cake home to his wife and he hadn't thought of it, and he probably wouldn't have thought of it, except it's labeled under the heading of "problem." "Do you have a problem?"
And he sort of thinks to himself, "Problem – that's something that you're supposed to do something about. Am I supposed to do something? Yes, I am supposed to do something. I was supposed to take cake home to my wife. Well, God, I'll have to sit here for the rest of the session and remember this now, because I'd comfortably forgotten it, of course, and never intended to take any cake home to my wife." You know, some kind of a weird, oddball combination goes through, and a present time problem charges into view that wouldn't have been into view. So the subject is – sorts out amongst the facts of life.

The rudiments are dangerous ground.

Saw a picture the other day of a Ford Interceptor motor-powered boat. All the advertisement was about a Ford Interceptor motor going up the Grand Canyon, going up the Colorado River at some fantastic rate of speed. And the ad was all about this motor, see. It's had me in total mystery ever since. You talk about a not-know! What the hell kind of a boat is this that can go at about thirty or forty miles an hour up against the Grand Canyon, banging its stern and so forth, and it's bows onto rocks at a high rate of speed, don't you see, and actually make it 365 miles upriver? And the other thing is, who the hell did that? [laughter] You know? Had me in mystery ever since. I got a record up here that says the "Grand Canyon Suite," or something of the sort, and I sat there and during the whole time, you see, I couldn't hear the music at all. I was thinking about this Ford Interceptor going up the Grand Canyon. [laughs] Stuck me in total mystery.

But if I'd never seen the advertisement, I wouldn't be worried about it, you got the idea? And I'd probably be able to enjoy the "Grand Canyon Suite," and life would be marvelous. When somebody shoves this advertisement under your nose, you know, and you're being audited, and – so help me Pete, we never have realized before there was such an unknown, such a mess about it, and we postulate at that moment that it is a problem, and then we go on and have to handle it as a problem, and this becomes very boring. And we find tremendous amounts of auditing are being consumed on present time problems. And this itself – now listen carefully – is the only present time problem: getting auditing.

So it solves very nicely that the pc who is a – gets bugged every time you say to him, "Well, do you have a present time problem?" He says, "Oh, my God, oh yeah, oh yeah, I do. Hmm," and so forth. The only thing you're running into is scarcity of auditing. The pc is afraid he isn't going to get audited. There's a tremendous scarcity of auditing. All right, that amounts to a present time problem, so you have a pc there trying to make two sessions out of every one session. And as a result you get very slow gain.

There are numerous games that men play. You go out here on the golf course, other places, and you'll find they're playing all sorts of games. The Scots invented this game because it only requires one ball. And you'll find these fellows out there, and they have such an anxiety to hit the ball right that they go into the woods, the trees, knock the caddie off on the 18th hole when they're playing hole number 7, you see. But they have this terrific anxiety. I've heard pro after pro say, "Relax! Now just relax and go through the motions."

Every once in a while the fellow wouldn't have anything on his mind, and he would accidentally step up to the ball and go through all the proper motions and there goes a 265-yard drive, you know, right down the middle of the fairway, you know, right on to the other
green. One small putt and he's in. He's got an eagle, you know! Well, his anxiety now sets in. How did he do it? [laughter] So he's got a new anxiety.

I suppose golf pros never, never, never would get rid of this anxiety problem because otherwise they'd never have any pupils, don't you see. Because this particular pressure – you know, "have got to do it," "have got to get it," "have to press, to press" – somehow or another is just too much, you see. And it gets everybody upset and then they have to have golf lessons, of course, to overcome this but, of course, the golf lesson doesn't ever overcome it. It's quite remarkable when you look at it. The anxiety to do right often winds up, you see, in a total fiasco. You're just so anxious to do right, you see, that you wind it up and it's just a total fiasco, you know. The ball is in the woods and the pc is flat on his back weeping silently to himself someplace, you know, and there's been no session, no golf game or anything. It's just anxiety.

Well, it's the postulate. The trick is, about golf – and you'll understand it about auditing – the trick is – is a very simple trick: The guy has already postulated he can't do it. He must have, if he feels nervous about it. He's postulated that he can't do it, you see. So this fellow has an idea that he can't have a session before he starts getting worried about trying to have a session. So it's – it's just a red flag that's hanging up there with storm warnings from the truck to the foot of the mast. It's very obvious if you'll take a look at it. Anybody who starts pressing on the rudiments has a present time problem called "How am I going to get audited?"

So don't – from here on just don't worry about that phenomenon. You go down the rudiments – I say, well, it's one of the facts of life that you have to face that you have to go down the rudiments. And you go down the rudiments – don't make a big deal out of it – but you get to the present time problem, the pc starts sighing and moaning, and so forth, and he didn't know he had one and now he's got one. Don't you see what he's doing? He's trying to have a session and of course, this triggers the fact that he can't have a session, so the best way not to have a session is to have a present time problem that is mixed up in the session, and "Oh, my God, I don't want a present time ..." Well, what does all this add up to? Don't you see. It adds up explicitly, instantly to the fact that he has a scarcity of auditing. He's got such a scarcity that it's very, very valuable, therefore, it has to be done terribly, terribly right, do you see. And he's got to get the most session he can possibly get into that unit of time.

Well, he's pressing so hard as a pc that he will actually sit there and do additional commands and try to make a session out of it in some oddball way. And you the auditor often sit there watching a pc getting audited, not realizing that the pc cannot do the auditing command. But the pc is pressing so hard, trying to make a session out of it because of the scarcity of auditing, that he doesn't give any real evidence of not being able to do the auditing command. There's something wrong with the auditing command. There's something undoable about the session. And yet he's in there trying to make a session out of it.

Now, maybe you could do the process, but that is no criterion on whether or not the pc can do the process, don't you see. So he'll inevitably substitute a process in there that he can do in some fashion or another; he'll put additional auditing answers in there or commands in there or something of the sort, trying to make a session out of it. And all this comes under the
heading of "trying to make a session out of it." And if you've got a pc around who is desper-
ately trying to make a session out of it, you have a pc who has a present time problem called
the scarcity of auditing.

Now, it's perfectly all right, right off your bat to call for that one. Only it sometimes
may be phrased as a scarcity of treatment. You get one off the street – raw meat walks in off
the street, and so forth and you say this person has never been audited before, how could he
possibly have a scarcity of auditing? Well, of course, he's got then the greatest scarcity of
auditing there is: he's never had any; he's never even heard of it. But the point is, he does have
a scarcity of treatment.

There is a terrible scarcity of effective treatment. As a matter of fact it has been zero
on this planet as nearly as I can trace for about fifty thousand years. It's just been zero. There
was always a repercussion on the treatment. You go into the Aesculapian temple and they
slipped you the hellebore, and after you've had your fit and your dream and a few things like
that, why, you were all cured. You didn't have paraclosis, or something, but you certainly did
have – you went on having these fits. You get the idea, you know. And keep having these
dreams and these fits, and that's worse than the paraclosis, you know, and all these things.

So you go to a medico, and the medico, he cuts out your zorch and there you are:
you're zorchless. And you say, "Well, that was good. That was awful good to get rid of that
zorch, the horrible things it was doing," and so forth. Only now you're operating without a
zorch. And this'll catch up with you sooner or later because the body is designed to be run
with a zorch.

Every once in a while the medico elects some part of the body as dispensable. And
now it's tonsils, now it's appendix, now it's this, now it's that, now it's something else. One of
these days they'll elect the head.

And the – the general situation as far as this is concerned, of course, is – is a conse-
quence to treatment. So treatments which have consequence make, of course, effective treat-
ment very scarce. Bad treatment makes effective treatment very scarce, naturally. The person
is then frightened of having any treatment. He's frightened of having any treatment because
he's had so much ineffective treatment. Got the idea? I mean that's – in other words, some-
boby has run a "can't-have" on him.

You know, the medico up here with the chromium plated, zitherproof operating thea-
ter, where only two colleges of surgeons and eight universities full of students are cheering in
the amphitheaters as he delicately amputates a zorch. You know, nice, quiet, orderly operative
procedures, you see. And everybody knocked out cold unable to perceive anything that's go-
ing on, you know. And it's a real ball, you know. And you wake up in the hospital room with
no awareness of having gotten to the hospital room and you say what happened and you fum-
ble around and, by God, you've got no zorch. You know, something of this sort.

And you lie there and you can hear the blood dripping on the floor; nurse comes
around on her midnight rounds (she's been out having tea or something of the sort). You go
up at this local abattoir, pardon me, hospital, [laughter] and you find – you find accident cases
and everything else just trundled into the front room, you know, and skipped. And hours and
hours and hours will go by. Nobody ever comes near them. You think I'm kidding you but that's the way she rolls.

All right. Now, the more instances of that a person has committed, the more instances of that, you see, that they have received, why, the less treatment there is. Of course, because these things aren't treatment. So you can actually get somebody who gets terribly anxious for hospital treatment because he's never had any treatment in a hospital, you got the idea? He's kept going to hospitals but they never treated anything. And he just gets into a total anxiety, you know. He wants treatment, he can't have treatment, and – and there it goes. And he'll get into a terrific wingding. So it makes quite a problem. And it goes over into auditing. And auditing would almost inevitably have its roots in circa twentieth century maltreatment, instead of treatment, you see. Punishment instead of treatment.

They do some remarkable things of one kind or another. I myself have run into a few head-on. Had some sinusitis one time so they started pulling teeth, that was a great one. Had nothing to do with it, either. Became obvious even to the medicos a short time later, you know.

I was in a hospital one time and my stomach wall wouldn't heal. Been messed up. And so they kept feeding me custard. And after about the 465th custard, I just had some kind of an inkling – I was coming around a little bit. Actually, what was wrong with me was I was utterly exhausted. I'd just been in combat theater after combat theater, you see, with no rest, no nothing between. And it sort of came to me that this was not the sort of a diet that I myself would select of my own free choice. [laughter]

So I used to slide out with a good-looking nurse, and – beg your pardon, she was a WAVE. And she knew where there was a wonderful Chinese noodle parlor. And so after I'd eat my custard, she would come in and we would go out the back gate and we'd go down and I'd have several egg foo yungs. And you know, soothing things like sweet and sour pork, you know, and so forth. I started to feel better, started to get back on my feet again. And it was those custards – I kept telling the doctors, you see – those custards were absolutely marvelous, particularly when served in Chinese restaurants under some other name. You weren't supposed to eat anything else, you see.

So then finally, finally, through the connivance of a couple of hospital corpsmen and several pals in the Marine, why, I got the wrong meal ticket issued to me, and there was a special diet table where they fed people nothing but steak! [laughter] So I do know where all the steaks went that the civilians didn't get, because they were all served at that table. Huge piles of steaks would come in, you see, and I'd demolish four or five of these steaks and feel much better.

The medicos never found out about this. And I finally got restored to duty, "Certified for continental limits of the United States only. To stay where a proper diet and ration and adequate rest are assured." And of course, the next piece of paper back of that says, "Ordered to the Fifth Amphibious Force," you see. [laughter]

And next hospital, just same sort of nonsense going on in all directions. I walked in the front door under protest and they said, "Go to bed."
And I said, "Why?" And I said, "I feel perfectly all right, and beside I have a date tonight in Monterey."

And they said, "Well, Monterey is much too far away, and you're going to bed." And the nurses around there – these girls that got turned down for the women's teams on the Olympics, you know, they're really husky – and so I went to bed and, by damn, they put me there for two weeks. There was nothing wrong with me. I was just supposed to report to the hospital. Two weeks I spend in bed. Of course, you know me, I wasn't two weeks in bed, but that was what the orders said. Their windows open from the bottom and the top.

But after a while, you get – the dim notion starts to penetrate, you see, that there's no treatment available. You just get this dim notion. It somehow or other enters from – like a ray of light, through the upper windows of the cathedral. And it goes into your medulla oblongata and it goes splank! And you'd say, "There is no treatment being offered in any direction for anything. What do you know!" So you start checking around and find out this is true. Of course, immediately it's a "can't-have" on treatment of various kinds whatsoever.

Sometimes quite the reverse has happened. Some kid's born in a family that they're all sold on the idea that if you bite rattlesnakes or, I don't know, something, you know – I'm indiscriminate as to races. If you just bite enough rattlesnakes, why, you develop strong teeth, or something like that. And this kid happens to have very soft teeth, and they need to be pulled every now and then and nobody ever pulls his teeth.

There are probably people in this room who had parents who had bugs on the subject of medical treatment. Either you had to go and get treated – particularly right in the middle of the basketball season or something of the sort – or you must never go and get treated, you see. Both of these two extremes result in, of course, no treatment. So it gets to be a problem. And it's carried over into auditing. Just the long and the short of the thing. It's carried over desperately into auditing.

Where you've had ineffective healing practices running on a planet for a while, nobody thinks anything can happen. So that's a terrific scarcity, don't look at it in any other way, you see. The – a "no treatment at all" could be a total scarcity, don't you see, but it still adds up to scarcity. And now we're back to Scientology 8-8008, scarcity and abundance in all things, and that applies to treatment, and that's the present time problem to the pc who's having trouble in an auditing session.

This pc will get up to this kind of a state where he'll demand auditing and won't have it when he gets it. All of that stems immediately and directly from the present time problem of the scarcity of treatment. How do you handle such a thing? Well, handle it in any present time problem process. It is a present time problem of long duration because, of course, it's this lifetime. There's nothing to it, you just handle it. Just as you would any present time problem. Only you get it phrased – and the pc probably never thought of this as the present time problem back of all the present time problems he has every time you mention present time problem to him, see. He never thought of any part of this, so you've got to introduce some innuendo along about this point. It's not evaluation, it's innuendo.

And you innuendo him into the cognition that "My God, auditing is scarce!" Of course, you can run such a process as, "What auditing session have you been unable to con-
"What unknown in an auditing session would you want to escape from?" You can use any process that has to do with present time problems and wind up at the other end with the pc with no more problem about having present time problems. That would be the way to cure this particular phenomenon and manifestation.

Also the pc who continuously has present time problems has obviously not told you anything about his present time problem. It goes back to this: Those things that are known are not aberrative. That's where it goes. That's a very blunt, blanket, wide, wild statement. Even though I, myself, and you customarily forget that particular facet of Scientology. That is a fact: That which is not known is the only aberrative factor.

Those factors which are known are not aberrative. The individual sits there and he says, "Oh, well," he says, "I know, I know what's wrong with me, it's my mother. And she used to just be cross with me day and night, and made me drink Horlicks. And I did nothing but drink Horlicks from the time I was one to the time I was twelve, and I know that's what's wrong with me." Well, you can just write it off, right that moment. You just write it off, just overtly. There is one track where we know nothing is wrong with the pc. Horlicks and Mama. You get the idea?

Of course, now after a while in auditing, you start revealing certain factors in the pc and your processes begin to reveal certain things to him. Those things which are half-known can still have the unknown portion of the half-known, you see, producing difficulty. You see? So the second the pc says, "I know all about it," does not necessarily mean that he has recovered from it if he found out about it in auditing. You see, it does not necessarily mean that that is now a known sphere just because he said so. Never believe a pc.

One of the things you should operate on. The pc says, "That's right," we better look. And that's operative in all fields except goals and terminals, oddly enough. The pc who has a goal is hell on wheels in the direction of this goal. His attention is – just gets totally wrapped up in this particular goal and his progress toward that goal, and so on. There is his attention, and that's why people clear on goals and terminals.

Well, you probably, customarily treat a goals question in the rudiments quite lightly. You probably don't think too much about it. You say, "What goals would you like to set for this session?" The fellow gives you four or five goals for the session. And you say, "Well, I'll pay no attention to those things." You say, "We'll just go on and I decided what I am going to run in this session, and we've got to flatten off so-and-so in this session, and such-and-such in this session."

Well, if the case isn't running right, you go back over your auditing reports. And auditing reports are quite valuable and every auditor ought to keep them meticulously. And actually an auditing report should be written at the time the auditing is given, and it should not be written from notes taken at the time the auditing is given. It ought to be the actual transcript.
Now, if you've got to have a copy of an auditing report, put a piece of carbon paper underneath the actual auditing report that you are writing. But don't turn in transcribed reports because you'll tell yourself lies and you will omit data. You see, because it's only notes which you are taking during the session, you therefore don't make a full report because you're going to transcribe it. But when you transcribe it, that data happens to be missing, don't you see. So it's only notes, and then it becomes only an auditing report, and these things are very valuable, particularly now in goals.

If we did not, for instance, have all of the goals lists of all of the auditors who attended the course in Washington, we'd almost have had it, you see. And they were going to type up – I just got a despatch today – they were going to type up the first couple of hundred goals of each one of these lists and send it to these students. And I said, "Oh, no you don't. Whistle them up and bring them in and find their assessment and get their goal," because it's, of course, in the first – really probably in the first few goals: the first 40, first 100, first 150 for sure. Now you're really reaching out. But by keeping those records, well, we know something about it.

Furthermore, if a clearing goes astray these days we can always put it right if the auditing reports of the pc are available to us. We know what processes and levels weren't flattened and where the case was so – got submerged. We know lots of things about the case then if we can go back.

If a case stalls it's a very, very good thing to go back over all of the auditing reports of the case. Now, one of the ways you go back over all of the auditing reports of the case is to find out if there has been a consistent statement of a goal in each and every session or every few sessions, see. It's a similar goal. It's the present time problem of long duration that you somehow or another have not recognized was there, do you see? And he actually may not have recognized that it was there, but he kept giving it as a goal.

The goals given in the rudiments are important. They are important for the location of present time problems of long duration, and they are also very important for locating present time problems of short duration. And the biggest boost they give you is solving the present time problem situation. That's what that goals question gives you. Because the person nearly always announces his present time problem of long duration in his goals lists. And it'll just be session after session. It'll make you weep sometimes. You look over an auditing report, whole sheaf of reports, and the person says, "I want to get over my zorch operation" you know. And you look at this, and it's just sheet after sheet after sheet, you know, report after report – goals of the session: get over his zorch operation. And you look in vain to find anything that's happening about the zorch operation. And you do worse than that, you look in vain to see much improvement of the case.

So that's an interesting way to go about tracing a case, is using those goals. You should pay some attention to those goals.

Of course, you're plowing madly ahead in the direction of clearing him and getting in auditing and so forth, but remember auditing is what the pc, to a marked degree, considers auditing. It is what the pc considers auditing to the degree that he will stay in-session. And you can do anything you want to do with the pc as long as the pc considers it's auditing. What
does the pc consider auditing is? Auditing is the handling of his fixed attentions on the track. And that is what auditing is to a pc.

So you needn't ever quail at getting in a rudiment where the pc's attention is fixedly fixed because the pc will consider it auditing. And if you can't quite find out why the rudiment is out, and you insist on some half measure -- you say, "Well, we'll just audit this, you know, because we can't -- we're sure we must have found it." Ah, but did you? You see. The rudiment stays out, the pc isn't interested in running it, he's quite upset, and so forth. Well, we haven't got the rudiment. We haven't got the root of it. We're -- we're not really running it. There's something wrong with our estimation of that rudiment.

Now, we may find the pc is ARC breaking, ARC breaking, ARC breaking along a certain particular line, and we enter into some line of inquiry about it after a while, and we should enter into a line of inquiries: Why is he ARC breaking with us? Might he not be ARC breaking with somebody else? It'll be a present time problem of some kind or another that's causing him to ARC break. And the present time problem will always be scarcity of auditing.

It's just as -- actually as simple as that, but did somebody else make the auditing scarce before we came along? See. Has something else happened here? Is there something else? Now, maybe this pc was run consistently and continually -- maybe they had three hundred hours of auditing and during that whole three hundred hours of auditing their dislocated zorch was occupying the totality of their attention and the auditor was running them on, consistently and continually, their wife. But their attention is not on their wife. The attention is on the zorch. You got the idea?

So auditing is what the pc considers frees up his attention. And when -- when this pc is not being addressed where his attention is fixed, he doesn't consider it auditing. Also he doesn't get Clear.

I tell you every few lectures there's one thing you always do wrong, and you don't find out what the pc is doing. This is the oldest crime of the auditor. They never ask enough questions. They're always a little bit leery that the pc will ARC break or get upset, or have his attention dragged off in some fashion if they ask too many questions.

Well, of course, if they ask a bunch of irrelevant hogwash, the pc'll get upset. And the auditor gets educated into believing the pc gets upset by being asked questions by having asked pcs in his early career. This auditor has asked pcs a lot of hogwash that had nothing to do with it and, of course, the pc got upset. So they get the idea that if you ask the pc too many questions, why, the pc will get upset, and that therefore you should just sit there and run the session.

Well, the pc can become quite oblivious of you, he can become very upset with whether or not you're there. "Are you there? Do you know anything about what's going on?" And the big not-know of the session can become, very well, what the auditor is doing. The auditor know? No, the auditor doesn't know, so therefore the auditor has a not-know on the session. So if the auditor has a not-know on the session, the whole session becomes a not-know, you got the idea?
He gets the idea that he must be withholding something from the auditor because the auditor's never asked any questions concerning what was going on. Now, if you're going to ask questions, ask pertinent questions. But if you're asking pertinent questions, don't care how many you ask. Get very searching. I should give you more auditing demonstrations because I'll tell you I will just sit and ask a pc for minutes at a time, what he's doing, how he's doing it, what has been happening and if he's got any picture now and what he is looking at and if there's anything there that he hasn't noticed, and all kinds of things of this character, you know. And I'd ask him and ask him. Any pc I audit will always tell you that I'm very interested in the session, or I certainly am looking right down their throats. They get a sensation of presence, in other words. But, of course, these aren't just, thrown-away questions, they are very, very pertinent questions, always. Because I really do want to know.

I – I see a pc is going this way, I want to know what's this all about? I don't just say, "Well that's boil-off," and skip it, you know. "What'd you run into?" you know. "Oh, well, I just ran into the so on, so on and so on and so on."

Well, because you're asking him what he was doing, and not what's going on in the environment or what you're doing, of course, his attention is very thoroughly on his case. So, therefore he's in-session because you're keeping his attention on his case. By asking him about his case you keep his attention thoroughly on his case.

"What did you do with the last auditing command?"
"Well, I did so and so, and so and so, and so and so, and so and so with it."

And I say, "Well did you do anything else?"

"Oh, well, yes, I haven't found the auditing command was easy to answer so as a matter of fact right in the middle of the thing I always mock up a couple of matched terminals, you see, of the thing."

And I say, "Well, that's very interesting. And very, very interesting. Have you gotten anything out of that?"

"Well, as a matter of fact I have."
"Well, now what part of the auditing command haven't you answered?"
"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Now, what was the first time you failed to answer that point?"
"Oh, well, it was way back at the beginning of the session."

"All right, now you just answer that one again, here's the auditing command."

You'd think under this much duress that the pc would be saying, "Oh, Christ," you know, "am I really being kicked around the track!"

Oh, no, he doesn't feel that at all. I ask him a couple times later, you know, "You still putting those matched terminals up there?" I don't tell him he mustn't. "You still putting those ..."
"Oh, no, no, I ... as a matter of fact I hadn't, uh, hadn't been doing it. Hadn't been doing it the last few commands."

"Well, all right, haven't been doing it?"

"Hm-hm."

"All right, that's good. Then the auditing command is all right, now?"

"Oh, yeah, there's nothing wrong with it. Let's get on with the session!" You know, that sort of thing.

"Well, that's right. That's what we're doing now," and give him the next auditing command, and so forth.

Where is that attention fixed? It is something on the order of examining small search-lights that are playing around in the dark. And you can actually find out where these search-lights are playing inside that pc's skull. All you got to do is ask. Find out what the hell is going on.

Now, you can always mark it down that a pc who goes anaten has had a drop of havingness. So, it must be his first and primary havingness, is the havingness of an auditor.

So if a pc ever goes anaten he's lost the auditor. I always just use that as a rule of thumb. Pc blinks out on me, I blink in. I don't ask him anything as crude as, or I never have but I might – I wouldn't put anything past me in an auditing session – but just say, (you know, it's an understood question whatever you ask), "When's the first time you lost the auditor?"

"Oh, well, oh, hell, that was a long time ago. Uh, yeah, five, six minutes ago."

"What happened?"

"Well, I just – I just – didn't – all of a sudden I felt very lonely standing out here on this plain."

"Oh, you're standing on a plain. I didn't hear about that. All right, what about this plain?"

"Well, I was standing there and I answered the auditing question and all of a sudden here I was standing on this plain, all by myself, and these cold winds are going by, and so forth, just like they are now as a matter of fact," you know.

And you say, "Well, how'd the auditing question apply, just right there?"

"Well, it applied sssd-ssss, that's – that's gone! That's gone now."

And you say, "Well, how about these cold winds now; how did the auditing question apply about these cold winds? What did it have to do with being all alone there," and so forth?

"Well, oh, I see what you mean!"

"All right, what do I mean?"

"Well, here's the guy I was with, lying at my feet with a knife in his back, and you know I didn't notice that before? I didn't know that. I must have killed him! Let's see, there's
nobody else here and I must have killed him. Could – it must have been me! Of course I wouldn't do a thing like that, you understand."

And we just got one Christ-awful overt off the thing. What did he do, you know. Well, he went into some kind of an avoidance mechanism of some kind or another and it compounded the felony, and he'll pick up some rationale that he's lost the auditor. And if you don't give him an auditor back along about that time he'll continue to go anaten.

I could grade your auditing – A, B, C, D, E, F, G – simply to the number of minutes of anaten experienced by your pc in a session. I could just rack it up and just keep count of it, you see, and grade your auditing. And then you'd find out that the pc – the auditor auditing the pc who had the greatest amount of anaten would have the least auditing presence. The first loss of the pc is always the auditor.

Now, the pc gets himself into situations and you think that maybe, mono-centrically, that it's just things that you do, you see, that cause him to lose the auditor. But no. I give you a synthetic case in point: the pc has answered the auditing question, finds himself on this lonely plain, bounces like mad, goes someplace else carrying this terrific feeling of loneliness with him of some kind, and of course he is now alone. The auditor hasn't done anything but give him an auditing command, but the pc feels alone. So, of course, he's lost the auditor. Because he's alone.

Now, a pc can get into that kind of a situation and go on auto so quick it'll make your head swim.

The number of minutes or hours of anaten of a pc in any given intention [intensive] are a direct indication of the presence of the auditor. And the solution to the problem is: find out. Find out. Pc starts going anaten, the pc is alone, that's all. He's not with it. He's not with you, and something is wrong. He is doing a retreat, and it's more than a retreat from the bank. There's inevitably a certain amount of anaten, but it ought to get as-ised rather rapidly with the processes you're running now. And it ought to get as-ised without a fog-out in present time.

Anaten and boil-off on the part of the pc – I don't want to put ideas in your heads as pc, but I have to tell you the facts of life – over this cup of tea in the kitchen – and the facts of life are that auditors who are out of session, from the estimation of the pc, have pcs who go anaten, and that's about all there is to it.

And the way you get over that barrier is simply just get snoopy. And of course, if you're finding out where the pc's attention is, you naturally will free up a lot of the pc's attention, which after all is the purpose of auditing.

So you can do any God's quantity of nagging on the subject, you can become the damnedest bore. The direction to err, however, is the direction of too much. Never too little. Get awful yappy and questioning in the midst of a repetitive command process, see.

Give him the auditing command, "How many needles can sit on the head of an angel?" you know, whatever it is.

And he says, "Well, eighty-two."
And you say, "All right. Have you got a picture there?"

"Oh, yes, as a matter of fact got a picture."

"Well, what is it of? Is it black and white? Is it 3-D? Oh, 'tisn't. All right, all right. Now, what – have you had any other pictures just before that?"

"Yes, I did. I had a couple. As a matter of fact I still got it," see, "still got one of those, one of those. It's stacked up alongside of this picture."

"Oh. Well, is there any part of the auditing command you didn't answer that other time?"

"Well, as a matter of fact I was too busy to answer the auditing command the other time."

"Well, just you answer the auditing command, now, for the other time." "All right? Yeah, all right."

"The auditing command was so-and-so, and so-and-so. All right. Okay. Now, did you answer that one for the other time?"

"Yeah."

"All right, you answered the other one for the other time? All right. Now, answer it for now. And the auditing command is so-and-so, and so-and-so. Okay. Now, how are these pictures stacked up?"

"Well, they've changed."

"Good, all right. Now, what's your attention on now? All right, attention is on this picture. All right, here's the next auditing command."

You get this kind of a yip-yap. Sounds awful yappy, doesn't it? Doesn't sound like the auditing sessions you've been giving lately, either, does it?

You can conceive the pc's attention as a small searchlight of which you are handling the handle. And you can just take the searchlight around in his skull and you can turn it on anything and up and down, illuminate the pictures, and so forth. After a while you can get pretty good at it. You yourself, of course, are looking at something which up to the moment you ask is an unknown. How come you can tolerate this much unknownness? I can't. When I go to a motion picture show, I don't like to sit facing the back. Almost never do. Almost never take cotton for my ears either. I like to see the movie. I get very interested in this movie.

Now, this is what's going on. You're – you're looking at the blood, sweat and tears of the Churchills of yesterday. You're looking at the come-to-realizes. You got come-to-realizes in this pc that would make Bernarr MacFadden a deep viridian with envy. True Confession special. "There I was, a poor little innocent girl, sitting on my – the doorstep of my Astarte's Temple. Sweet, innocent, no overts of any kind. And these goddamn soldiers came up and here they are burning the temple down. And I didn't do a thing. We were kind of strangers in the land, you see, and I had nothing to do with this."

And "What are you looking at?" you know.
"Well, I'm just looking at these soldiers."
"Well, what are these soldiers doing?"
"Well, they're pulling down the altar."
"Good. What else are they doing? What else is there?"
"Well, there's nothing else there."
"What else is there?"
"Nothing. There's nothing in the place."
"What else is in the picture?"
"The dead body of their captain we stabbed – I stabbed." [laughter]
You say, "All right, and when did this stabbing occur? First time I've heard of this stabbing, you know. When did this occur?"
"Well, in the first reel, of course. It was after this night of orgy."
"Well, what about this night of orgy?"
"Well, it's like this. The local governor paid us to put on a hell of an orgy so the invading troops would get so loused up they wouldn't be able to fight the battle tomorrow and that's the only overt I had – except of course killing the general."
"Oh, it was a general."
"Yes, it's a general. Didn't I say?"
"All right, good. Well, who won the battle?"
"Oh, well, hell, I never stayed around to fill that out. They killed me."
"Oh? All right. Here's the next auditing command" and so forth, so forth, so on.
"What's happening now?"
"Oh, nothing much. I'm up here about fifteen thousand feet above this temple. It's a little tiny block."
And I say, "Fine. All right, come on. Here's the next auditing command ... What's happening now?"
"Nothing."
"Did you answer the auditing command?"
"No." [laughter]
"All right. Here's the auditing command, I'll repeat it ... All right. Now what's happening?"
"Oh, well. You shouldn't ask."
"Well, why shouldn't I ask?"
"Well, it's messy."
"What's messy?" and so forth.

"Well, am I ever going to get out of this temple? I was fifteen thousand feet up, and everything was all right, and I'm right back in the middle of the temple again!"

"All right, what's going on?"

"Well, it's something I forgot to mention before. We'd poisoned all their wives."

"All right, good. Got a picture there?"

"Yeah. Oh, yeah, yeah."

"All right, here's the next auditing command."

Got the idea? This is a conducted Cook's tour of the bank. And you can get away with an awful lot of auditing just sitting back and repeating the auditing command and never finding out what the pc's doing. Scientology is at a level today where this actually works, which is rather fantastic. But there are ways, man, of speeding that up, that make that kind of auditing look something like a rickety one-horse shay, compared to, of course, a jet airliner. And it's big comparisons.

And believe me, when some pc has been audited like that he knows he's been audited. He knows it. He'll tell you, too. "Well, we got out of that! Whoohoo!" You see, "we" got out of that. I've even, way back when, in running engrams, and so forth, used the word "we," consistently and continually. "Well, where are we now?" Pc probably winds up with a bank where Ron is ... [laughter] But you got to find out what's going on.

If you don't find out what's going on, the pc's attention does this: It hits and bounces. Now, this escape mechanism I was talking to you about is always present to some slight degree. And he'll leave a stuck and he'll leave a stuck and he'll leave a stuck, and these sticks finally all compound to a kind of a dizziness, and where is he at? Well, it'll come out free in the end. It'll come out, one way or the other, just on repetitive auditing, rather permissive auditing. It'll go on. And it only adds five times the number of hours necessary to get the same result, that's all. That's why I've never been down with a crusher on this stuff, you see. I mean, that's why I never really raised hell about it one way or the other. Because there's no point if you're going to get there anyway rather smoothly.

The only thing that restrains me from forcing this type of auditing on auditors – I mean just forcing it on them and saying this is the way to do it and you better not do it any other way – is the fact they can be so damn knuckleheaded occasionally.

This guy runs into the temple, see, and he's just now looking with horror as they pull the altar down and find the dead general back of it, don't you see. And at that moment the auditor has this horrible feeling – you know, got an engram just like it; maybe he was the general – and will pull a stupid one along about that time, you know, get stupid about it.

But the reason I'm mentioning this to you now so bluntly is because you've got the mechanism for that. If you aren't doing an escape mechanism of pulling the pc's attention out of the bank, pulling the pc's attention out of the bank, pulling the pc's attention out of the bank, you actually yourself will never ask a stupid question in trying to find out what the pc's doing. Because your question never has the hidden fact from you that you're trying to get the
pc to escape. Of course, it's damn dangerous to be in a temple which is falling down and where one has committed a murder with fifteen dozen soldiers around brandishing copper swords. Very dangerous to be in such a locale.

Well, the "kind" auditor says, [whistles] "Come outside! Oh, you're fifteen thousand feet up above the temple. Whew! [relieved sigh] Boy! Is there any other zone of life later than that where things were calm?" [laughter] You get the idea?

As long as an auditor experiences impulses, no matter how obscure, to rescue the pc from danger at every side, and pull the pc off the bank, of course, it isn't safe to have an auditor asking very many questions, don't you see? Well, that's the whole bug back of this. So that's why I today tell you about this other.

I've told you about the other from time to time. Well, I'm saying you better do it. You better do it. Pc says, "Well, here I am, ten thousand feet above this temple and everything is fine now, and good we can go on with the session."

"All right, is there anything you skipped there, just before you went up?"

"No, no, nothing, nothing."

"All right, and I'll ask another auditing command."

You've inferred that he go back and take a look, you see. And you ask him the next auditing command, "What is the most unknown thing you can think of about Astarte?" or something.

And the pc says, [sniffs] "You did it to me. Here I am right back in this temple. I've been trying to get out of this temple for fifty thousand years, and you – you're trying to get me right back in this temple again, and here I am."

You know, it's a little – little accusative feeling. Well, you, if feeling defensive and not knowing whether you're right or wrong, are liable to take this slight accusative thing as making you actually think you have done something wrong. Well, I'll tell you what's wrong is: Let him out of the temple and let him stick in an exteriorized bounce. And then run for the next fifteen sessions ten thousand feet in the air, not confronting anything. "Yes, I'm running the auditing command. Everything is fine. There's nothing but peace."

Well, the clue is that the bank is as it is because it has so much action and randomness in it. And if you can't keep the pc in areas of randomness, the pc won't clear up, that's all. And that's your five-to-one auditing factor which Julia here was been talking about for years. That's the bulk of that auditing factor.

I – I was never very allergic to action. I haven't got to have action. I used to drive somebody I knew very well completely stark staring mad because I used to go up and ... They say, "What are you going to do?" you know. Their whole idea of life you see was to be doing, you know, be busy, be working or something, you know.

And I'd say, "Well, I'm going up and sit down for a while."

"What are you going to do?"

"I'm going to sit down for a while."
"Yeah, well, what are you going to read?"

"Nothing. I don't happen to have a book right now I'm interested in."

"What are you going to do?"

"I'm going to sit down for a while."

"Well, what are you going to think about?"

"Nothing."

And the person would go absolutely, "Woogo! God, I could never do that. I just think of that. Awful, you know, terrible!"

And it's unthinkable, you know, just to do nothing. But at the same time it's also unthinkable in auditing if you don't get the pc to confront the action which has got him stuck, stuck, stuck. You do not audit the quiet points of the track. Just skip them! Although a scarcity of action is what is wrong with a pc, we have to ask how did this scarcity of action occur? Scarcity of action occurred because of the unpalatability of action.

Ask this horrible question: "Why is this pc sitting there on the plain, farming?" He goes out and he plants these beets, see. And then they come up very quietly, because it's a very nice climate. And the beets come up, and then he has the beets thrown into a wagon and they are dragged off to the beet store, see. And next season he plants the beets, and every Sunday he goes to the same church, and he hears the same sermon, and he listens to the same confounded hymns. And he goes back and forth, and he walks on the same paths. And if you talk to him very – very much you would find out that it was dangerous to do anything else. That's the keynote. The great payoff of being quiet. Of being still. Of never being in motion. The enormous bonus this pays is always: "You won't get hurt."

That's the superbooster of conservatism and such things, you know. "We won't go into any motion because if we do, we'll get hurt." What taught him this? So you find this pc sitting there, complaining about the fact that there is no action. There is, "nothing happens in life." He is bored. He is bored in life. Nothing is ever happening.

And you say, "Well, all right. Let's go join the Marines."

"Eh, well, no."

"Well, what are you going to do?"

"Well, next Sunday I'm going to go to church."

"What are you going to do Monday?"

"Well, I'm going to go out and hoe the beets."

"What are you going to do Tuesday?"

"Oh, Tuesday. That's my day to clean up the smokehouse."

And you say, "Well," you say, "life's pretty boring, huh?"

"Oh, yeah, life's awful boring. It just runs the same routes, the same routes."
"Well, fine, let's join the Air Force."

"Oh, well, no."

"Well, why not join the Air Force?"

"Well, you might get hurt," or "Things would run wrong," you know?

Action has been given a bad name. It's discreditable. Action is now discreditable. You'll find the whole literature of the society at this particular time is devoted to the discredibility of action. People go into action, they get in trouble. This is obvious. Read any novel if you don't believe this. Heroes no longer dash over the top and emerge unscathed with medals pinned to their bare skin. No, they're sort of sick in the trench, you see, and they crawl over the top because they're so tired, you know. And just the moment they stand up they are severely wounded, you see. And then they're carted off to a very brutal hospital, you see, where it's all pain and then they get a letter that Emily has left them. She's run off with the iceman. [laughter]

Now, action has been given a bad name. Why? Why? If the pc is so starved for action, if he's so bored with the dolessness, you would think offhand then, that there was just a scarcity of action – you see, you might think it worked out this way: that there was a scarcity of action because he wasn't in action. You know, there's a scarcity of action, because he's in a situation in life where he can't have any action. This is quite obvious, isn't it? I mean that's the first thing that you might adjudicate on the subject.

Of course, he has a scarcity of action because he's a clerk. And he sits in this office all day long, you see, and he doesn't even have any excitement on the lines. He doesn't have anything to judge or say or do or anything else. There's nothing really going on. He has figures he knows nothing about which he enters in a ledger that he knows nothing about which goes to a destination he knows nothing about. And you say, well, that man is suffering from a scarcity of action because he's not in action.

Now, what is he doing, doing that? That is the proper question to ask. Action must have gotten a bad name. How did action get a bad name? Well, he'd been working at it for a couple of hundred thousand years; therefore, it must be pretty desirable if it has that much of a bad name. And it is very desirable.

So, the faster you get a pc over the idea of the discreditable nature of action, the more the pc is going to move out of those quiet areas on the track, too. Because he's keeping those to make sure that he doesn't go into action. He'll keep those very closely. He'll have this whole long life, you see, as a beet farmer. He's got this beautiful life as a beet farmer and you ask him, "Well now, how many angels can stand on the head of a pin?" and you think you're getting someplace, you know. You just think you're just roaring around like mad because you're getting a little tone arm motion and everything's going along all right.

And you, however, along about this time should be asking, "What sort of a picture does he have? Where is he? What is he doing? What is he doing there?"

Well, he hasn't noticed what he's doing either. But he's asked – answered the question, "Well, eighteen."
"What sort of picture do you have there with that?"

"Well, I got a picture of this old country church, and the organ is playing rather badly and out of tune," and so on.

And you say "All right, how many angels can stand on the head of a pin?"

And he says, "Well, seventeen."

And you say, "What kind of a picture you got there?"

"Well, I've got this long country lane, and the quiet, white clouds drifting by."

Well, if you kept check on it, you'd find out he'd had these things for the last eight sessions. And he's going to have them for the next eighteen sessions. Why not? He's running all the safe spots on the track, of course.

You say, "Well, what does this picture look like?"

"Well, this picture looks like it's just a – just a picture."

"Well, how big is this picture?"

"Well, this picture is about uh – oh, it's about two feet by two feet."

"Well, does the picture have breadth in any way?"

"No, no, it's just, small little picture."

"Well, does it have any dimension?"

"No, it doesn't have any dimension."

"Well, is that the size your pictures always are?"

"Oh, yes, yes."

"Well, what color is it?"

"Well, there's no color in it."

"Is there any picture above or below it?"

Haaaarup! Blow the whole thing, huh?

Liable to have very quietly kept all of these very quiet lives there, and they're actually running through blood and guts, man, the whole way. Only he doesn't put any attention on those at all. If you start asking him to look around he'll find out some things. He'll find out how pictures ought to look.

You'd be amazed what the ideas people have as to what their pictures should look like. Though it's not up to you to correct them. But it's sure up to you to find out. You'd just be fascinated what some people think a picture is.

Had a pc had a cognition the other day just on this basis: "I always thought every picture I had should be 3-D in all directions, 360 degrees. And therefore, I didn't think I had any pictures because my pictures weren't like that. If I were looking at a book it was just a picture of a book." Well, what else was their attention on? How could they have anything but a pic-
ture of a book if all they were looking at was a book? What did they think? They had some kind of a machine that did a 360 degree CinemaScope that somehow or another put it in? No, they – they of course, they've got the pictures they got. They have the pictures of what they saw. Naturally. And only the pictures of what they saw. But they have some weird ideas about pictures, believe me. And every one of those weird ideas about pictures is backed up with the discreditability of action.

I'll give you a little sequence that you might be interested in on that basis. I think I've mentioned this to you before, but it's rather startling. It took me by storm. All right.

Auditing question.

Cognition: "The Greeks had books, printed books."

"How did the Greeks print the printed books?"

"Well, they printed the printed books this way," and so forth.

Auditing question.

"Well, what do you know, the Egyptians printed books, too."

"All right, how'd they print books?"

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

And the auditing question, and so forth. And the auditing question, the auditing question.

"What kind of a picture have you got there?"

"Well, I've got a picture – it's a picture, it's ..."

Auditing question.

"What picture you got there?"

"Same picture."

Well, auditing question.

"What picture you got there?"

"Same picture."

"Has anything changed in that picture?"

"No, not for the last five, six auditing questions."

All right, what's the exact mechanic present here? Books. Is there anything more quiet than books? You're going down the middle of a roaring action chain, man. Except, of course, you're going down it on the basis of the stable datum. The quietude. The quietness is a core in the middle of some hurricane. You're going down books; where's the hurricane?

And this interesting idea was injected into the session, "Why don't you look on the other side of the picture?" And at that moment Boom!!! What was on the other side of the picture? Some of the goddamnest fights that anybody ever saw. But it was an awfully quiet picture about Egyptian books. You get the idea?
Well now, a pc will just stay there on that nice quiet chain, bouncing from one quiet Sunday to the next quiet Sunday, bouncing from "Old Hundred" straight into "Lead Kindly Light," until you tell him to look. And how do you tell him to look? By asking him what the hell is going on. Auditing question. "What's going on?" Auditing question. Auditing question. "What's going on now?" Auditing question. Auditing question. "You got a picture? All right, what is it of? All right, what's going on?" Auditing question. Auditing question. Auditing question. "Got a picture? Got a picture now? Has it changed any? What – what's it look like now? What's happened here?" See?

"Well, there's some more of these books."

"Oh, I see."

"There's this stack of books now."

Yeah, auditing question. Auditing question. "What's going on now?"

"Well, there's this small number of books. They're pretty books, you know, they're awfully pretty books."

Now, the danger point is asking the pc a question he can't answer, such as, "What are the books about?" He doesn't know it, you know. It's just books, see. Asking him for particularity that he wouldn't possibly have the answer to is the kind of question that will get you into trouble if any question of this character would get you into trouble. But even a question of that character gets you into less trouble than a total neglect of the whole situation. So you could very easily say, "All right, is there anything else around there?"

"No, just books."

"Well, where are all these books?"

"Well, they're just here in this bookstore."

"Okay." Auditing question. Auditing question. "What kind of picture now?"

"Oh, just this bookstore. I'm very grateful to you. You know, I hadn't realized it was a bookstore. It's very beautiful books. They're all down the shelves and everything."

Auditing question. Auditing question. "What you got a picture of now?"

"Oh, just this bookstore."

"What's outside the bookstore?" Boom!! He ran a bookstore on the Alaskan frontier. Three killed every morning before breakfast on the front steps. Got the idea?

You can do a certain amount of direction of the pc's attention by asking him questions. And as long as these questions do not yank their attention off the subject on which it is operating, he will get into no trouble whatsoever. As long as you don't say "Oh, look at something else. I'm tired of you looking at books." Or as long as you don't say some other auditing command; change the process.

And he says "Why?"

"Well, you aren't getting along well enough, you see, with that particular process, and..."
This is all invalidative of what the pc's doing. But just finding out what he is doing and what he is looking at, and ask him to look around a little bit more – this type of interrogation and questioning and so forth – can become more illuminative than anything you ever saw. And then, on top of it, any time you see a violent escape of some kind or another, scent that he must have escaped from discreditable action of some kind or another. And ask him if there was ever – did he tell you everything there was to know in that sequence which he just left?

"Is there anything that you left unknown about that sequence?", you know. "Is there anything in there that you didn't quite look over?"

"Well, I'm safely out of that now, and I don't think we need to talk about that anymore because – we got out of that all right."

And you say "Good, what did you get out of, exactly?"

"Well, there you've done it, you see. I mean, here I am right back in here, I've been trying for eighteen thousand years to get out of this temple and here you've got me back in this temple again."

"Well, what's going on in there, anyway?"

"Oh, this is where we tortured the victims."

"What victims?"

"Oh, these victims."

"Who tortured them?"

"Those high priests. I didn't have anything to do with it, you know. What am I doing with all these gowns on, you know? Yeah! Well, there's something I – I just realized: I – I was the high priest. Oh well, yes, yeah. I – I see what you mean. Yeah, this isn't so good here, is it?" and so forth.

"All right, I'll give you the next auditing question."

Of course it's the auditing question that got him into this mess. And it's the pc that's jumping out of a mess. And it's the auditor that gets him to apply the auditing question to the mess, you see, but he does it rather delicately. By just asking him: "What's going on? What are you looking at? What does it consist of? Is there anything else? Is there something you haven't mentioned?"

"In that sequence about the fur trade industry, now, that we just – you don't seem to be in now, is that gone?"

"Oh, yes. Oh, that's gone."

"Well, just a moment ago you had pictures of all these canoes. What you got a picture of now?"

"Sky. Got a picture of the sky."

"What sky is it?"
"Oh, it's the beautiful sky of Normandy. I don't have any more to do with this ... this fur trade industry, you see. I – I'm out of that, you see, I'm all out of that. All out of the fur trade industry."

Now, the wrong question, and the question the auditor would ask who thought it would be a good thing to get the pc out of all that dangerous area, would be, "Well, what does the Normandy sky look like?" [laughter] You say, "Well, what happened to those canoes?" You know, aside from the fact that you are interested and you're curious, they – there were these eighteen canoes going down the river, one after the other, and they were all full of painted savages. And that was the last you ever heard of it. Well, I don't let people run continued stories on me. I'm not expecting him to run into these canoes somewhere up the track in another fifty-seven hours of auditing I want to know about those canoes now.

"What happened to them? The last auditing command I gave you had canoes. Now you don't have canoes. What is this all about?"

"Well... I was an Indian. Hey, what do you know! I was in the canoes! Oh, this was just before they went over the rapids! Ha-ha! Yes!" Glug. [laughter]

And you say, "All right."

Next auditing question. Next auditing question.

"Yeah, we went over the rapids, and that was it, and we're all drowned, and now I'm back here in this beautiful Normandy sky."

And you say "All right, good enough, good enough. All right. Now, how many – how many people – did you see anybody else in the water there, in the rapids at all?"

"Uh, no no, no, no, no no."

Next auditing question.

"Well, as a matter of fact there were about twenty!"

And you say, "Well, that's good, that's good, that's fine." Next auditing question, next auditing question, next auditing question, that's fine. "Now, what've you got a picture of?"

"Well, this beautiful Normandy sky."

And you say, "That's good. Now, what happened to the canoes? Did they just drift away after they went over the ... oh ..." Auditing question, auditing question.

"Oh, God almighty!"

"What's the matter now?"

"Ugluh-ug-lu-gluh! I got terrible somatics in my throat."

"Well, what's the matter? What's happening? What's happening?"

"Well, after we got all dumped in the water, the fur trappers on the shore started firing volleys into us. Oh! Oh! Yeah, and they killed everybody. You see, this was a big lose for me. I was a big chief, you see. I had been over in England, and I picked up one of these Indians so I decided to ... I – I that's right. That's the way that went. Yeah, that's right, and then all of a
sudden the English attacked me and that was, so on. And I was Indian, that's right. And – yeah, here's the picture! Here's the picture you've been looking for."

You know, and all of a sudden the whole sequence – the unknowns vanish out of the thing, and the thing is all clear, and he can look at it and not look at it and he skips it and so forth, and he's not running away from it anymore. Do you follow that?

But it's very adroit auditing that does that. Because you can be totally knuckleheaded and ask all the wrong questions, but it is better to ask some questions than none at all. The way to err is being too yappy. And the way to make mistakes is never to say anything. Because the pc will just bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, bounce, bouncing, never confront. And it's just like the present time problem I started in to tell you about at the beginning of the lecture. And that present time problem is simply there, and the pc knows he's got it. But 1A won't let him run it. So in that particular case you overtly direct the pc's attention, you see, with the auditing command. You say, "What is unknown about that problem about teacups?" He's worried about his teacups, you see, and you run that flat. He's interested the whole way. He knows he's getting auditing.

Well, now, if you keep directing his attention back into where his attention is really fixed and those points from which he's trying to escape, boy, does he know he's getting auditing. See, by definition, he knows he's getting auditing to the degree that his attention is being directed where it is already stuck. His attention is already stuck there, even though he's escaped out of there. So he knows he's getting auditing if his attention is freed from the spot and not permitted to escape from the spot. You see? And by asking no questions at all, your pc has no illusion of being audited at all, and wouldn't even really believe that a session is in progress.

So how do you get a person in-session? Well, you direct their attention, find out where their attention is, so forth. And they know they're getting audited. You find out where their attention is stuck – you guess where the attention is stuck. Put it back there. You say it must be still stuck there. You don't get Normandy skies – you don't get Normandy skies in the middle of a rapids in the North American wilderness full of savages. The Normandy skies are awfully quiet so the guy must have moved into a stable datum and must have escaped from action. Now, what on Earth was the action? And of course you yourself are interested. And if you yourself really want to know what the action is, you will find out. And of course that is what his attention is stuck on. And the pc winds up with action not being discreditable. He takes care of all this. Up to this time, he's got it all justified. Your computer is normally leading a quiet life and he is walking to church every Sunday and he is listening to "Lead Kindly Light" and the highest randomness that he runs into carefully is that some Sundays they play "Old Hundred." [laughter]

You find that sort of a sequence – here in present time he's leading that kind of a life – you have to suspect at once that action has become discreditable and that he can't have it, and that he's very carefully not having any action. Well, of course, the healing from that, of course, makes you direct his attention over into the zones of action and the zones of action then – becoming inspected, he becomes more familiar with it, he recognizes that he could have action. That action isn't quite that bad. He becomes more familiar with it and there he is.
Okay?

It's very simple. All you have to do is do it. Okay?

Thank you.
WHAT IS AUDITING?

A lecture given on 31 August 1961

[Part missing]

Well, this is the 31st of eventful August, AD 11. And the generalities which have come up to relieve auditing come into various new gains of some kind or another. I hope very soon that we can be through in Scientology with all bad auditing of every character, size, shape and everything else.

There is such a thing as poor auditing. There are two stages of it: Basically, the individual audits sort of naturally and then learns the rules of auditing and audits all thumbs with the rules of auditing. You got the idea? And then eventually, why, these rules drop back to where they ought to belong and the guy is now doing a very good job of auditing. There comes a time in any auditor's career where one audits with all thumbs. But the basics of auditing are what they are, which is to say you are auditing a human being, and this auditing is addressed to a case, and the road map which you have is better and better. And it's so darn plain now that you can almost walk out in an open field, you know, and you just can't miss the road. You will get to Tipperary whether you like it or not, you know, providing you do anything even sensible, but nothing discounts auditing. Auditing must be done. Auditing must be done. Now, what is auditing? What is it?

Well, it's the pc in-session. Definition: willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case. Exact definition. We broadened that definition recently by saying "able to talk to the auditor." This becomes manifest in Security Checks – how you bring this about: able to talk to the auditor; interested in own case.

Well, interested in own case means interested in own case. Not interested in session. Get the vast difference here. Sessions should never be interesting. Never. Never, never, never interesting, the session itself. The pc's attention should never really be distracted from his own case. And then he will find that it's a very interesting session. He will say it's an interesting session, but what he means is his own case was interesting during that session.

Now, you'll find many a witch doctor has violated this to such a remarkable degree that they practically bang everybody into apathy. But this is the way a witch doctor runs an auditing session: He gets a couple of rattles. And you don't realize it but he's the immediate forebearer here on Earth. There hasn't been any therapy since the witch doctor. That which went in between didn't get the 22½ percent. The witch, the witch doctor, the witchcraft of Europe which extended up into – in England here – up to the maybe about the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth century. Yeah, I know it's extended into the sixteenth century because that's where the doctors got digitalis. They got it from the witchcraft.
So it is a bit different being a witch and being a witch doctor, but their modus operandi was quite the same. They maintained such a compelling presence, their presence was so compelling one way or the other, that a patient didn't have a chance of doing anything else but being interested in the session. You take a couple of gourd rattles and a snake that leaps out of the middle of the witch doctor's bonnet, little things like that. As a matter of fact, I can scream like a witch doctor. Now, that's quite an accomplishment. I'll have to practice one of these days. Go down the woods and scare old Farmer Jones's cows. [laughter]

In old Irish mythology, there's a wonderful, wonderful line: Two giants are fighting, and they made the ground shake to such a degree that the cows shed their calves, even though they had none. [laughter]

But anyway, the witch doctor very often has a mechanism like this: Carries a little pouch. Normally, you'll see a witch doctor has a pouch. And this pouch is supposed to be an amulet. That's to keep the patient from knowing what's in the pouch. And they'll normally have things like Greek fire, gunpowder, pepper. You get the uses of these things. Gunpowder – well they've got a fire there, and the session is going very tamely, and they flip some of this gunpowder, you see, with a quick prestidigitation. Can't even see their hand approach the pouch, you see. They're making some motions in the air and suddenly pow! You see, the fire blows up. Well, it's interesting. It distracts people.

And a while after the fire's exploded, they make some more motions in the air, and nobody notices that the hand has approached the pouch you see, and it's come out and flipped something in, but the fire burns glaringly red with leaping flames, you see, and all this kind of thing. It's very interesting.

And the patient's sitting there minding his own business, and he looks very calm at this particular moment, and with some prestidigitation and fast hand passes calling on the spirits of the air, why, the patient starts sneezing like mad because, of course, he's just had a face full of pepper. It's very interesting to watch.

North American Indian – particularly amongst the Iroquois, they had various ... Well, as a matter of fact, the white man has so stamped out the Indian up there that there's practically no tracing any of the real old customs, but there were a few missionaries who went up there amongst the Iroquois and into the hinterland before the white man and rum and fur ever were a subject, you see. None of these things were a subject inland. And the Indian tribe was there as it was with all of their customs. They used to live – we think of them as living in wigwams, you know and all kinds of things. Actually, they used to live in bark houses in palisades. And very elaborate. A very elaborate civilization, and the Iroquois medicine clans were fantastic. They were something that would make the AMA green with envy as far as organization was concerned. They were really a complicated clan setup. And they had rituals of various kinds that you would have been very interested in, to have studied them.

These early missionaries, as I mentioned, did find most of the dope about this, and they reported it endlessly, before of course they got executed or something of the sort or exorcised themselves from either the Indian or the white society. And we find there are very few books of this character still extant; they are very rare. And I've had the privilege of reading some of them. Very fancy.
They had ideas of soul transference. They had ideas of exteriorization. They had a medical-type exteriorization, you know. You fed a guy enough of the proper bark, you know, and gave him enough fumes, well, he'd find himself out of his ruddy 'ead and way up in the air, you know.

And they apparently could do something with animals, such as exteriorize and do something with the animal, you know. Make an animal do something peculiar and then reinteriorize and so forth. Quite interesting. And of course, their religion is indistinguishable from Christianity. That's why they had such a hard time making the Indian into a Christian. The Indian was full of endless arguments, of course, because the Indian believed in one god. And there the missionary would come a cropper at once.

He'd come in there with the big news that there is one god, you see. And the Indian would say, "Mm-hm. Ug." Total agreement, you see. "And at one time there was an enormous flood, and there was a fellow by the name of Noah, and so on. And he built an ark, and all of the beings on earth all died and perished in the flood except ..." And the Indian will say, "Mm-mm-mmmm." And when the white man gets all finished telling him about it, why, he says, "Name not Noah. Name Hecton." Knew all about the flood, you see, but he had a different personnel in there.

Adam and Eve – knew all about Adam and Eve, except Adam and Eve wasn't quite the right names so the white man wasn't quite smart. He wasn't in the know. You see, all man had descended from Adam and Eve, and there had been a flood, and one god and, you know, the lot, you know. And God had created all the animals. Oh, yes, see, religion never had too much of a chance because the Indian never found out there was any difference.

But he had a very advanced medical technology that was around the subject of herbs, and so on, which was quite good. And it all got lost. Lost the lot because it wasn't a written technology, and it went down by word of mouth, and so on. And you had to have new people to be studying the thing in order to preserve it.

And as soon as the white civilization made an encroachment and disease like measles – which they call smallpox, but actually was just measles – reached, of course, from continent edge to continent edge and practically wiped them out long before they had even heard of the white man. So much so that Lewis and Clark could uncork a little bottle, or just pretend to start to uncork a little bottle, saying, "Now you will have peace with all the tribes here on the Pacific Coast, and if you don't I'm going to take the cork out of this bottle and empty its contents over the land. And it contains the red death." And all the chiefs went pale and said we will have peace and they did. Thereafter, they had peace. That was a peaceful mission. Blackmail. Or redmail.

Anyhow, they – technology of healing contained so many factors of such complexity that it required half a lifetime to learn how to do these things. Now imagine if you as an auditor had as a requisite, being able to scream loud and piercingly enough, you see, to be heard about three city blocks. See, you find yourself going out in the woods and practicing screaming. Actually, screaming is an interesting therapy. You can sometimes send some preclear out and tell him, go on out there someplace where nobody can hear you, and scream for a while, and he'll feel better.
But anyway, as a therapeutic measure, the scream is used in this fashion: A piercing scream is emitted followed by a total silence. You see, you have to be able to cut the scream off right now and leave a silence in there and then utter the magic, hypnotic words. You see, they're actual – just an hypnotic command of some kind or other, like, "You will be well" or, "You will die tomorrow." They didn't care which way they sent people. And then resume the scream at the same pitch and volume. So actually you have: Here's the scream, you see, and then here's the silence with the command in it. And then that gets totally buried in the rest of the scream. And the patient doesn't ever realize that the practitioner has ever spoken.

He just lays one into the middle of the scream. Well, of course, when you're standing two feet away from a guy screaming loud enough to be heard three city blocks, and then you cut it off suddenly and then you put the implant in and then start it up again and so forth, why, all kinds of interesting things happen because the audience that is watching this on the tribal ground, they never heard the stop of the scream and the start of the scream, you see. And after this witch doctor has screamed at the fellow, of course, he either gets well in three days or dies in three days, whichever way was the most profitable. And they had it taped. All kinds of wild things like this.

You have to be able to leap in a back somersault high enough to go through the top of the smoke hole of a wigwam and sit on the trees, you know. Those poles. So that you ostensibly in a smoky interior simply disappear from sight, so that you cannot be found anywhere in the wigwam. The way they did this was to do a backflip and go up through the smoke hole and sit there on the poles, you see. And then by projecting their voices downward, talk in loud voices – spirit voices which had different tones and incantations than their own normal voice, you see – and boy, was this a show. And some patient lying there next to death's door naturally would become so interested that he'd come back to life again. [laughter] Very abrupt.

The history and breadth of medicine or healing or religious healing, or anything like that, has gotten pretty well unknown to the white man. He is so self-sufficient in his belief that he can do a great many of these things. But actually, their percentage was pretty high. Very high. You combine herbs and magic and superstition and these things together, and it's pretty high. And right now the white man in his arrogance, doesn't realize that in South Africa he is only doing maybe 30 to 40 percent of the cure, even when he's paid. Because the native goes across the street to see the witch doctor to complete the cure. And he merely considers the white doctor is quite inadequate because he never gives the spiritual fillip to it, you see, that drives the cure home.

That white pill might be all right, but that split feather in the pocket is a guarantee that it won't happen again. And the white man, of course, he doesn't realize these things so he's just stupid. The white man had never really better find out what natives think of him. It would be very, very bad for his pride, believe me. It was an awful shock to me. The first time I ever ran across this was the Eskimo.

There was a fellow there, and he wasn't working. And somebody said "dudtha" to him, you know. And my ear cocked up, and I had heard this word dudtha or whatever it was. Nobody can speak Eskimo. It's a fact. Nobody's ever learned all of it. I'd heard this word thrown in my direction, so I wondered what the connection was. And I said, "What did you call him?"
"Oh," he said, "He's a loafer. He's no good."

"Well, what did you call him?"

"Oh," he said, "he sits there. He's not helping us load."

"Yeah. What did you call him?"

He said, "A white man." [laughter]

And wouldn't they get that impression. It's a good thing we don't hear these things.

Anyway, if you were practicing amongst such a people and you failed to follow these now-I'm-supposed-to's of what healing were all about, you see, why, you would naturally be suspect as a practitioner.

You couldn't flip backwards and disappear; and there were no spirit voices suddenly resounding where you had just left; and you would talk to somebody and he didn't start sneezing, you know; you got near a fire and nothing exploded; they'd say, "Fake, man, fake." Got the idea?

Well, you're walking forward straight into that in Scientology, but the fake is the guy who won't know Model Session and he won't know how to do this and he won't know how to do this and he won't know the proper form, so of course he isn't an auditor. Isn't that right?

You've got the now-I'm-supposed-to. Now these now-I'm-supposed-to's have very, very potent reasons back of them. They are tried and tested and true. But they also become a badge. And the ease with which a person can handle a Model Session is, of course, his hallmark of whether or not he's a pro. You get that? It's whether or not he follows the form. Now, he makes mistakes in the form; immediately the preclear thinks of him as a bad auditor. He omits part of the form. The pc is immediately upset.

It's in actually the same category as – he hasn't done a backflip and had spirit voices appear at the point he vanished, you see. So therefore, he couldn't possibly make anybody well, because part of the magic incantation is missing. The now-I'm-supposed-to is missing so the fellow must be illy informed as to what to do. Rather amusing, but you're walking forward to that.

Now this can become so much a thing, that it is only necessary to follow the form to be an auditor. You see the reverse side of the coin? And that can become so idiotic as to be the same as the old master who was teaching the neophyte, and the old master, every time before he gave the neophyte his lesson, tied his cat to the bottom of the bed – having nothing else to do with the cat, you see, tied him to the bottom of the bed. So of course, the neophyte – when he became the master, he starts to teach somebody, and he says, "Now," he says, "the first thing let's do is find a cat and tie him to the bottom of the bed," you see. Now, that old wheeze is not without good purpose.

But you can get so interested in tying cats to bottoms of beds that the soul and spirit of auditing can vanish. It's all right to know the forms. And you sure better use the forms, and you better go through the forms, but auditing comes back to something else. It comes back to running cases. It is almost more important – always more important to run cases than to run cases according to form.
That doesn't persuade you in any way to abandon form, but it does persuade you to be able to use form with such ease that you can immediately and instantly sail into a case and find out everything you want to know about the case and follow the case through. And your use of the form is very, very easy.

Your use of the form can be so easy as to not really be apparent to anybody as a form. And that is the real art. That is the real art. When you're really expert, it won't ever look like a form to anybody. It'll look like just you're doing something. And it'll look like you're doing something effective. And that requires real art, and it requires real skill.

And that's the point you're moving over into. And if you stop short of moving all the way over into total, casual ease... Actually you're running something that is as bound in rules, you see, as concrete. But you handle it with such offhand ease, and you handle it with such naturalness that it never occurs to anybody that it's a form. Now, that is really fantastic. You have to be terribly comfortable with what you're doing. You have to be completely comfortable. You have to be able to move within the perimeter.

It's like Japanese painting. A Japanese painting, you know, is the most stylized painting in the world. The laws which surround Japanese painting are so fantastic that when I was a kid I used to wonder how on earth anybody could remember all the rules and still paint a picture that looked like that. A great deal of, you see, the stroke that paints the tree must be stroked upward since the tree grows upward. And all sorts of odd rules of this character, you see. And you have to do it this way and that way and the other way. And there are certain ways to grind ink stones. And oh, it just goes on and on. But when they turn something out, when a real craftsman turns something out, it is quite a piece of art. It is really remarkable. But he turned it out according to the rules, which made it three times as hard.

And I should think that the rule – instead of making auditing easier, I should think you are now at the stage where you realize that the form makes it harder, because you have to sound natural, and you have to be interested, and you have to be in there pitching, in spite of the fact that you are utilizing a form.

Now, if you fall short of appearing totally natural, then you will fall short of total control. There is where this thing bridges. If you sound the least bit artificial while you're doing this one ... of course, if you don't use any form at all, you know you won't be a pro. That'll be – you'll be a fake, you see. You get the idea? I mean you wouldn't really be an auditor. "He's not a well-trained auditor. He doesn't use Model Session." You get the idea? "Doesn't run the rudiments right," and so on. "Tisn't in the proper order."

All right. That's not enough. If you can use this to a point where the preclear never notices that rudiments are being used in that order – ah-ha, now that's real art. That is real art. You've moved over, way over on the other side. And your ability to control a pc and hold him in session will be utterly fantastic because he has no doubt about anything. He is very sure that your mind is straight on him and his case and that he must comply with what you've said, because it is obviously addressed to him and is totally natural. It is so natural that it must be addressed to him. Don't you see? And it sounds like a communication. This is very compelling.
So your nadir, you might say, of professional appearance in auditing, is to be able to use the form perfectly, but to use it with such ease that it isn't recognizable as a form; with such casualness that it appears to be totally relaxed; and that there is no question in your mind as to what you're doing or where you're going or what you're going to achieve. And this very casualness seems to speak of reserved power – something on the order of a huge Rolls-Royce motor which is sitting at the curb idling. You got the idea?

Ease is power – always. Strain is never power. The soft voice will always compel more obedience than the loud one.

Man is in an utter rage with you. I mean you're bossing workmen or something like that. Walk over to the foreman and whisper something to him. Just whisper it: "Now, get these men back to work. Get them back to work." Walk away quietly. Boy, you'll have injected more enturbulence into that rage than you ever heard of. The next thing you know they'll all be back working, and they might still be muttering, but they figure that if anybody said anything to them like that there must be something to it, see. Try it sometime.

Don't just Q-and-A with him out of rage, you see. Then out of that results war. I imagine, that if some of the warring nations of World War II had found the method of submitting a quiet enough message to one another in a quiet enough way, they would never have been in any war. But all the messages were very loud, weren't they? And they got louder and louder, and there got to be more and more confusion.

Now, this is based on the fact that – of the Effect Scale, naturally. And it's very easy for you to audit a pc with tremendous control, providing you yourself are not anxious. Providing you yourself appear to have, and actually have, every confidence that you can control every part of this situation. And you just go on and audit in this particular way. And the fellow says something, and you take it up. And you give another command, and he says something, and you say, "That's fine," and "All right," "How about that," and so on. And he's purring along there like mad. Because you are not trying to interest him in the session.

He feels that there is nothing to look at all but the bank. There's just nothing to see around there but his case. Got the idea? And if there's nothing to see around there but his case, there's no great demonstration of rudiments, and there's no great demonstration of a nice, big fumble with the E-Meter. And there is big twisting of knobs and dials and the clatter of cans, and strained look on the face, and the deep concentration, and the this and the that, and the worry on the part of the auditor. All of these various things add up to no control to the pc.

The auditor sits down, takes the E-Meter, turns the thing on. He doesn't even bother to settle it in, you know. He settled it in before the pc got there. Hands the pc the cans and says, "All right. Good. Fine. Squeeze the cans. All right. That's it. Okay. Now beginning of session. All right. Start of session. All right now. Let's see. Where are we at today? Mm-hm. Mm-hm. All right. That's good. That's good. Now ..." And here we go.

You go on down the line with your rudiments, check them out, and so forth. You're not doing anything very important. That isn't very important. The pc's ARC breaks aren't very important. Now you get down to a point of where you got – you're going to run the process, see. Well, you roll up your sleeves, you know. Just about that much interest as far as the voice comes up.
"All right. We got that out of the way. Now, here's the process I'm going to run on you." And you give it to him, see. "Here's the first command."

I seldom ask the pc if it's all right with him. I assumed that it was if he sat down in the chair. If he's fool enough to sit down in the chair, why, I'm not going to trifle with it. [laughter] I'm not going to trifle with this any further, believe me.

And he says, "Wow! wow!" and "Gee whiz!" and so on and, etc.

And I say, "No kidding. All right. All right. What do you know about that. Yeah. Well, what do you know about that."

I don't say, "Yes. Good. Yes. Thank you." Much more likely to say, "Mm-hm. All right." Get the idea? Different attitude. It's the attitude of the fact that, all right, he's given, we're interested, and we're both in his bank running it, you know. And here we are and so on and that's all that's important that's happened around here. It's his bank. That's the only thing we're interested in. We're just interested in what he's looking at and where he's going and that sort of thing. That's where the interest is. Our interest isn't on sessioning. Got the idea?

Well, when you get that good, you all of a sudden will speed your results up. That's all. It's the ease with which you can do it. The ease with which you can do it is to a large degree born of confidence.

Your confidence is based, of course, on wins and ability. And when you have ideas that you're not going to win, naturally, your confidence drops. The reality factor has to be kept in. And if you're anxious about somebody's case, you will appear anxious about somebody's case.

I handle it another way. I say, "Gee, I sure am worried about your case these days."

And the guy says, "You are?"

I say, "Yes, Sir. I sure am. I was thinking last night. I was wondering what in the name of common sense this is all about?"

And he says, "You did?"

And I say, "Yes."

He says, "Well, I haven't been worried about my case."

I say, "Well, I have been."

"Well, why are you worried about my case?"

"Well, you never say 'Gee whiz.' you never say, 'Gosh, what do you know?' Nothing. You just keep running this stuff. I don't know. I – I'm worried." Much higher reality factor than, "Now we are going to audit you. You are going to sit there, and I am going to give you... Here is the first auditing command. Do fish fly? Good. Do fish fly? Good. Do fish fly?"

If you feel that way, it's much more real to say to the fellow, [slightly exasperated voice] "Well, I hope this is the right process to run on you." [laughter] "Let's see how it goes."
And you'll find all of a sudden the pc is right in there pitching with you. It isn't the fact that you're anxious about it that makes him anxious about it. He's liable to try to cheer you up. [laughter]

But, I mean, if you are looking confident apparently but are feeling very unconfident, he's liable to go quite the reverse. He's very likely to respond to your anxiety. Extremely likely to respond directly to your anxiety. And the more you withhold your anxiety, the less he'll go into session.

"I hope you can put up with me this session, because I feel a little bit tired. If that's all right with you, I'll go on auditing you."

"Oh yeah. Do you feel very tired?"

"Oh, not particularly. It's no overt. No overt for you to sit there and get audited, but if I flub a few times, why, you know what to put it down to. If that's all right with you, here we go."

No, he isn't getting ARC breaky. But you sit there, you're dead exhausted, dead beat, and you're saying – you know, brace – "Is it all right with you if I start this session? Good. Here it is. Start of session." He says, "What's the matter with this guy?" Thrown an unknown into the situation. The auditor's an unknown factor to the pc. Now, frankness on the part of the auditor is part of the auditor's communication. And this goes over to a borderline of evaluation. The auditor starts thinking unkind thoughts about the pc. Starts chopping up the pc one way or the other. And of course, this is very, very bad for the session indeed, and it jumps the code, and the whole situation is going to run sideways and backwards and upside down, and the session is going to drown. You can sure count on that.

Well, the answer to that is, if you're having bad thoughts about a pc, and you feel very antipathetic about this particular pc and that sort of thing, you better get one of your fellow auditors... It's a good thing, you know, to have friends because they'll audit you. And you better get one of your fellow auditors to flatten O/W or something on this particular pc. You'll feel better, and he'll feel better, before it's through, see.

But the reality factor begins, of course, in your actual command of your information. If you don't feel you have an actual command of the information and you're pretending to have an actual command of the information, your session will come a cropper every time. You cannot help it. It always will come a cropper. No matter how hard you try, it'll come a cropper. A session goes to pieces only on those points of unreality in the auditor. If you want to know why a session goes to pieces, analyze the points of unreality that the auditor had. It's interesting, isn't it?

You look it over sometime. If you're training a bunch of auditors, and you find one or two of the auditors having trouble auditing, find out what's unreal. Now, one of the ways you ask about what's unreal – I just give you this as a method of checking this down: "What were you disagreeing with in that session?"

You know, the auditor was auditing a session. Get him afterwards. "Now what were you disagreeing with in that session?"
"Well, I disagreed with this and I disagreed with that, and I disagreed with something or other."

And you find those are the exact points that the session went to pieces on and the exact places where the pc went astray. It is quite interesting. Because there was no R in the session. Now if there's no R; let me yawningly go back to 1950. There's no R, there is no A. And if there is no A, there is no C. Reality, affinity and communication: It is the triangle, and when one of those corners of the triangle goes out of balance, the other two go out of balance, and they go zip, boom. And don't think that they go out on a lag. The R doesn't go out, and then a little while later, like a half an hour, the A go out, and a little while after that, the communication goes out. That isn't the way it happens. That's a simultaneous triangle.

When you say the R goes out, and then the A goes out, and then the C goes out, you're actually talking in milliseconds. They all go out together. They're simultaneously operating factors. You may become aware of them later as separate factors. You may become aware eventually that the C went out. The C went out. Well, if you want to spot where the C went out – when the C actually went out – you had to go back and find out when the R went out. The R went out, and there went the A, and there went the C.

You feel mad with the pc. You'll find out that this was a gradient scale, that you actually started feeling mad at the pc much earlier, and it was at that moment when an unreality entered the situation from the auditor – not from the pc, but from the auditor – when an unreality was entered into the session. At that moment, the auditor started to get peeved with the pc. Just bing-bing. Happens right now.

All these things are sensible. Sensible factors. Now, a session, basically, is an ARC activity. And if a session has high ARC in the auditor – it's only necessary in the auditor – it will materialize in the pc. Now, a pc can look at his bank as well as he can communicate. A good auditor has a highly perceptive pc. That's interesting, isn't it? The same pc, audited by an auditor with low ARC, is not perceptive. Isn't that fascinating?

Now, we're getting back to the Iroquois Indian, practically, aren't we? We're getting into factors of telepathy and transference and rapport and empathy and all kinds of oddball factors. But actually these factors have always existed. No matter whether you call them good witch doctoring or good this or good that. These factors are always present.

Now, if you feel an annoyance, or an anxiety with the pc, basically, that annoyance or anxiety with the pc is going to drop R. And is going to cut C, and it can be very destructive to a session, be very destructive to the pc. The pc would find himself practically running in the dark. Why is he running in the dark? Well, the auditor has got a low ARC. Not with him, you see, but the auditor – who is actually the projecting force of the session – is projecting a low perceptivity. And the pc can't see his bank. You got this?

This is one of the first factors that got in the road of Dianetics. This got in the road of Dianetics. One auditor would be able to get a session going and run engrams, and another auditor couldn't run engrams, and there was quite a big lot of question marks flying around in all directions. How could all this be taking place?
Actually, it was auditor presence in the session. You could explain it in many ways, and these many ways do not have to be explained by telepathy, or any odd factor at all.

An auditor who is confident, of course, is furnishing an auditing environment in which it is safe to depart into the never-never land of the unknown. It's as simple as that, don't you see.

So of course, you can say, well, an auditor who's not confident has a pc then who won't see the bank. Well, of course, it isn't safe to look at the bank in an environment which has got a sort of an 'ostile flavor to it. You got the idea?

So it's the auditor, in the final analysis, and the emotional tone of the session. And this has a great deal to do with whether or not auditing takes place. I'm talking to you now about the real high-school basics of auditing. These are not just the mechanics of auditing. This is where this stuff goes.

Now, when you're - you yourself have been auditing for a long time and you haven't cleared anybody - you're not auditing in any high level of confidence. Now, you've seen somebody cleared, and you start auditing in a higher level of confidence that we would phrase as hope. When you've cleared somebody, you start auditing in something that could be characterized as confidence. And when you really have rung up a string of them, nobody will be able to live with you. You'll be totally insouciant. But that in itself is a reality.

Now, also it goes this way. When you have audited a pc up to results, you feel more confident about pcs. And when you've not gotten these results, you feel less confident about pcs and so you're auditing in an auditing environment which has a low ARC in it. Got the idea?

These things are very easily explained. They are simply observable. You can always detect the false note in somebody's confidence, always. The auditor is sounding confident but isn't at all confident. And of course, this is observable. The pc is nervous. The pc's attention goes off of own case on to auditor, because he feels there is something here he doesn't know. And we have an unknownness in the session.

Unknownnesses would be the keynote of this. The auditor doesn't know whether or not he can produce a result. He doesn't know whether or not he can hold a pc in session. He doesn't know what he can do. He doesn't know what is going to happen. He has no determination of the final result. These are all not-knows, not-knows, not-knows, you see. It adds up to the pc that the auditor is not-knowing. Therefore, there is a mystery in the session.

The pc may try to spot this not-know. Very hard and arduously. The pc may be trying to spot this and not know what he's trying to spot. But he gets stuck on the auditor. Why? A thetan stuck to anything is, of course, just a mystery sandwich. It's thetan, mystery, object. Mystery sandwich. And of course, the auditor then can't keep the pc in-session because the pc has got a mystery on the auditor, and we have the auditor plastered all over the pc. You get the idea? Because the pc is... See? And he doesn't dare see anything, and he doesn't dare act. These are the factors. These are the factors that are involved. They're all explained on the order of how much mystery does he smell around here.
Well, I disabuse the pc of mystery as fast as I can, as a method of operating procedure. I tell him how long we are going to audit, if this seems to have any importance — if it has a bearing on the thing, I say, "Well, we're going to run this session until such-and-such a time."

Of course, if you're running the session not against the part of a pc's day where the pc will have anything to do, you just say to hell with that. We're just going to run the pc, you see? Got the idea? I mean, you're running him from eight o'clock on, and you've got till midnight, as far as that's concerned, it just doesn't matter. The pc knows you probably may or may not start ending it at around ten. If he looks the least querulous about anything, well, you find out why. It's usually something about the time of the auditing session or something like that. So you'd set him right anyhow. Got the idea?

The rule of thumb is, if there appears to be a mystery about what is going on, you give the pc the dope. You just destroy the mysteries about the session. I can be counted on usually to give a pc a synopsis of what is going to happen. I've never gone so far as to say, "And at the end of that time you will feel much better," but I have gone as far as to say, "Well, we'll take care of that. I'm going to take care of this headache you've got." You know?

I ask the pc for his goals, too — it's polite — while I tell him what I'm going to do. Tell him what I'm going to run. If I ignore doing something, I tell him I'm going to ignore it. That is to say a rudiment. I'd say, "Well, there's a fall here on this ARC break with me. But that's what I'm running toward anyhow. And is there anything you want to tell me about this? I notice there's a little fall here."

"Yeah. Well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"I thought it was something like that. Okay. Now we're just going to skip that at the moment because it'll come out in the session shortly. Okay?"

And the pc says, "Well, I guess so. Well, all right." And all of a sudden the ARC break disappears because so much R has been thrown into the session. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Get the idea?

And a quarter of the way through, you're running some kind of a process or other, and the pc seems to be floundering around and nothing's happening, I say, "I don't like the way this is going. I'm going to give you another auditing command. Going to change the auditing command. What do you think of that?"

The pc says, "Well, I don't know. I think it'll probably be a very good idea."

"Well, I don't like the way the other's going."

"I don't like the way it's going either."

"All right. Here's the new auditing command."

No bridge. Didn't stop any session, start any session. See why? I'd introduce an unreality into this situation — without telling the pc why, I'm going to stop an auditing command; I'm going to throw a bridge in; I'm going to start another auditing command; I'm going to go through the tortuous mechanics of everything, you know. You can hear the wheels click, you know, and the cuckoo is grinding his beak inside the clock, and all this kind of thing. The pc can be counted on to look up and say, "Well — hey what — what — what — what's the matter?" I know that I've been a very bad auditor. I know that I've been an absolute fool if the pc ever
looks up and asks me what's the matter. If I haven't filled him in before he thought of it, I figure I'm doing wrong.

"I'm going to run through this, and I'm going to keep up with this command until I think the thing is squared away. Is that all right? All right. And that may mean that we'll be overrunning this session. Is that all right?"

"All right."

There's never any doubt in his mind that when the session starts to overrun that the session was going to be overrun. He knows about it already. See?

And I always try to make the pc right, and never try to make the pc wrong. I never bother to make the pc right at the expense of my being wrong. If he says I said something that I didn't say, I acknowledge him. I don't say I said it. Because that would introduce another mystery in it, because he probably knows down deep that I didn't say it. You see this? So I just acknowledge it. I'm liable to say something, "Well, can we recover from that? Is that all right?"

"Yeah, well, that's all right."

If I'm challenged for flubbing an auditing command or repeating an auditing command – if it is valid, if it is perfectly valid, if I did repeat one leg of a process, you know, running without any tally or anything of the sort on a ten-way bracket, God knows, and so on – I will normally catch it before the pc does, and if I don't catch it before the pc does, I figure I'm kind of slipping, you see. "How many ways from center have you batted your – ? oh, I've said that before. Excuse me. How many ways has your grandmother batted you? That's the right command. Is that okay? You got it?"

Pc says, "All right." He says, "Well, anybody can make a mistake." That's his reaction to it if he thinks of it at all.

And you say, "Well, how many ways have you batted your – uh – your – urn – uh – your grandmother?"

Pc says, "I answered that before."

Oh, man, that is really a lousy piece of auditing, see. It's not a lousy piece of auditing because you made a mistake on which auditing command you were giving the pc. That's not necessarily horrible. But it was horrible because the pc found it out. You got the idea? You didn't find it out before the pc did. See?

You should know more about what's going on in the session than the pc does at any given instant. And therefore, you have more R in the session than the pc, and therefore you stay in control of the pc in the session.

When you have a pc wising you up as to what was going on, well, there's – something has slipped. That's all. It has slipped, and it slipped a long time ago, and it slipped badly, and there's – R-factors are out, and everything else is out, from the middle outward in a session. This thing was out. This has probably been out for days or weeks. Lord knows how long it's been out if that kind of a condition can exist.
The pc is not always right. But the auditor doesn't have to tell him he's wrong because the auditor's not trying to prove anything to the pc. There isn't a single part of auditing that consists of proving anything to a pc. You don't have to prove a thing to a pc. You don't have to prove him there are Clears, or that he can get Clear, or that he can get released. You don't have to prove to him that Scientology works. You don't have to prove anything to him. Got it?

"Prove" is one of the basic games of the thetan. And people are always – on the whole track, thetans have been running around telling others to prove it. And a pc can get this games condition very early. But if a pc wants you to prove something to him, you already have got an out R-factor someplace. Something has gone wrong earlier than this point.

You say, "Well, I'll show you that Scientology works. I will give you a session." See?

The guys says, "Oh, I don't believe it works and I believe it's kind of fraudulent and so forth. And I'm not sure. And, uh, I'm not sure and, uh, so on."

Not because you want to prove anything to him, say, "What withholds have you got?" You know, this is a social conversation taking place in the underground. "What withholds have you got?" You know, very puzzled. "What's with you and the rest of the human race?"

Bzzzzzzz. Boom. I never Q-and-A with whether it works or not. I wouldn't discuss for three seconds with anybody whether Dianetics or Scientology work. And I would never audit anybody to get a result that will electrify the community.

You know, the guy wants to be audited on this sole basis. He wants this young girl to be audited because it'll do so much for Scientology. And we hear that quite often. That's one of these "prove" things. Prove it. Prove it. Prove it. Sure, if we audit a young girl and get some result, it'll electrify the community. That's for sure. But isn't it interesting that every effort to prove the validity of Dianetics and Scientology, some of which efforts have cost as much as fifty thousand dollars, have all of them netted us not one single bit of gain.

It's given us lots of nice records, and I'm very happy to have the records.

The reason they have trouble with business is the president of the company is sitting there in his old slacks and his tweed coat that is out at the elbows – see, they no longer wear top hats because laborers knock them off. And he's sitting there at his solid mahogany desk, and he says, "Now you say," he says, "that this will up production. You say this will up production. Now, we could do it on a basis that if it did up production, why, then we would do so-and-so, and if it didn't up production, then we wouldn't do so-and-so," and so on.

That is the time to go yawn, yawn, yawn, because the old thetan game of "prove" has started stopping things. You shouldn't be selling him anything anyhow. Sit on his head and audit him. He'll come up at the other end, and say, "What in the hell happened to me? I feel better."

You say, "Good. Of course you do."

He'll say, "What is this stuff?"

And you say, "This is Scientology."

And he says, "No kidding." He says, "Does it always do this?"
"Yeah. Why don't you go to a PE course. I'm not going to give you one here. Or I'll give you some more auditing if you want."

The guy says, "Well, if you could just get me over my lumbosis, I would be happy to pay you four hundred dollars."

That is the time to go yawn, yawn, yawn.

You now say, "Well, I'm not trying to take any lumbosis away from you. But I'll give you some auditing."

"You don't want my lumbosis? You don't want this game? No game, you mean? No game? No game?"

And you say, "No game. Scientology's the game that everybody wins. The only game on Earth where everybody wins. So, we're not interested in your lumbosis, or proving to you or your wife or anybody else that Scientology works."

Because you've gotten the thing into a disagreement, an argument, and a games condition before you've even begun to audit. And an auditing session is not a games condition. You should know it. The one thing an auditing session must not become is a games condition whereby the auditor sits there and prevents the pc from getting a win, and the pc sits there and prevents the auditor from getting a win.

And this can be quite detrimental. But you should realize – and the only reason I've embarked upon this little excursion here is just this – that every Homo sap that is wearing out shoe leather or rubber soles on the metropoli of Earth is in a games condition. And all you have to do is just whisper, "games condition" and they're right there. It almost takes precedent over a session. And could very easily take precedent over a session.

So anytime a pc offers up anything that looks like a games condition, just let it fall with a dull plop in the middle of the floor. And every time you embark on anything that looks like a games condition to the pc, patch it up. Because from there on, your goal will be opposite from his goal. And if your goal is to make him better, then he'll get worse or try to. Because it's a games condition, he will try to do an opposite. He won't agree with you in this kind of a condition. And a games condition immediately and directly results instantly that you obey [disobey] almost any part – except the eating one; oh, I guess maybe that one, too – of the Auditor's Code. Those are all prevention of games conditions. They could be looked at that way in a loose, rough way.

Pc, well, get the shuns. The pc is sitting there to get smarter, so you educate him. See? He's sitting there to find out from himself, so you give him the information. Now let's put it a little more closely, and you'll see exactly how this fits. He's sitting there to find out something about his case, and he finds out something about your case. See, that just doesn't work. And it'll start putting him in a games condition whether you like it or not.

All right. Now, the pc says, "Uh, you said the auditing command before."

And you say, "No, I did not."
And you'll have a divergence of goals at that point in the session. At the least whiff of a games condition, a pc can be guaranteed to take off in that direction. They'll be knocking the tennis balls around the court from there on, man.

Disagreements, of various kinds, of course, lead directly into a games condition because the game is basically an individuated nonagreement. The only agreement there, is to have a game. And as soon as you establish the agreement to have a game, of course, all other things go into a disagreement. You've got certain rules of this game, but the pc is on one side, and you're on the other side, and you're not auditing now. Auditing is the one activity in which a games condition must not exist. That's for sure. And, as soon as you drop out R, of course, you've dropped in an ingredient that could lead to a games condition. So that a missing R goes into a games condition.

Now, you're sitting there withholding something from the pc with magnitude – you yourself might kind of get tricked into the thing, you're playing some kind of a game with the pc. You get the idea? It sort of reacts like that. You're withholding something from the pc, so obviously you must be playing tennis with the pc. You see? Just the fact that you are, will enter this type of atmosphere into the situation. Of course, C breaks down at once. Auditing is an activity of an auditor taking over the control of, and shepherding the attention of, a pc, so as to bring about a higher level of confront ability. He has got to be able to confront more of what he has done, is doing, and so forth.

You actually are not even changing the pc. Same pc. He's going to shed some valences, some various things are going to happen of one character or another, which will certainly appear as change. You haven't changed the pc, because his level of vision can remain at 249 degrees in direction, only it is now eight miles long. It isn't being stopped two inches from his nose by an automobile accident he had. You get the idea?

So you haven't even changed the direction of his attention. Eventually he will wind up with his attention in all those directions, only his attention will be free in those directions. What you're doing, actually, is extending and familiarizing a pc with himself and his bank and the universe, various dynamics.

And therefore, his attention very well has to be shepherded. You can't expect the automaticity of an auditing command to do all the shepherding of attention, because the pc is going to duck.

The pc's attention is on object A, and the pc goes into a dispersal from object A, and you don't want the pc at that moment to be dispersing from object A because you don't think object A has been regarded at all. And yet you think at the same time that the pc is totally capable of regarding object A. We're not going to throw him in over his head. But he just told us that, "Well, I have this stuck picture of this candy shop."

"All right." Time goes on. "Now what are you looking at? What have you got now?"

"Well, I got this camel."

"Camel? What happened to the candy shop? It's all right to have a camel, but what happened to the candy shop?"
"Oh, that just disappeared."

"Well, what was that about the candy shop?"

"Well, I don't know. It was just a candy shop. And it was just sitting there. There, there it is now."

"Well, did it come back? Has it still been there?"

"Why, I guess it's still been there. Actually, I have this camel. It's a small picture up to the right of the candy shop. I hadn't noticed that before."

"Well, what gives with this candy shop? How come? What's on the other side of it? What's in front of it? What's all this about?"

"Yeah, well, you shouldn't have asked. You shouldn't have asked, you see." This was the key withhold that was holding up the whole Security Check. He robbed it. That's all. And it just seems to have been totally occluded, and the only thing he's got left of it is a stuck candy shop. And the motion and action around there with the eighteen blocks he was chased by the police patrol car. There's nothing around the candy shop. Nothing, except policemen, guilt, potential prison, and an eighteen block chase, and a screaming police car, you see. Nothing around the candy shop. It's totally blank. That's it.

You can count on the fact that every stuck picture is in some degree held, but that the person is able to regard the action if he can regard the stuck picture. The indicator that he can regard at least some of the action or consequences in the scene, are indicated by the fact that he has a stuck picture blanking them out. So he can always do the gradient scale of looking a little bit further, and you can always do the gradient scale of looking a little bit further at what the pc is looking at.

You didn't ask the pc to look at the candy shop in the first place. You just found out that the pc was looking at the candy shop. You got the idea? And it's just a candy shop and a candy shop. Once in a while you'll have a pc saying, "Well, candy shop, candy shop, candy shop. Aaaahh. It's a picture of this cand – it's a picture of this damned candy shop."

"Well, what is that?"

"Well, I don't know. That's started to worry me. It's just sitting there."

"Well, what about it?"

"Well, it's just sitting there. There isn't anything about it. That's what's so mystifying about the whole thing, you see. There is nothing there. It's just a candy shop. And there's nothing going on. And I think I've had this for the last twenty auditing commands. I mean there's this candy shop. I mean there's just this candy shop, you know."

He's actually asking you, for God's sakes, let me investigate this thing or do something because I myself do not have quite the punch and power to do so. Don't you see?

So you say, "Well, look on the other side of it. Is there anything just short of it? Is there anything on the other side of it?"
You only have to do that once, something of that sort. And boom! He's looking at more, and this thing all changes and so forth. But changes on cases which are rapid, and changes on cases which are highly beneficial, very often come about from the shepherding of the pc's attention. Not from the permissive grind, grind, grind. But let's find out what he's looking at. And then let's get him to see it. That he's looking at something doesn't mean he can see it, because he doesn't know what's all going on with that situation. Now you're blowing more unknownness out of the session, aren't you?

The pc with an unknownness confronting him can become absolutely frantic. Utterly frantic. It is just an unknownness, and he can't seem to examine it, and he doesn't seem to know what's going on, and if the auditor at that particular time is deaf and dumb, and there's nothing happening, the pc can become quite upset. Why? Because he's letting the auditor steer his attention, and then the auditor doesn't steer his attention. You see?

He's granted the auditor permission to do a conducted Cook's tour through the bank, and then the auditor says, "Well, that's a ghetto over there, and we don't want to have much to do with that. And that there, that's the court buildings, and we don't want to go in there. And, oh, that's good enough. Well, fine. Just answer the auditing command, that's all. Now let's see, let's -- well, that's just a street. That's just a street. That's all right. Keep your attention about four feet off the pavement, and you won't see any bodies or anything on it."

An auditor isn't there to conduct a safe tour. The only safety precautions you utilize in the bank is to get the pc to examine what he's looking at. And that goes skip, skip, skip, skip, skip, skip, skip. Well, there's another somatic. Skip, skip. And there's another somatic. Skip, skip. And there's another somatic. Skip, skip, skip. Another somatic. Another somatic. I now have eighteen. Skip, skip, skip. And there's another one. Skip, skip, skip, skip. What are you doing then? You're just letting him collapse the bank on himself.

Well, somewhere along the line you have to say, "Son, as painful as it may be and as difficult as I know it is, on life's long highway, you will have to stop and turn around and stare, at least, some of the smaller devils down. And the time has come now. What is beyond that candy shop?" Have you got the idea?

Now, you can get into the idea that you can throw a pc in over his head much further than he is prepared to go, because the pc is always telling you that you have just done just that. How does he do this? He tells it to you by sweating. He tells it to you by screaming. He tells it to you by writhing. You got the idea? And all of these things are, of course, signals of, "We should get out of here." And the auditor who says, "Well, this poor fellow is in trouble. Let's get him out of there," of course, has just taken him and thrown him in trouble. Because the trouble he got into originally in that area was by escaping from it. And he's been in trouble about that area ever since. So all the indicators that the pc gives you, is the pc is in trouble.

And the only error you can make is let him slide out of trouble, let him automatically wander out of trouble, let him somehow or another fall on the pavement, and roll into the gutter, so that he doesn't have to look at the candy shop. You get the idea? And this eventually winds up to a very slow gain.
Yes, eventually the auditing command will come around again and take another sweetmeat out of the window of the candy shop. And then fifteen hours of auditing later, we take another tiny little flick off the top cornice of the candy shop.

Now, an auditor mustn't press and be anxious and be upset about anything but the pc looking and going. Case gains. He wants the pc to get some case gains. He should be quite pressy about that.

"Oh, this process is taking too long, and I think we'd better run another process, because we've been running this process for five minutes, and nothing's happened. So let's run another process now," and so on.

That is the wrong way to direct a pc's attention, because it's directing his attention off of what he's doing. It'd be much smarter – five minutes have gone by and nothing has happened with the process. And you say, "What are you doing?"

"Well, I'm doing so-and-so."

"All right. What else you doing? Whatcha looking at? Whatcha looking at?"

"Well, I got this stuck picture." That's usually the thing. Or "There's just nothing here. Nothing at all. I can see nothing wherever I look."

You say, "Is that so? Which direction are you looking?"

"Well, I'm looking up."

"Good. Look down." [laughter]

Got the idea? Don't change the process because it isn't going fast enough for you. Get the pc's attention directed, and it'll go fast enough to suit most anybody. And of course, you get educated against doing this, because you do it five times with great success, and on the sixth time, the pc lets out a piercing scream, and you are yourself restimulated into remembering that poor native that you shoved the iron spear through while upholding imperialism, so the communists could eventually knock it down, you know. And you are restimulated into believing that you have just impaled this poor native again. Obviously, there's a man in trouble in front of you, because he is screaming.

Naw! He isn't in trouble because he's screaming. He's in trouble because he's getting well, he thinks. See, he isn't in trouble. The only way to get him in trouble is say, "Now, come up to present time!" He'd be in trouble. He'd be in trouble right then. You get what the right way out is? The way out is the way through.

And an auditor who cannot get a pc to move on through is of course an auditor who is being oblivious of what the pc is doing. You can't get a pc to move through something when you don't even know he's anywhere. If the pc is exactly nowhere as far as you're concerned, you can't tell him to look up, down, sideways. You can't tell him to look further at something. You can't tell him to go – "Well, I don't know," the guy says, "I don't know. I just – I don't know. Ever since I ran that picture about the camel, I've had a lot of difficulty here. I just don't seem to be able to get the auditing command and so forth."
"Well, what about the camel? Did you miss anything around the camel? Is there anything else around that camel?" and so forth.

"Oooooooh! You shouldn't have said that." You see. You can count on it every time. Every time the pc stops running, the pc has started fixedly looking. The way to stop him from fixedly looking is tell him to look a little more or look a little better. And the next thing you know, you'll be getting resounding and horrendous results that you never heard of before. This case will be running that you thought was all slowed down because you didn't have the rudiments in, and all of a sudden the case will be running bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. Case will be very interested in what he is doing and so forth. Got it?

If I didn't teach you how to audit a pc, and if I taught you only how to follow a form, I would be doing very wrong. Forms are forms. But running a pc is running a pc. And that is all there is to it. Pc sits down in the chair, and you say, "Start of session." If you've got your ARC in and your R-factors are in, and so on, you go down there with the rudiments, you square them away, and you get the pc into the process, and then you run that pc – you run him.

Now, it doesn't mean repeat an auditing command and repeat an auditing command and repeat an auditing command. Yes, it means repeat auditing commands. But it also – what is the pc doing with the auditing command? What else is he doing with the auditing command? What is he looking at? What is happening? Tone arm all of a sudden isn't moving. Hasn't moved for about four or five commands. "What are you looking at?"

"Nothing but this stuck picture."
"Oh. How long have you had that?"
"Well, I don't know. Last five minutes or so."
"Well, what is it?"
"Well, it's a picture of a mosque."
"Okay. What's going on in the mosque?"
"Nothing. It's just a picture of a mosque."

Oh, right away, what do you know? He must have run into a confusion and a stable datum. And the stable datum is the mosque. And he's looking busily at the stable datum, and he is ignoring the confusion. And the only thing that's going to let him out of there, of course, is to pay some attention to the confusion. And if you can get him to look at the confusion, of course, there goes the stable datum because the stable datum is no longer necessary.

His security is totally bound up in the fact that "If I just stand here and look at this mosque, I'm all set." The hell he is. He's been all set. But he's been standing there looking at the mosque in the bank with his attention all bound up on it for maybe the last thousand years. Well, that seems to me to be a long time to examine mosques. [laughter]

Well, it hasn't done him any good for a thousand years to look at the mosque. How do you think it's going to do him any good through the rest of this session to look at the mosque?

You better tell him, "What might be around that mosque?"
"Well, nothing is around any mosque, of course. It is just sand in all directions."

"Yeah, well, what's around that particular mosque?"

"Oh, this one. Oh, well, nothing, nothing. Mossians or something, they come out and ... Well, as a matter of fact, there is a Mussian right now. He comes out and he says something or other. Well, what do you know, ha-ha, something happened to the picture. Ho-ho. Hey, what do you know?"

That's good enough. Give him the next auditing command. And he executes it, and you say, "What happened? What happened to the mosque?"

"Oh, it's still there. The Mussian's stuck now."

"Well, what's around that mosque? What is around it? Where is this thing located? What is it doing? What is going on? Anything you care to say?"

And he says, "Well, there's nothing around it." He says, "You see, the whole city has been destroyed. Everything except the mosque."

"Oh? Well, what are you looking at there now?"

"I'm looking at the destroyed city."

"Well, what else do you see there?"

"[Sniff] Nothing, except my whole family [sniff, sniff] dead."

But you see, the computation was if he could just stand there and look at the mosque for the next thousand years, he wouldn't have to notice all those corpses. Something of this sort, don't you see? It's always that sort of thing. Always. I'm not talking now about one particular case. The case that has the black field – wake up sometime and say, "What is on the other side of it?" The case that never sees a picture there, everything is invisible, and so forth – "Which direction is this invisibility?"

"Oh, it's all around."

"All around in what direction?"

"Up, of course."

"Well, look down."

So much for the invisible case. You got the idea?

It's up to you to direct the pc's attention. Why? Because he himself, in that very bank he has been in, has his attention fixed on these objects solely for one reason only: that he has been powerless to direct his own attention in that particular bank and those particular situations. And if an auditor doesn't come along and do some attention direction, of course, the auditing command alone will do the attention direction. Well, it will do something at a slow limp.

But unless the auditor says, "Look. See. What is it? What did you do with the auditing command? What else did you do with the auditing command? What is happening?" Unless
those things go in, you also don't have ARC either because the pc winds up believing implicitly that the auditor doesn't care.

If you want to run a session which has fast results, and you want to do fast clearing, I'm afraid you'll just have to get down to the fundamental, which is that the auditor is somebody who directs the pc's attention through his bank. Okay?

All right. I feel now like saying, "Go now and sin no more," but I won't. [laughter] I'll be back nagging at you again next week.

Thank you.
Principles Of Auditing

A lecture given on 5 September 1961

[part missing]

All right. This is 5 Sept., isn't it?

Audience: Yes. Right.

And 61. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, I hate to begin on a theme like this. There are actually so many things to tell you, why, I don't think it'll ever get it done. I don't think they'll – these things can ever be told you; they are just too many. So I would like to invite your cooperation and initiative in sweeping up, surging forward and synthesizing some of this material as you go. There's no substitute for understanding and there is no understanding without experience.

Nothing was more wonderful than the North's total solution to the black slavery problem of the South. They were not encumbered by any familiarity with the problem at all, which is an optimum way to enter into any problem, of course. One is uninhibited by facts. And the South, of course, was totally uninhibited by any facts of what was going on in the North or what that was all about. The only familiarity they could establish between them, then, was war.

Let me point out that's a terribly, terribly apt example, because that in essence is an auditing situation where there is no understanding or familiarity. If you do not permit understanding and familiarity of the preclear with his bank, he will go to war. And if the auditor does not have understanding and familiarity with the pc and his bank and the mechanics of the mind, he will be at war whether he likes it or not.

The anatomy of hatred is totally based on the anatomy of noncomprehension. And noncomprehension is totally based upon a lack of familiarity and observation. If you want to not comprehend something, by all means don't look at it. But another condition applies: that a tremendous amount of pretended knowingness and pretended understanding can arise after one has not observed. The ancient example of the wise men and the elephant is a very poor example compared to an auditor attempting to audit a pc when the auditor has no familiarity with the mind.

Out of this you get such idiocies as Freudian analysis, which is just plain idiocy, and after some years will bring the patient – who has to be patient; that is why, you see, the term is applied – to a state, you see, where by being careful he can still live. That is the Freudian equivalent of Clear. That was their goal.
Now, a Clear is brought up to a point where he is free to act, which is just the other end of the spectrum. Now, the Freudian analyst sat there in his analysis on a busy, busy, busy pretended knowingness. He "knew" that the observation of children's sexual parts brought about insanity. Well, it must have been, because he looked in childhood only for sexual incidents, and that's the area of the least sex, isn't it? Yeah, fascinating. So he knew what caused insanity, and of course he went on and made people insane.

The Freudians never released it, but in the first three months of analysis, at one time, the astonishing figure of 35 percent suicide resulted. Never been made public. They never validated any gains in spite of the fact that they had the whole field of psychometric tests available.

Psychology is even more idiotic. The psychologist is born out of a school of science that observed dead tissue. The medico has all of his stable data from the area and field of dead tissue. The pathologist does observe a few bugs wiggling, but dead tissue is the source of medicine.

But there – the study of dead tissue – ah, the psychologist came out of this same field. After you've sawed the top of a corpse's 'ead off, all you can find in a skull is a brain, so they studied it. Oh, I suppose that's better than nothing. But let me point out something to you – that the thing they should have been studying had left. [laughter] And out of this, of course, we got a no-observation of the mind and the fundamentals of behavior because they were not observing what they were processing.

I'm not just giving you some tricks of logic here. What I tell you is absolute fact: that the whole theory of modern medicine is based on a study of dead tissue. They – in medical school all they do is cut up dead bodies. They have a ball. They whittle and chop and classify, and that's all very interesting, and I'm sure they learned a great deal about anatomy. But when it came to the mind and they opened up the skull and found a brain, they of course studied it and they haven't been anywhere since. Do you realize that a field is as vital as it makes progress, and a science is as vital as it makes progress, and it is no more vital than that. Let me point out that there has been no significant advance in Freudian analysis over and above the day of its origin in 1894. And there's been no significant advance in the field of psychology since its origin at Leipzig, Germany, in 1879 – they've not gone anyplace. So obviously they couldn't have been observing what the mind was all about. They couldn't have been or they would have found out something.

Now, the most novel thing that I introduced into the study of the mind was the observation of living beings. Very interesting. What a new thought! But you'd have to be able to confront motion to do that, and you yourself would have to be to some degree a man of action. You'd have to be able to confront some action.

You'd have to be out there slugging it along with the fellows who were sweating. And you would never have studied this in any ivory tower. And to withdraw to the highest peak of the Himalayas and regard with curiosity one's umbilical remains is of course not the way to do it because no familiarity ever occurs.

After a while, you would start saying, "Well, if you stretch somebody's umbilical cord far enough, why, you'll get a Clear." Inevitable. All right. Let's take a look at this, because we
can learn a great deal from this one fact. An auditor has two sources of familiarity – two sources – in processing. There are more sources of familiarity than this in general that he could work with but I'm talking now about sessions.

He has the familiarity we call subjective reality, and he has as well the familiarity of the observation of a preclear and his meter behavior while in session. In other words, while he himself is in session as a preclear, he has the opportunity of obtaining familiarity on the data and functions of life and thinkingness. And then as an auditor, you see, he has the opportunity of obtaining an objective familiarity on the behavior and activities and phenomena of the pc as viewed directly with his own eyes and indirectly through the electronic phenomena of the E-Meter.

In other words, there are two spheres there of observation as far as auditing is concerned. Naturally, there are more spheres. There's the sphere of observing life, observing living. There is the sphere of living, as well as observing living. Of course, it's rigged so that if you do too much living in this particular society, you wind up with too many withholds. And after that, of course, your auditor has a lot of trouble trying to get you in session.

I don't know, I think there possibly is some phase of life that is not punished. I haven't discovered what it is yet, but [laughter] – but speaking strictly and entirely in the zone of sessions, there are these two sources of observation and familiarity. You have an opportunity to become familiar in two zones: one as an auditor and one as a pc.

Now, certain laws govern auditing. And if you were in a state of mind where you believe that there are too many laws and that you were having to memorize too many laws and that you have to think of too many laws while you were busy doing it, then I can tell you that you have a vast familiarity on the subject of laws and very little familiarity on the subject of the mind. Ever stop and think of that?

Now, rules can only go so far as to guide you in the path of right and light on the road to making Clears. They can only go so far. The great oddity is that it can be done at all. That is the oddity.

But factually speaking, no number of rules can deliver into your hands a familiarity with what is going on in the pc at any given moment. You yourself should be able to experience that or should have experienced it and should have some knowingness on it. And the moment that you gain knowingness upon this particular subject, the rules will all fall into line and will all have proper value, and you will see the reasons for all of them. And you'll see which ones are important and which ones are not important.

All of that is very comprehensible; you have all been audited. This is obvious that you have familiarity with the mind because you have been audited. Oh, I've got a crasher for you. I've got a crasher for about 30 percent of the cases in Scientology: You have never seen a mind. That's a crasher, isn't it? That is only – the only source of very bad auditing, is no familiarity with the mind.

Now, of course, I have got the machine guns out and the cordons divided up in all directions on just one subject, and that is Clearing. And I am doing every possible thing that I can do to improve auditing, wherever it is, in order to make Clears. This is my push. And to
make them faster and more smoothly with a minimum number of flubs. This is, you might say, my current crusade.

We look at a broader track, I might have some other crusades of much broader significance; but right now this is my current crusade, and this crusade has been in progress now since the 3rd South African ACC. So all I've been doing, actually, is just making better auditors.

And every time I find another gate opening on this route, I am very happy about it indeed. And though I myself may sound somewhat condemning occasionally, just assign it to my urgency. On this line, I am eager. And I would say – having no actual survey present, but just at a – offhand estimate – that at least one third of the auditors in Scientology have never become familiar with the mind. They have no subjective reality on engrams, secondaries, locks, ridges, machines, circuits, time track, visio, sonic, tactile, kinetic – haven't any reality on these things. Don't exist. Horrible state of affairs, isn't it?

All right then. This requires a special technology, and the second that we get this technology, we of course can advance cases much more rapidly. Why are cases dragging their heels to Clear? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why? Why are auditors being difficult to train? Why? Why? Well, they're only difficult to train in those areas where they do not have familiarity.

So obviously, the technical advance which is most needful at this present instant on this particular crusade and campaign is a type of process that will give one a great deal of familiarity with the bank and all of its aspects. And at the same time you would pick up all the hangfire cleared cases. All the cases that are hanging fire on the road to Clear are hanging fire because they are not going along the line they should be going in auditing. They are walking the far, far, far perimeter of the crater, operating so as not to fall in.

I don't know how many hours they could do this on current processes, but that would be up to the auditor. Now, the processes which we have, used in a skilled fashion by an auditor who has comprehension of the mind, would not possibly permit anybody to do this. They would fall in. Bang! That would be it.

Ah! But an auditor who has no familiarity on the mind will applaud this tightrope walk on the far, far edge of the crater. And so he makes very sure that the pc never falls in because that is the thing to do – to keep out of trouble.

All of man's wars, sicknesses, diseases, economic disasters, political chaoses and anything else which he has assigned to the various plagues of existence come entirely from one area: keeping out of trouble.

If this planet and civilization were ever to vanish, perhaps I will come back someday and put a sign in orbit on its exact track – just a single sign – no planet, you see. "There was a planet here once, but they were very anxious to keep out of trouble. They were awfully careful." Oh, that sounds like a grim thing.

Well, fortunately, I'm not going to have to do that because we're all going to get in and pitch. This is for sure. But it's just this. It's just this. It's just that diffidence, this withdrawal from session. It's just that diffidence which makes all that difference. You're not supposed to
keep a pc out of trouble if the trouble is in his bank. Yours is only the trouble you're supposed to keep a pc out of is session randomness, but you're not supposed to keep him out of bank randomness. If he's got a bank to fall in, you would do a grievous crime if you didn't unfasten the nails and bolts on one of the slats of the bridge.

Auditing questions are designed to take the drop; and if an auditor is administering them so that no drop will occur, this must be an interesting session. Here you have all the questions necessary to plunge somebody into a great familiarity with his bank – on a gradient, so that it doesn't overwhelm him – and are applying them in such a way as to prevent him from falling in. By that time, you will start misinterpreting rules. You will need rules, and you'll have to misinterpret rules, and you'll have to do all sorts of things, and you'll so on, and it all becomes very complicated and so forth. But your problem is a rather interesting problem: it is how to keep somebody out of the bank. It is how to keep somebody from getting in trouble.

A pc never protests at getting into trouble that presents him with familiarity – possible familiarity. He never protests against this. What he does is protest against measures which prevent him from becoming familiar with the bank. You can always count on a pc protesting measures which prevent him from becoming familiar with his bank. To this degree, every thetan is owed a considerable compliment. They will do this in session. But sometimes in auditing they are being kind, they are being nice, they are being pleasant and they are being confused; and they keep the pc's attention out of the bank, and you get instant and immediate Trouble with a capital T.

Where do you get this trouble? Pc's getting no auditing, and he knows it. Well, how does a pc get no auditing? He's permitted to walk a tightrope far, far from the crater, and he's never permitted to fall into anything. Pc goes along, "Well, there's an answer to the auditing question. There's the answer to the auditing question," and so on.

And the auditor says, "Good."
And the pc says, "Well, there's the answer."
And the auditor says, "Good."
And the pc says, "There's the answer."
And the auditor says, "Good."
And the pc says, "There's the answer."
And the auditor says, "Good."

And the auditor knows better than to ever ask him, "How are you doing? What are you looking at? Where are you going? How do you feel about this?" Because if he did, the pc might confront his bank and that would be terrible, wouldn't it?

To audit without curiosity as to where the pc is and what he is doing is a sure-fire method of keeping a pc from ever getting into any trouble. If you never find out anything about what's going on, of course you don't have to confront his bank, he doesn't have to confront his bank and the time can go up to light years and nobody gets any auditing done. See?
You don't find out what's going on. He doesn't find out what's going on. Here we go. Here we go.

Now, as a general rule, any mechanism that you introduce into a session – any mechanism that you introduce into a session which permits the pc to avoid confronting his bank or takes the pc's attention out of his bank or takes the pc out of session is going to produce every evil you associate with auditing, which is ARC breaks, heavy problems – all these difficulties of auditing. They're all produced on the same common denominator.

Now, having learned this common denominator, I'll try to teach it to you so that you can really see this for what it is.

The pc objects to not being audited, and that is all a pc ever objects to. Now, if you just write me a catalog of how many ways a pc could not be audited, I will show you then every ARC break that a pc could have. See? That's all you have to do. That's all you have to do is just deliver no auditing, and you get back every phenomenon that you associate as an evil. Pc ARC broke, pc this, pc that, pc not in-session, long grind, pc no gain, pc with a lose, pc not want any more auditing, all of these – oh, just ad infinitum. Anything that you could think of that a pc is liable to do that you would object to as an auditor is all from the same source.

It isn't the pc **thinking** he has no auditing. It has to be the pc is **getting** none. And as soon as this occurs, you've had it. The rocket is up, the lifeboats are out, because everything is sinking with seacocks wide open. That's it.

You audit in such a way as to prevent the pc from being in-session and you're going to get every single evil that you have ever heard of or seen or experienced in auditing. So you just have to figure out how many ways there are that you could do this. So you can't lay it out, actually, one, two, three and say these are the ways. You have to take it from this general, broad observation. That is the rule: You prevent the pc getting audited, and the pc is upset.

Now, this goes so far as an evil of this character: You always have a present time problem with somebody's wife while you're auditing him. Well, what's the basic source of the present time problem? It is always that the wife is denying him auditing. One way or the other, the wife denies him auditing, and this creates the ARC break. Get that?

I don't care what he said, "She went out with Joe, and they went to a bar, and she came home drunk, and I had to put her to bed, and therefore I am very tired, and I am having a hard time staying in session because I'm so tired, having been up all night searching the bars of South Main Street," or something of the sort. Whatever this is, it doesn't matter what the PT problem was, somebody is preventing him from getting auditing. See? So that makes a PT problem and that makes an upset. Got it?

Now, the reason she does this is another interesting reason, which is on exactly the same line; is she can't have any auditing. Just add it up. So the grades of cases are those that can't have any auditing, those that consider their auditing is being prevented and those who can have auditing.

Now, on the first two classes you're not going to get any clearing. So the obvious thing is to remedy havingness of auditing. That would be an obvious solution to any part of it.
This fellow's old grandma keeps nattering into her teacup all the time about how he is doing this terrible thing of getting some auditing and so forth, and so forth. And you say, well, what's the matter with her? Well, you just better sum it up, if you want to understand this old girl, is she just can't have any, that's all.

Why can't she have any? Well, there could be several reasons why, but the main one is if you so much as rattled the knob of her closet door, an avalanche of skeletons would spill all about the room. There'd be such a nasty pounding and bumping of skulls flying about that there would be a terrible dishabille. Isn't that interesting?

Some of this could simply be noncomprehension. Somebody's mother, I think it was, was objecting to a girl being audited and was causing all kinds of present time problems. And the auditor finally got very clever and cross-questioned this and found out that there was no comprehension of anything that was going on. And she didn't know what Scientology was. So he took an old folder we had which gave the dynamics and the laws of Dianetics (Remember? The eight dynamics) and gave it to the old – ah – person. [laughter] And she read it, and after that, auditing was fine. Just was simply the randomity of a missing datum. It was that wild.

Now, auditing for herself, however, would have run into the other barrier. She understood all about it now: There were eight dynamics. And this so gripped her as a concept that after that she knew all about it, and she became quite an authority. The only thing she actually knew was the eight dynamics, and she had gotten these totally on having been handed this leaflet.

I think the leaflet came into bearing on an identical situation or the same situation. I mean it came into existence because of that. We then started using this leaflet very broadly. I remember this instance well. It was marvelous. People knew all about it. There were eight dynamics. And they were one, and they were two and three and four and five and six and seven and eight and that was it! And they knew all about it, and that was brand-new, and now life clarified for them, and everything was fine and it was all good roads and good weather.

But as far as them getting auditing was concerned, this again would have fallen across the skeleton. But if they'd gone on – they'd read the eight dynamics and they'd gone on – its cou – only have been skeletons. So it could be missing data or too much data that they're holding on to, which again they make data missing for you, you see – withholds.

So that third party situation still comes under just that heading: scarcity of auditing. Why is it scarce? Well, it can't be. It can't be had. Either it doesn't exist, which is they have no understanding of it and therefore it isn't anything or if it did occur, why, there would be too many social repercussions of one kind or another because they've got too many withholds. So they can't have auditing, that's all. So you never audit these people unless you practically back them into the corner of the courtyard, you see, and at gunpoint demand what the withhold is.

Anybody start arguing with me today on the subject of Scientology out in the broad public, something like that – I'm sitting there enjoying my creme de menthe or something after dinner, and somebody – all of a sudden somebody jumps me on the subject of Scientology and so forth, "Oh, that. Oh, you're that Hubbard. Oh, I see. Yes."
I tell you what I would do. I wouldn't go any further with the conversation with that. We used to say put them in session, run an engram and so forth. That's still perfectly all right, but I would now take a different tack. I would look at them surprised and say, "Well, what have you done?"

And they would say, "What?"

"No, what have you done that you couldn't tell me about? What have you done that these people shouldn't know about?"

It'd be so non sequitur, [laughter] everybody would be terribly shocked, and they would look at me (they always think you're some kind of a swami with a bath towel wrapped around your head) and they'd – "How did you know?"

"Well, it's fairly easy when you have familiarity with the thing. It does something to the eyes." [laughter]

Every single one of the people present, the next time they were in the bathroom would gaze into the mirror. [laughter]

All right. The pc who is ARC breaky or who gets present time problems is in some fashion or other being denied auditing in some way. I know this sounds very funny. I know it sounds rather monocentric on our part to say that they are denied auditing, because auditing is apparently something brand-new that hasn't existed. Adequate treatment has not existed on this planet – period.

What's your first thought if you fall down and bust your skull, "Oh, God, doctors! Oh, God! Hospital bills! Oh, my heavens on earth! Well, they'll probably trepan me. Ooooh, whoa, wah, wah..." You're not worried about the fact that your car is wrecked near so much as the fact you're now going to be treated. Isn't that right? You get an injury, now you're going to be treated. You hope you don't get too sick because then you will have to be treated.

Rarh, you can see some sawbones coming around and taking cotton wads and sticking them on swabs and sticking them into your nose – which won't do anything, you know, but irritate hell out of your nose, you know [laughter] – and monkey with it and say, "Well, you take this prescription, which you go up to the drugstore where I get a cut, you see, and over here to the chemist, and he'll fill this thing, and then he can put it on 'national service' or something." And then after you've gone to all this trouble ... It's just enough trouble just to get some of this swill, you see, and when you take it, it tastes ghastly, and you know it won't do anything either.

Confidence in treatment on this planet is at its lowest possible ebb. The only planet I know of where it dropped any lower was the Marcab Confederacy, and it dropped much lower in the Marcab Confederacy. The way they taught medicine there, they had a number of drawers with dead, dried tissue in them. And they'd drag these drawers out, you see, and show the students, "And this is a dried head, you see. And this is tissue that's been affected by tuberculosis. And this is this ..." and it was all dried, and so forth, and that was their total command of medicine.
The only thing that was wrong with this particular activity is these really were infected tissues, and they were still carrying the germ spores, which I thought was always a little bit rough. But I remember giving medical lectures occasionally, and any student gave me any trouble, why, I'd just drop some tubercular tissue on his desk. This was all sort of raw. But there it got to a point where you weren't ever permitted to get a new body. And this is typical of many space opera societies and is getting typical of this one. This one will go along, too.

And this society has got it rigged up now where the best treatment for this and that and the other thing, you see, is to give some fellow an artificial medulla oblongata and wire him up, you see, for sound. And they're starting this evolution where they're going to replace the body with the mechanical parts – you know, that I've told you about before – and eventually they'll omit the printed circuit, and the things still work, and they'll say, "What's this?"

All right. Well, not to get off onto whole track, but you've got a point here where treatment is very, very poor. It's guesswork, it's unpositive, it is negligent. Little girl hurt in an automobile accident here in East Grinstead is taken up to the hospital. She lies there on a cot bleeding for several hours in an anteroom without anybody even coming around to put a tourniquet on. I mean stuff of this character just goes on all the time. Treatment has to be done by calloused people because it doesn't treat.

Now, the consternation which can spread through a hospital by a Scientologist walking in from bed to bed and doing Touch Assists and so forth has already been demonstrated on many occasions. And it is consternation. But nobody can confront it. The doctors can't confront it. Some of the nurses do, but never the doctors. Scientology has done some fantastic things in hospitals. Well, I personally have discouraged it. We are not in the field of healing. That doesn't say we can't heal better than they can. But healing is at such an ebb that if you cure somebody with a broken leg – I mean that, too, cure him – and he's been in bed for three or four days with this broken leg, and they're getting ready to come in and put a souvenir cast on him – I think that's why they put casts on things like that, it's so people can write their names on it and then keep the souvenir.

The end product of this is what? You cured him! My God, you never heard so many remarks as will be made by doctors which are further off base in your life. They are fantastic remarks! They are incredible! And it'll finally sum up to, "Well, the leg couldn't have been broken." And they will make this remark while they're looking at their own x-ray plate!

I had this advanced to me one time. A little kid was cured of leukemia by an auditor. In older days they did much more of it than they do now. And the auditor thought, boy, that medico's eyes are really going to pop out, see, when he finds this is all negative now.

It was an interesting engram, by the way. Mother's favorite phrase was, "It'll just turn your blood to water." And the auditor pulled this phrase out of the bank and the kid got well. That is, of course, leukemia. That was it. Interesting, huh?

But the medical pronunciamento is: "The child couldn't have possibly had leukemia because leukemia is not curable." [laughter] Just try to wrap your wits around this, you know. You get kind of groggy, you know, trying to make all corners of this thing. They just throw everything out of existence because they know it's not curable and they know themselves are not capable of curing. Hence, their callousness. They have to make nothing out of their pa-
tients, otherwise the treatment would be an overt. The psychologist has to make nothing out of man because treating him would then be an overt. They're just lessening the overt, is their professional approach ordinarily.

All right. What does all this add up to? Absence of treatment. You have preclears who are trained from – not the cradle – they have been trained since the Roman arena; they have been trained since the last pyramid – into the nonexistence of treatment. Well, that is then no cure, no auditing. But the funny part of it is – the very funny part of it is – the very large percentage that still hopes treatment can take place. That is what is amazing! If you're going to be amazed about anything, not amazed about the fact that the wogs never whipped themselves up any method of doing anything, but be amazed at the fact that after all this people still have hope. It's never been killed in a large percentage of the people.

Now, those in whom it has been utterly squashed, to get them into any kind of a session and so forth, oh, wow, man, wow, because you're going on a total no-have of auditing, don't you see? But if there's any hope there at all, that hope must therefore be rather thin. By this time it must be rather raveled. And all the auditor has got to do is make a motion in the direction of no treatment and he ARC breaks the pc.

Why? Because the pc's hope of treatment is already so thin. So you're doing, at first, kind of a cheerleader's job, you know? I am talking about before he gets into session, you know? You have to kind of reassure him. And then when you get him in session, let him have treatment.

All right. Now, how many ways could there be of not letting him have treatment while he's sitting in the pc's chair? How many ways could there be?

First and foremost is not permit his attention to go onto his case. And that's practically a common denominator of all of them. If he's sitting there in the chair, don't let his attention go on his case. Even though he's putting in chair time, he's not being audited, see, and he knows it.

Now, the oddity is that the most crude fumbling around with the case itself, as long as the pc's attention continues on the case, elicits no real protest from the pc. He never protests about this. You run him into some of the juiciest bits that you practically will never be able to get him out of without superheroic auditing, see (actually, you can get him out of anything), and he never protests. He never really protests! But don't let him go into it and he'll protest.

All protests of the pc, all difficulties of the pc, all stem from this same button I am talking to you about: no treatment, no havingness on auditing.

And when these are even vaguely aided and abetted by the auditor, you of course have trouble with the pc; you will always have trouble with the pc. If you're going to give pcs auditing, give them auditing.

All protests of the pc, all difficulties of the pc, all stem from this same button I am talking to you about: no treatment, no havingness on auditing.

And when these are even vaguely aided and abetted by the auditor, you of course have trouble with the pc; you will always have trouble with the pc. If you're going to give pcs auditing, give them auditing.

Now, what is auditing? Auditing consists of putting a pc in-session. And this has two things: able to talk to the auditor and interested in own case.

Now, interested in own case infers, of course, and means attention on his own case. So if you wanted to refine this and make that definition of in-sessionness even more workable,
you would say, "Attention on his own case and able to talk to the auditor." And that would be
an absolute necessity. So that would it be what auditing is.

Auditing is directing the pc's attention on his own case and directing his ability to talk
to the auditor. That would be the scope of auditing. And the only way, then, you could get
into trouble, if that is an auditing session – the only way you could get into trouble – would be,
take his attention off of his case and make it difficult for him to talk to the auditor. And
that would add up on both counts to no auditing. And you would run square into this other
button, and there is where you get the violence of the ARC break. It can be pretty explosive
and can be pretty violent because actually it is painful to have these things happen. But the
basics of the pain is, is there is no auditing, so therefore damage might occur which is irrepa-
yable.

You see, he knows – he believes now the auditing could cure any damage, but if
there's going to be no auditing then the damage isn't curable. And this is exactly which way
his mind dives. So he's in a state of anxiety. The moment you violate in-sessionness, he is in a
state of anxiety.

Now, there are many other phenomena involved with this. One of the phenomena con-

sists of this: He is looking at an engram. The only space in the engram, actually, is brought
about by his attention on the engram; and until the engram is desensitized, he will have to
keep some space in it to keep the engram off the front of his nose.

So that if you distract his attention suddenly from an engram, the space possibly may
disappear out of the engram, and he finds the engram on the end of his nose. And the engram
might have some bite in it. You haven't bitten him, but the engram has. By doing what? By
taking his attention off the engram.

His attention is on the engram, and his attention is on as much of the engram as he is
able to put his attention on it at that moment; and then all of a sudden the auditor betrays him
and pulls his attention off of the engram. And of course the engram will collapse on him,
bang! It's uncomfortable. He doesn't like this. It's physically painful; it can be. He'll develop a
somatic from it. There are various phenomena will occur. Sensations occur that he doesn't
like. And now he compounds it with an overt against the auditor – one, two. See?

Now, how could the auditor distract his attention? How many ways could an auditor
distract his attention? Well, once more we have a very long list. It'd be a dictionary full of
ways. There are numerous ways his attention could be yanked out of session. One is choosing
an auditing room, or permitting one to be chosen for one, which has action or activity in its
vicinity. Why? Because you've set up an auditing session then as the stable datum around
which action is occurring. See? That would be one. You can get away with a lot of that; but
don't try to audit somebody in the middle of a busy street, because there's motion going on all
around, and you'll find later that the auditing session is itself kind of an engram. Why? Be-
cause he got all this motion out of the tail of his eye, you see, and yet his attention is supposed
to be on the case, and so forth.

Well, you can get away with quite a bit of it. But you'll find out in – an operation in a
hospital which is located in a busy traffic area of a city is far more serious than an operation
in a hospital in the country where there is no traffic action. That's fascinating. That's how you
make an operation hang up. Just put a hospital right in the middle of four freeways, and then put its operating room out in a corner of the building, you see, where you've got the visibility of two freeways. Now, we're trying to run the operation and we have a hell of a time running this operation. It seems to be an awful sticky operation. We find out it was for removing a pimple on the left gluteus maximus, you see? It wasn't much of an operation, but, boy, is it stuck!

You see, I know that there was – now that there was larger scope in terms of cubic area to an engram. You'd think of the engram as taking place in the operating room, probably with a scope from the patient to the doctor, you see, or in the immediate vicinity, maybe a cubic yard of engram. You get the idea? Whereas, factually, it isn't even as small as the room, which would be something on the order of fifteen or twenty cubic yards of engram, you see? It's more like half a cubic mile. And as the pc starts running it, he becomes aware of more zone. And if there's activity in that zone, it pins his attention back into the operation.

One of the interesting ways of running an engram would be to pay absolutely no attention to what was going on, particularly, in the operating room – this engram taking place in the corner of the building – but just find out what he wouldn't know about the traffic around the hospital. You'd find all of a sudden the engram just goes fling!, you see? It's just the traffic around the hospital, you see. Oohhhohhhh! Boom. That was what was holding the engram in place. Actually, the engram wasn't being held in place in the auditing room. It was being held in place in the corridor. Got the idea?

If a pc has had a lot of auditing in a very busy, active environment or area, ask them what has been unknown about the activity of an auditing area. And you're liable to find their sessions blowing up much faster than on trying to run out auditors. Get the idea? Because the auditing sessions were maybe fifty cubic yards of zone, and he's only looked at the first cubic yard, and he – yet he was aware of the activity in fifty cubic yards. So the activity in fifty cubic yards pinned him down into the half a cubic yard. You get the idea?

Environment. Environment. Motion in the environment. Very, very interesting study all in itself.

All right. That would be the first thing that you would do about it, is guarantee the noninterruption of the session. That's the auditor's responsibility; no matter who made the room assignment, that's the auditor's responsibility.

All right. There are certain physical limitations against a certain thing like this. But any auditing room you've got around here, to give you some area of comparison, is fairly quiet. That's fairly quiet. Now – there's a little interruption, but it doesn't usually amount to a hill of beans. I'm talking about more motion than that. You got the idea? It takes a little more motion than that to really pound them down and pound them in. It takes something like – well, the most – as we've known for a long time, the most horrible thing you could do to any accident patient would be to throw them into an ambulance, open up the siren, and drive them at eighty miles an hour. And I think, I think that the boys know this down deep, and that they're just lessening the overt of treating him at all.

Basically, it'd – in most (quote) treatments (unquote), it would be kinder to leave the fellow lying on the battlefield or at the scene of the accident, you know – take him over the –
under the hedge and put a pillow under his head and say, "Well, are you as comfortable as possible?" Oh, yes. He's as comfortable as he could get under those circumstances. And if he gets well, he'll get up from the hedge, and if he doesn't get well, he'll die. But who introduced this idea of the scarcity of bodies? Well, there isn't any great scarcity of bodies.

Well, how all this treatment? Ambulances, you know, screaming sirens, eighty miles an hour, you know, traffic areas and so forth. And in the bustling reception rooms, you know, and up elevators and down carriage ways and halls and into a room that's gleaming full of all kinds of reflected light, you see? Oh, man. They're great. They're great. They're marvelous. They got it all taped. And then operate him on some kind of a gas with oxygen in it or ether with lots of oxygen, and have the oxygen tank explode or something like this. They do that very often. Anything to create randomness. Well, I'd say their mind isn't on their business, and we shouldn't make the same mistakes. All right. So much for the quietude of the room.

Now, an auditor who chatters endlessly about other things than the session while auditing a pc, or chatters at a pc in (quote) breaks (unquote) about other things than the session, of course, is actually setting himself up to get the pc's attention off of it. That is not a very broad error, but I have noticed it often enough in HGCs to comment on it. You're dragging his attention off of his case in the break, and then when he starts a session again or something like this, well, of course, the pc's attention is every place. The pc most normally wants to keep on talking about his case, if you ever noticed, during the break. Well, if you're tired of hearing of his case for the moment, excuse yourself and go get a glass of water. He won't object.

But now, in the session itself, an ineffective or unworkable process, of course, is no auditing. But we've got the technology of this thing pretty well taped, and you can almost neglect it. Just do a good technical job. Use the tools which you have. Learn how to use them and so forth. That is an easy one. And that is actually not too much of a barrier. And yet it is the barrier at which you mostly strain. It is not the major barrier of keeping a pc in-session. Certainly, anything we have had since February run on a pc – just chosen at random almost and run on a pc with – inside the limits of what you can do and what you can't do – would keep the pc in-session. I'm now just talking about smooth sessions, don't you see? Almost anything. An old Dianetic engram would keep him in-session. So, technical – technical is a separate compartment to these other things I'm talking to you about.

All right. Our next big hurdle then – let's just lay aside technical. There it is, and it's very important, and that is what we're doing after all, but it is not the main source of auditing bust-ups. Even when poorly done, it is not the main source of auditing bust-ups, because it is auditing. It's administration of that technical which is the main source of difficulty.

Now we get to our next one – our next one, and by far the most important one: the prediction factor. This has all sorts of things such as surprise. Surprise. What is a surprise?

Well, first and foremost, people who have low tolerance for the unknowns are surprised easily, much more easily than you would think. And the degree that a person can be surprised is in direct proportion to his intolerance for unknownnesses. The less a person has tolerance for the unknown, the more he can be surprised.

Now, what is a surprise? And the reason I'm talking about surprise rather than not-know is to give you a little better look at it. A surprise is not having known. A surprise is not
not-knowingness; a surprise is not *having* known. A surprise is a past tense knownness. Now, I've been trying to crack what a surprise was here since 57, and there's what it is. It's a not having known, and that gets at the root of every surprise, and that just rips up all the surprises on the track, *zippety-bap*. That is very rapid for running surprises.

Not having known – not-knowingness. "What isn't known?" doesn't run surprises. "What wasn't known?" runs surprises. You see, the fact had existence before he found out about it, and he is shocked by the fact that he didn't know about it by some weird prescience of some kind or another when it was going on. So therefore, the death of Uncle Zorch is uniformly a surprise, because Uncle Zorch died a week or so ago and we didn't know it. And that is the source of surprise.

Of course, the basic anatomy of surprise is elementary. It is just change unpredicted. So a surprise is an unpredicted change. That is your technical background definition, but how does this register in the mind?

An unpredicted change is not of any consequence unless there was a knowingness present which the pc didn't know and then finds out. See, like the death of Uncle Zorch: Uncle Zorch has been dead for a week, and now he suddenly finds out Uncle Zorch is dead. Now he is very surprised. You see? This amazes him. He's surprised. What's he surprised about? Well, actually, he tries to go backtrack into all that unknowingness of a week. And of course, he gets the impression of himself floundering around for an entire week in a not-knowingness, which is an invalidation of his knowingness and his permeation. And that is the only thing a thetan ever objects to: an invalidation of knowingness. Then he objects with violence, but it's on the basis of surprise.

He thinks of himself as going around all that week – he thinks of everything he did that week with Uncle Zorch dead, which of course does what? It's actually a pretended unknowingness. He didn't really not-know it during that whole week, you see, but it was a fact that existed somewhere of which he was not aware. So he gets a future that looks like this: that all sorts of things he doesn't know about are going on in his vicinity that he will maybe find out about and they will be a terrible shock to him. See? So he starts living in an environment in a state of anxiety. Because he has now had it demonstrated to him clearly and brilliantly that facts not known to him which are quite destructive can exist in his environment without his awareness. So he starts fighting the black thetans every night. You got the idea?

See, he's sucked back into the whirlpool of unknowing yesterdays. Well, the truth of the matter is he knew his environment in those yesteryears, but he looks back at them as not-knowing the environment. So he doesn't know whether he knows it and he doesn't know whether he not-knows it, and things of horrible portent might be going on at just this very moment.

Do you realize – I'll give you an example of this. Do you realize that your nearest and dearest and best loved one right at this exact instant might be in terrible trouble and you wouldn't even know it? Can you get a little spark of anxiety out of that? [laughter] Well, that's what anxiety is and that's what nervousness is. And the fellow who's starting to get nery about things has simply been taught this lesson: that facts can exist without his awareness of them, and he moves over, as a protection-survival mechanism, over into: "I had better be very
alert because it can happen again, you see, that facts can exist without my knowing anything about them. So therefore I am living in an unknown environment."

And this, by the way, is the greatest destroyer of IQ there is. IQ goes down in direct ratio to the amount of unknownness which the individual conceives the environment to hold. It isn't how stupid he is. It's how much unknownness does he conceive to exist there, which is quite amusing. So this then will also apply to a subject.

Fellow can't learn German. He's stupid on the subject of German. Well, why is this person stupid on the subject of German? Well, there must be a lot of feeling that there's terrible unknownnesses in the zone and area of German. I think you take somebody that fought in World War I, World War II and tried to teach them the German language, I think you'd have a ball. See? After he – he's sitting there minding his own business eating his bully beef or something of the sort, and all of a sudden somebody says, "Well, there was an attack yesterday over on A Company, and Bill is dead." It isn't even really the shocks and shells, don't you see? It's Bill is dead, but he should have known it yesterday. Get the idea? See?

If he was any good as a thetan (this is his self-criticism) he'd know these things. Got the idea? He doesn't know these things, so therefore he's stupid. His – his conception of the amount of unknownness on any subject gives you the direct ratio of his intelligence on that subject. So in the environment at large you get an additional one which is, the amount of unknownness he conceives might exist in the environment at large, regulates his intelligence about the environment at large.

Ah, you get people in insane asylums where this has gone all the way out, and they don't know those walls are there, ooohhhhhooohhhhh. Might be something else, you know? Ooohhooohh.

Watch them, you know. And then they get to a point where they don't know. They don't even dare look at the wall. They don't know they don't know about the wall, and so forth, and uhhhh there might be spooks present and – and then they very often will solve this whole problem. The anxiety factor, when it comes to solution, gets to be gruesome indeed. They will mock up unknown presences so they can be known presences, you see? They solve the whole thing. They say, "Well, the way to conquer all this unknown environment, or this unknown about what the people are going to do, is just put the people in the environment. And we will say they are there." Don't you see? Now, let's solve it with a total delusion.

I saw such a fellow. I was up at Lowestoft inspecting a couple of motor fishing vessels not long ago and there was a war veteran there, and he came aboard one of them, and he was evidently using one of its cabins to change his clothes. And he came aboard and he changed his clothes and he went out and with the most vile language was having violent arguments.

First, he tried to have a violent argument with the boat guard, but this didn't work too well. But he had the most violent argument going along, and I listened to it. And, of course, everybody said, "Well, he's been crazy ever since the war, but – " and so forth, "and it's just something he does," and so on. But I looked at him rather interestingly from a standpoint of exactly what he was doing, you know, as a Scientologist would. What is this fellow doing, you know? And he was scolding back at somebody who was reprimanding him – probably a sergeant – very defensive, snarling, vile, violent kickbacks. There was obviously somebody in
his environment that was just scolding him all the time and reprimanding him all the time and
telling him all kinds of things all the time, and sometimes the person would be over on
the right and sometimes over on the left, and he'd have to bop and turn in that direction and shake
his finger at this fellow and curse him out and say – and tell him off, really tell him off. And
he'd walk a few more feet, and the fellow would be over here by now, and he'd tell him and he'd tell him off, and so forth.

Well, what was he doing? He was putting a known in an environment which had be-
come intolerably unknown to him. He could no longer tolerate that much unknown in his en-
vironment, so he had put a known into it. In other words, he had gone through the line of just
merely being insane on the subject of the environment, and he was now in a pretended know-
ingness on the environment, which was really gone. You get the mechanism? Well, that's the
mechanism of surprise.

Well, this applies to sessions, very closely and very directly applies to sessions. Most
of what a pc is going through is accumulations of unknownnesses that he suddenly found out,
and nearly everything he's got in the bank is a prevention against being caught unawares
again. I won't bother to give you any examples of that. If you're interested in examples of it,
look in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health – any engram in there that is detailed –
and you will find out that it is the intolerance of the unknownness that causes the person to
get the reactive computation that will act without his finding out about it.

You see? He's got some kind of a mechanical setup that any time – you see, it's very
dangerous. The little fish gets bit in water that has yellow stones on the bottom. So, of course,
when he sees yellow stones on the bottom, why, he must have a mechanism now which tells
him to get the hell out of there because he's in danger, and he just does this automatically.
And he (quote) doesn't like yellow stones, don't you see, (unquote). So he never goes near
yellow stones, and this keeps him out of ever being bitten in water where there are yellow
stones. And then, of course, he starts to go kind of daffy because the next time he gets eaten
up, he gets eaten up in water that has blue stones. "You can't win," see; that'd be his motto
after a while.

Do you follow this rationale of how all of this comes about, exactly what occurs when
a pc finds out something in session from the auditor which existed before he discovered it?

Now, let's look at a mechanism of what could happen in something of that order. The
pc is sitting there interiorized into his bank. All right. That's all very well, he's sitting there
interiorized in his bank, and he's going along and he's looking at it and so forth. And then all
of a sudden the auditor reaches over and diddles with the E-Meter cans, and says, "Well, the
meter is out so we have to stop the session." This happens more times than you'd think.

Well, the pc is given the datum that the meter was out and he didn't know it, so there
wasn't a session when he thought there was one, and this has possibly been going on for a
little while, see? And the little while that this had been going on, of course, is an unknown
area, so that's what pins him in the session – not his consequent overt so much as what was
unknown. Got the idea?

Now he's finding out about his case, and he's going along fine about his case, and he
thinks the auditor is satisfied, and all of a sudden the auditor stops the process. The pc thought
he was doing all right, the auditor didn't think he was doing all right, so you've got an un-known.

That's a come-to-realize more than a surprise, but it's a come-to-realize that an unknown has existed – an unknown has existed – and those are the damaging points of the line. They're not complicated otherwise. See this?

Of course, surprise is based on change, and sudden change is the anatomy of all surprise, and so forth. But we're interested in the more – the living phenomena connected with the change, the unpredicted character of it. What do we mean by unpredicted? We mean not known. It's the not-known character of it that is the sticker, and that's what sticks them in surprise. It's not the fact that change occurred that sticks them in surprise. It's they didn't know it. And you better learn that one well as an auditor.

You can change a process fifteen times an hour on a pc without damaging him, but you can suddenly change a process on some consideration he doesn't know about once in two hours and ARC break him across the boards. See? The unknownness. He thought he was doing all right. All of a sudden he isn't doing all right, or something like that, don't you see?

He thought he was going to run this thing flat, and the auditor isn't going to give him a chance. The auditor has been sitting there, possibly with some critical thought – because the pc will add up and put supposed knowingness and all sorts of things in the way, and therefore he gets accusative of the auditor. He'll try to solve this problem. What's he trying to do? What are all these accusations against the auditor? They're just efforts to solve the unknownness which existed before the fact of change. What the hell was all this about before the change occurred? You see? He's left in a zone and area of noncomprehension.

All right. That's very messed up. That can get very messed up in a session. That can go blooey-blooey-blooey. Do you see what the exact mechanism of it is there?

All right. Then you could do auditing along in this style or you could advise the pc well in advance of what you were going to do and what you intended to do, and if you did this in a way so as not to yank his attention too violently off of what he was doing, well, it'd be fine. So, your one-two-three would be something on the order of find out what he is doing and then advise him what you are going to do.

You say, "Well, what are you doing? What are you looking at? What is it?" That's perfectly all right. You can ask him all kinds of questions that you possibly care to along this line. "What is it?" "What are you doing?" "How is it going?" "How did you answer the question?" "What did it apply to?" "Did any picture come up?" "Is a picture there?" "Have you seen any pictures for a little while?"

Any type of questioning like this, of course, is directly putting him in-session, isn't it?

All right. Now, if we only do this just before we throw in the bridge and end the process, this becomes a signal that he didn't know the process was going to end at this moment; so you ask him how he's doing – this can get this silly – you ask him how he's doing, and he'll tell you that he didn't know you were going to end the process. He gets upset because he didn't know you were going to end the process. See?
So if a pc is getting into that state of thing, auditor patter can move over onto this as a
cure of the not-knowingness of the pc; and you can say, "Well, I'm not going to end the proc-
ness just now, but how are you doing and what are you looking at?" You get the difference?

"Oh," the pc'll say, "Well, that's all right," you know?

"Now, I want to find out what you're doing, because it's getting toward end of session.
I just want to find out what you're doing so that we can get this patched up okay before we
end the process."

Why, that's okay with the pc, too, don't you see? See, that cures his notknowingness.

All right. Now, you can ask him how he's doing before you tell him to do something,
and he'll be fine. But if you start suddenly on an auditing command – this isn't ne – this does-
n't get people into much trouble – you start suddenly on an auditing command without telling
him you're going to do so or clearing it, he will normally go ahead and run the auditing com-
mand. That is not a very fruitful source of trouble about it. But if the auditing command does-
n't work after you have done that, of course, he thinks you are impetuous or rash. See? So this
is just one other way that you're denying him auditing.

Now, a pc is only one kind of victim. There's only one victim – only one victim com-
plex in a pc. He's a victim of no auditing. That's the only victim complex he's got. No matter
how many victim complexes show up on his case or motivators or anything else, these things
are minimal. What's important is that he's the victim of no auditing and – because out of that
becomes all your auditing difficulties, and we're talking about auditing difficulties in this lec-
ture, see? So it's just that one thing. It's no auditing. See? You're making a victim out of him.

All right. Now, this reads to him on this basis: that an unknown exists that he doesn't
know about in the session. That's why you have to keep the R-factor up. Pcs know. They can
sense these things, you see? And unless you keep them genned in and keep the R-factor in
and keep the knowingness factor in and so forth while you're auditing, you get into all kinds
of trouble that's very mysterious to you. And you say, "What in the name of God is happen-
ing? I mean, what is wrong with my auditing?" Well, your auditing might be practically flaw-
less except it'd omit these points. It'd omit the basic point of denying him knowingness. See?
So your auditing becomes an unknown, and that's why you've got to keep an R-factor in.

You're tired. You don't want to audit him. In a very short period of time he's going to
find this out, and of course that makes a new surprise, because the mechanics of surprise are
there no matter how gently the news broke. See? So breaking the news gently, to hell with
that. Just make sure that when an unknowingness is about to occur to the pc, you turn it into a
known as far as you're concerned as an auditor – from your viewpoint as an auditor, as far as
the session mechanics are concerned. Warn him. Keep him aware of what's going on. Got the
idea? What you are going to do.

Now, of course, you can err perhaps in being too verbose about telling him what you
are going to do, but that error is not serious. It just consumes a little time. The error is in try-
ing to make time in an auditing session by omitting this. That is the error which causes your
ARC breaks and upsets. Omit this. Why do you say, "Now I am going to audit you"? See?
Why do you say such things as that, except to gen him in. "Now this is the process we're go-
ing to run." Well, whether you have his agreement or not, for God's sakes give him the knowingness.

Now, you can audit a pc without his agreement, but you can't audit him without his knowingness. So move your importance from agreement over to knowingness, and you'll start running awfully smooth sessions. Get smart at this. Get real smart at this.

Right at the beginning of session, give him a whole timetable of the session, then keep it. Tell him what you're going to do, step by step. Keep him genned in as to what's happening. Now he'll relax about the environment, because his main difficulty is he thinks the environment is full of unknowns. Well, don't make the auditing session another unknown to him. Give him the gen. Give him the gen.

Now, ARC breaks clear up most rapidly on not-know processes. These are killers. And you want an ARC break process that works, man, that is one of them. But remember that a not-know process run in that wise is always run past tense. Don't ever run it present tense. Run it past tense.

"What wasn't known," you see, "in this session?" "What wasn't known about what I was doing? What didn't I know about what you were doing?" Didn't I, you see? Past tense. Not "What don't I know about what you're doing?" Always past tense. Always past tense, because that's the element of surprise. That's where the track is collapsed. It's that an unknown existed which he found out about. And it's the find-out-about point that you are hitting now in auditing and that is not the damaging point. When you try to clear an ARC break you're trying to clear all these find-out-about points, the known points, and they are not the difficulty in the session. The difficulty in the session is the period which preceded it. So he is thinking of this not-known always in a past tense.

This doesn't apply to Security Checking or anything like that. I mean you're not interested in – we're just talking about sessions. Doesn't matter what tense, as this doesn't influence the use of not-know elsewhere. You use those past tense or present tense or the other ways, you know, any way that it's supposed to add up. I'm just talking about patching up ARC breaks and keeping a session running.

So you keep the knowingness in, and keep it in good and heavy. And you keep in, at the same time, a fairly predictable activity. Well, that gives it, of course, Model Session. You're asking in certain order and you're asking in certain ways on the basic bones of a session. And this is predictable to the pc, so an auditing session becomes known to the pc; and every time you jump this in any way, the pc is liable to object. But it is possible to jump it providing you genned him in enough. You just gen him in. You don't even have to have his agreement. Just gen him in. Don't be so propitiative. Just tell him. You know? You say, "I'm sitting here thinking of doing something else with this particular thing we're doing. How is it going to you? How is it doing?"

"Well, it's not doing badly. It's doing fine. I'm right in the middle of this engram here."

"Well, do you think there's anything we could do to make it go a little faster?"

"Yeah. There possibly is because I sure stuck up here."
"Well, what are you doing right now?"

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right. I'm going to vary the auditing command so-and-so and so-and-so, and it's going to be so-and-so and so-and-so now. Do you think that would get anyplace with it?"

"Oh, yes. I think it would."

Well, apparently, you're seeking his agreement. Actually, you're filling him in. See the difference? He'll never ARC break on you on something like that. He'd know. It's not that he'd agree or not agree. It's that he'd know. Do you follow that?

All right. Now if "unknown" is that vital in a session and if "unknown" plays this enormous part in the existence of a thetan, don't you suppose that an unknowness about the constituency, size, shape, general characteristic, name, rank and serial number of his bank doesn't register on the pc with exclamation points? Man, don't it! It really does!

If you don't know about banks, if you don't know about engrams, if you don't know about secondaries, if you don't know about ridges, and you don't know about the time track, and you've never collided with any of these things – you'd carefully skirted that volcano – of course, you're auditing from what pedestal? From the same pedestal that the North declared war on the South. You're auditing in the grand, vast deserts of the unknown. And, of course, it registers straight across to the pc that you don't know your business. And, of course, after that you'll have nothing but trouble with pcs. Interesting, huh?

So if you don't bother to ask pertinent questions that make sense to the pc, and if your questions don't make sense to the pc, of course, the pc doesn't think you know what you're doing. And your ability to control and command a session is directly proportional to your familiarity and knowingness on the parts of the human mind. Directly proportional.

Ah, you've long muttered and thought about this, of how come I could audit pcs that you might have trouble auditing? Or how do I get results faster than you do? It is basically just that. It's right on that basis.

I very often leave a pc gasping as to how I found out that this was about to occur. Well, that's an all right kind of unknown. That's perfectly all right to him because he now knows something else: He knows he's in safe hands. Even though he doesn't know that there is an arquebus pointed straight at his midriff around the corner, why, obviously the auditor already knows that the arquebuser is standing there.

I even demonstrate this to a fellow every now and then. I move him up a few more minutes – I can realize that he just isn't going to go near the part of that engram at all; he isn't going to go near that part of the track, that there is something there, and he is not even approaching it. And I keep saying, "Well, is there something else there?" you know? "Which direction is it?" and so forth.

"Yeah, well," he says, "I am looking to the left."

And I say, "Well, why don't you look to the right? Why don't you just look over to the right?"
And, of course, he gets it straight in the midriff, and he's going to say to himself, "How the hell did he know that arquebuseer was standing over to the right?"

Well, of course, I might or might not have known that the arquebuseer was standing over to the right. But I sure know that if he's going to look over to the right he's going to find out more about the engram, and how do I know this? Well, because he's looking to the left. [laughter]

And it gives you a strange aura of omniscience to the pc. He feels that you must see all, know all.

Well, let's give him a reverse look. Let's give him a reverse look. He's looking at an engram, and he's about to get his head chopped off on a chopping block, and there he is, and this is all very grim, and so forth.

And you say, "Well now, how about that lock there that you're looking at?" and so on, and so on. "Uh... uh, look around the room and let's see if you can have something." Instantly and immediately, he thinks you're the most stupid character he ever ran into in his life. So therefore the unknownness is resident in the auditor, isn't it? You didn't ask the right question.

Get familiar with the mind and make the session familiar to the pc, and you'll be a bearcat of an auditor.

Thank you.
SUBJECTIVE REALITY

A lecture given on 6 September 1961

Okay, this is 6 Sept. 61. Which is more properly AD 11. Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Well now, I was early for the lecture today and I had a complete lecture to give you, and I forgot it. [laughter] So I'll now have to dream up another lecture.

The difficulties of auditing that I covered yesterday, if you will remember, had two ways that you could learn something about auditing, that is to say, as an auditor observing the pc and being audited – the subjective reality. So today's lecture is definitely on the subject of subjective reality, and this then perforce includes numerous parts of the mind and what it's all about. It's a very restimulative lecture, so if you're easily restimulated why you'd better put some earplugs in. [laughter] You better get your earplugs in because this is very bad stuff, you know; I mean, engrams, secondaries, things of this character, they're just horrible. Shouldn't go near them! Might get stuck in them.

The earliest days of Dianetics still expresses some of the awe and almost fear with which the reactive bank is regarded. The viciousness of the subject matter, the – what an engram can do to you, what a secondary can do, the horrors of being stuck on the track, and that sort of thing, of course immediately drops down intention, and so on, the more command you have of the subject.

Now, we have tools today which make the tools of 1950 look like moving mountains with a teaspoon, and there is no great difficulty in getting somebody out of an engram. For instance, England, on the 5th and 6th London ACCs, Scientology almost bit the dust in England asking people to go into the bank and look at engrams and secondaries and try to learn how to run engrams and that sort of thing. It was completely beyond them, much to my shame.

Well, basically we didn't have tools enough to move an engram through on somebody who was having a terrible lot of difficulty looking at an engram. Person was having a great deal of difficulty looking at an engram, he didn't want too much to do with the engram. This gave a great deal of difficulty to the auditor, who himself had no reality on the engram, in holding him in it and pushing him through. So this compound difficulty of the auditor with no reality on looking at the pc in an engram and the auditor with no reality on being in an engram, and the difficulty the pc was having being in and staying in an engram, made a dog's breakfast. Made a pluperfect mess. Well, just because it fell on its head in this degree is no reason under the sun why it should continue to be on its head. Because you could run an engram today with no difficulty at all. You could get a guy stuck in an engram and unstuck in an engram, and so forth, as quick it'd make you spit.
Just nothing to it, believe me, believe me. And in this lecture I'm going to give you some processes that get people over their allergies of the bank.

Now, an auditor who believes that there is such a thing as an engram and there is such a thing as a time track, and who has the idea that there are such things as masses and has a good intellectual approach to the subject, and who is totally aware of pcs having been out of present time, but himself has no slightest idea of ever being in another time stream than now, is a dangerous auditor. That is a dangerous auditor. Because that auditor is doing an escape. He is escaping from then. And now is only an escape from then, by definition. Therefore he will do everything in his power out of kindness to give the proper solution to the preclear. And the proper solution to the preclear is escape from then.

This is directly in reverse to what makes Clears and what makes people well and what recovers things – is you have to show somebody that he doesn't have to escape from then, because he can confront then, and once he can confront then he is no longer stuck in then. You see, that's very simple. In other words, you have to show somebody that he can stand and fight his demons down. You see. You have to show him that he can survive in spite of. You have to show him that these things which are traveling after him were the shadows of life, not the substance. Now, that's what you have to show him. And if you're sitting there showing him how to escape from life, of course, you're teaching him to be worse off.

Now, an auditor who is permitting a pc to escape from life, from the bank, will make mistakes from a standpoint of auditing. And this is the most fruitful source of mistakes. Auditing mistakes, auditing mistakes, auditing mistakes. Pc has no feeling that the auditor is pitching with him; the pc has no confidence in the auditor; pc ARC breaking – all of this kind of thing is all mainly caused by this mechanism of the auditor is not getting the pc to confront the bank. And the pc down deep knows this is wrong. So the pc objects. Pc knows he isn't getting auditing in some vague, dim way, don't you see? And you get all these ARC breaks and upsets, and so forth.

Now, as I say, you can learn a thousand rules. Well, just – I don't know, what are you going to do? Keep a dictionary open alongside of the E-Meter and look up the rule for every auditing command? Or are you going to have understanding and instinctive knowingness adequate to what the pc is fumbling around with? Of course, there is no substitute for an understanding, and understandings are all built on observation and familiarity. There can be no understanding, actually no basic deep understanding, without experience. And a person who has not had any experience of a reactive mind trying to get somebody to handle a reactive mind, of course, as I said, just makes a dog's breakfast out of it. That is a mess from there on.

Now, it has long been said that a Scientologist is harder to audit than raw meat off the street. You hear this every now and then. You hear this left and right. Well, may be several reasons for this, apparent reasons. One of those is the Scientologist knows how it ought to be and how it ought to go. He is also accustomed to handling an auditing session. So as a pc, of course, he is more accustomed to handling the session than a pc would be. He knows which way this thing is. Actually, he audits faster. But he ARC breaks more, you see. Don't get these two things mixed, don't say that a Scientologist gets less case gain than raw meat, that is not
true. He gets more ARC breaks than raw meat. He is more critical as a pc. Why? What is the basic reason for this criticalness as a pc?

It is all in the zone and area of duplication. He just cannot sit there and permit himself to duplicate a bad session. All of his training tells him not to duplicate bad sessions. You see, he's supposed to run a good session. So he sees a session running badly, he becomes totally unwilling to duplicate it. So therefore, his havingness of the session disappears. Havingness and duplication are almost synonyms. So his havingness of the session vanishes much more rapidly than somebody else's because he recognizes what the session should be. And if he doesn't conceive the session to be what the session should be, why then, he is unwilling to duplicate the actions or activities of that auditor. So as a result he ARC breaks. He loses a session faster than raw meat, even though he's in better shape. The apparentness is that the amount of ARC break would be a case indicator. It is not a case indicator. He has a professional specialty, and all of his training says, "Do not duplicate bad auditing." So he, of course, cannot duplicate a bad auditor. So if he feels the auditor is doing a bad job, he refuses to duplicate the auditor and of course, duplication and havingness, being the same breed of cat, he of course loses his session much more rapidly. That strike home? That sound familiar to you? All right. You're just unwilling to duplicate a bad session, so therefore you put up quite a show as a pc. Has nothing to do with your case, but has a great deal to do with your professional attitudes or aptitudes.

All right. Nothing shows up faster in the auditor than an unfamiliarity with the bank. And if a Scientologist who is familiar with the bank is being audited by a Scientologist who isn't at all familiar with the bank and hasn't any idea what the bank is all about, you're never going to get a session, and that's it. At every side this thing is going to ARC break. Naturally, because a Scientologist is supposed to duplicate a bank-handling procedure which is reliable and good, the pc, being a Scientologist, will not duplicate a bad handling. Quite interesting. It's an interesting function, manifestation. A rather effective process to get over a bad auditing session would be, "What part of a blank, or an auditor or a person's name, would you be willing to be?" or "What about so-and-so would you be willing to be?" "What about so-and-so would you be unwilling to be?" You get the idea?

Well now, that shows up with great subjective reality at once, that there are certain things about the auditor that the pc is unwilling to be. And it is his unwillingness to be which makes it almost impossible for auditing to occur.

Now, a Scientologist will respond much faster to routine auditing which does so – show some insight than any raw meat that ever walked off the street, I'll guarantee you. If this other factor is introduced, however, he will not move at all. Because, of course, he can't communicate in the session. Communication-duplication. You have to have duplication in order to have communication. The auditor gives an auditing command, the Scientology pc is out the window. If the command has absolutely nothing to do with what the pc is doing, raw meat thinks he's wrong, you see. He thinks, "Well, I – I don't know, something new to me."

Therefore he says, "Well, the grapevine, the grapevine? I'm supposed to climb the grapevine."
The auditor has said, "Well now, take a look at that grapevine." Well, he's never really ever mentioned a grapevine, you see. There wasn't any grapevine in the session, and suddenly out of the blue, why, the auditor says, "Take a look at the grapevine."

Well, raw meat just says, "Well, grapevine," he says, "There must be a grapevine here. There's obviously a grapevine here," so he mocks up a grapevine or something of the sort. Tries to make something out of all this. And he's a little bit confused, but he doesn't dare protest because of the altitude factor. All right, so he'll go on and do an appearance of pc-ing, you see.

You tell a Scientologist – he's sitting there and he's looking at this railroad track and the auditor says, "All right now, what about this grapevine?"

And Scientologist says, "Grapevine? What – what the hell are you talking about? What grapevine?"

"Oh, a grapevine you mentioned a few minutes ago."

"Grapevine I mentioned a few minutes ago? I don't recall mentioning any grapevine. Oh! Oh, oh, oh, you're talking about – No, I said it was on the grapevine. It was rumored."

"Oh."

And you'll get something like, "Christ almighty, why the hell don't you learn how to audit?" [laughter] Almost instant response, don't you see. And the auditor has not been in good communication with the pc. He's made some little flub of some kind or another, you get this razzle-dazzle going, and whambo, see?

Well now, if the auditor has a good familiarity with the bank, he will know exactly what he has done. So therefore he can handle it. And therefore the ARC break doesn't continue very long He understands, don't you see. See, instantly he'll say, "Well, this pc must have been looking at something else and was quite absorbed in it and I've distracted his attention and I must be writing script here. See, I must have written a little script. Now, let's find out what the pc is doing" So right away the auditor finds out that he's had the wrong look at the situation, he says, "Well all right, what are you looking at then?"

"Oh," pc says, "This railroad track."

"All right, all right. What about the railroad track?"

"A railroad track, and it goes on to infinity," and so forth, and it so-and-so, a cognition and this and that, and so forth, "and that was what I was trying to tell you."

"Well, all right, I heard you now."

There's no more ARC break.

But the auditor who has no reality on the bank will go this way: the pc says, "Grapevine? What the hell, grapevine? Good God, why don't you learn how to audit?" See. Well, he's thinking; he's almost going into this, you see, and this other person says well – takes up at once the flub. Puts the pc's attention on the flub, you see. And the flub isn't anything because it's not aberrative. But what's in the bank is, see. So he puts his pc's attention back on what is aberrative, see. And the auditor isn't so self-conscious about this.
But the auditor who has no familiarity with the bank will say something like, "Oh, well a couple of minutes ago you talked to me about a grapevine. What did you mean about a grapevine?"

"Uh, well, I don't know, it was this grapevine, I mean, I said it was on the grapevine, and that meant some kind of a rumor, and so forth."

"Well, I misunderstood you. I thought you said that – I thought you said that you had a grapevine there."

"Well, I didn't have a grapevine here!"

"Uh, oh well! Well, what kind of a rumor was that that you were talking about?"

"Well, I don't know, I've forgotten about it now."

See, the auditor doesn't have the dimmest concept. He sees the pc, the pc is apparently there in a body, is apparently there in present time, is apparently able to talk, and so forth, and has no idea that the pc is not in present time, but the pc is on the backtrack and the pc is actually expressing displeasure at having his attention flicked off of what his attention is on, you see?

Well, the auditor that has some experience with the bank, he says, "Well, this pc's attention is on something else. What the hell is his attention on?" Don't you see? He says at once, "Well, the pc's attention must have been on something else. Well, what is the pc's attention on?" And, of course, the session continues.

But if the auditor thinks that this ARC break is terribly important, the mistake is terribly important, he'll put the pc's attention over on the mistake and we get an entirely different situation going because now we have nothing to talk about but the mistake. Now, we'll get off with TR 5N, and so on, and all this adds up to what? This adds up to no auditing. Ah, but that is the only basis of the ARC break. Ha-ha! So the more we handle the mistake, the less auditing occurs, so apparently then you can't blow an ARC break. Look simple? You see?

So the auditor who has no familiarity with the bank does not see why the pc is going kind of zzzz-zzzz. See? He hasn't any subjective reality on the idea that somebody can be there and absorbed in something and looking at something and trying to do something and trying to follow out maybe an auditing command and has his attention on something. If he understands this and if he knows this, and if he has subjective reality on it, of course his first thought – rules or no rules, you see – his first thought is, "Well, what the hell is his attention on?" See. Not self-consciously, "What horrible mistake I have made. Now I will have to remedy this terrible mistake I have made." Well, of course, the person isn't projected on the pc, hasn't any reality on what's going on, he hasn't any idea that the pc's doing other than just sitting in a chair. See, he thinks the pc's sitting in a chair so the pc's there to be sat in a chair, so therefore the pc is a person sitting in a chair in present time, who is just nastily and out of the meanness of his disposition or her disposition is having an ARC break. You get the adjudication, see? So you get an overt on the part of the auditor and an overt on the part of the pc, and then you get a dog's breakfast for a session. Get the idea?
You can make a fantastic number of flubs if you know what you're doing. You actually can. You can just go on, flub, flub, flub, and you know what you're doing, you can always grab them. But if your flubs are being made and you have an understanding of the subjective situation of the pc, you can straighten them up so fast that they're just there.

Yeah, you give the pc a wrong auditing command, or something like this; you miss an auditing command, and so on. And pc starts to answer it. Don't stop him, let him answer the auditing command. Then give him the right one. Don't keep dragging the thing up to PT. But you see, a person who has no subjective reality on the bank has no idea that he's dragging a pc up to PT. You see, he's not using any process that drags a pc up to PT, except put attention on the session. So actually the pc now gets present time collapsed on the track. Well, he's rather out of control. He has a hard time orienting himself.

Now, disorientation is for one thing the source of dreams and delusions. Disorientation. Person has a dream – Well, if you have a dream – you're worried about having nightmares, something like that; you want to cure yourself of having nightmares – or when you wake up, out of the nightmare, well, look it over and figure out how the nightmare spotted you somewhere, how it located you. And figure out where you are, and locate yourself. After you've done that a few times you become so unanxious about locating yourself that you don't have nightmares. Interesting, isn't it?

Thetan's in the skull and he can't find out where he is, the eyes are closed and the body is asleep, he can't find out where he is so he puts up some pretended or false knowingness as to where he is. And so the false knowingness as to where he is then makes this sequence known as a dream or a nightmare, or whatever. And that's all that is. It's a pretended knowingness about location is what a dream is.

Old Papa Freud were around, why, I'm sure he would contest that. He'd say that's – "Actually a dream is the expression of inhibitions, because everybody knows man lives with a horrible, ravening beast, barely repressed below the censor." I think the guy must have been on a naval vessel during the time of war and after duty he always had to censor letters or something. He had some engram running there.

But the upshot of this is, of course, you'd get a totally wild idea. If you were processing a brain or something of the sort, and you – and there was a thetan present, why, you'd choose the thetan for your randomness and after that you'd, of course, believe that there was a primitive being of some kind or another which lay down below the intellectual surface of the mind and you'd get all sorts of wild ideas, and so forth.

Well, the second you disorient a thetan you give him the only real shock that he can get. You've sort of chosen him out for your randomness. You sort of told him, "Get lost. Get confused. Get lost."

Now, when you're auditing, with the processes you're using and so forth, you're in direct communication with the thetan. All right, now, this guy, he's got problems and they're disorientation problems of various kinds and most of these problems are just disorientation. He doesn't know where he is, you see. All right, so he's down the track someplace, groveling around, and looking under odd corners of things to find out where he has been and you spring a surprise on him and his first reaction is not to know where he is, so his next action is delu-
sory knowingness. He'll put up a pretended knowingness. He knows he doesn't know something, but the first – his first reaction is to tell you that he doesn't know something. He doesn't know what you are doing. He doesn't know this, he doesn't know that. You get the idea? Well, actually all of he's – all he's saying is, "I'm disoriented. I was in one time stream and now you've got me back in this other time stream and now what the hell are we doing?" It's as simple as that, don't you see?

He thought he was going through the back alleys of Timbuktu, about to be knifed, don't you see. And you've got him all persuaded that he's in Timbuktu with your auditing command. Whether you realized it or not, you were persuading him he was in Timbuktu. You've said – you've given him an auditing command of "What unknown alley could you confront?" see, and he's obediently confronting some unknown alley, and then you give him an unknown room, because he's not aware of the room very much, and you give him the room suddenly, don't you see. And then you insist he stays in the room while he is still in the alley, and he'll put up delusory arguments. See, just like a dream or nightmare, you know. He'll put up all kinds of reasons why you did this.

And the only reason why the auditor did this is because the auditor didn't have enough subjective reality on the bank to realize that the pc is in another time stream, and that's it. That's the only thing that occurred. He didn't have enough reality on the pc's bank. And he fostered a disorientation and the pc becomes confused thereby. And the delusory character of a pc who is telling you all sorts of extraordinary things about your auditing, and so forth, these things are simply delusory. He's trying to orient himself, he's trying to find the unknown. But, of course, he's in the unknown of thinkingness because he's confused enough not to be able to confront the unknown of whereness.

See, the unknown of whereness, you know, location, always requires more on the part of the pc than unknown of idea. You see, solids take much more ability to confront than an idea. See, a thetan finds it very easy to confront an idea because he generally even thinks of himself as an idea. You see, so he finds it very hard to confront suddenly the masses, which is to say location. His location factor is the last thing he'll confront, so therefore he gives you delusory ideas as to what is going on, when as an actual fact he's looking for a factual location as to where he is, don't you see?

And if you don't put him where he is in a hurry he will go on delusorizing as to what you are doing and what he is thinking and what this is all about, don't you see. He just adds significance, significance, significance, significance, significance. And this is all an effort on the part of the thetan, believe it or not, to orient himself. It doesn't sound like it at first collision, but it is just an effort to orient. Where he is – all the auditor has to do to shut any of this off is to find out where the pc has been and where he is. That's all. It's so elementary, you see.

But an auditor would have to have an idea that there is a place to be, called the bank, before he could ask the pc where he is in it. See, if he didn't have a good, solid subjective reality on the is-ness of a bank, he could be startled enough not to remember the textbook rule of "always ask the pc where he is." He would never think of this because it's one of seven thousand rules.
An auditor who has a good subjective reality on this – the pc says, "What? What the hell? What – what was – what – what are you doing?" so forth. He knows what he's looking at. He knows he's – pc's attention has been on something, and therefore he's had an orientation called a bank orientation, don't you see. And he now no longer has this orientation. He is groping for an orientation, he can't find himself in the room, he can't find himself in the bank and therefore he feels very confused.

Of course, all the auditor can do is to find out, "Well, where are you?" see. "Where are you? What are you looking at? What were you looking at?" Not even, "Just before you said that," you see, "Just before I made this mistake, where were you?" Now, of course you've done this sequence. You've put the pc's attention on the mistake, and then put them on the whereness, and now he doesn't know where the hell he is, see. You've given him a via.

You can cure up an ARC break and then by mentioning it in your next question, ARC break the pc twice as bad all over again. It's very simple. You're asking a Security Check question of some kind or another, and you say, "Well, now, just before that ARC break I was going to ask you this question now, and you..." See, what'd you do, you disoriented him again. See, he thinks he's supposed to be looking at his bank and getting auditing, and you seem to be insisting that he look at a no-auditing called an ARC break, don't you see.

But if you've got a good reality on the bank and the thenness of things, and so on – which is a rather simple reality to attain, actually – why, you get this other response. And he rather grumpily says, "Well, I – I was looking at this alley."

"What alley?"

"This alley!"

"All right. How long is it?"

"Well, it's just an alley alley. It isn't very damn long. Alleys normally aren't." He's still nattering. He's a little bit disoriented, and so on.

"Well, does it end? Does it run between two streets, or what?"

"Yeah, well, it ends between two streets," and so forth.

"Well, where is it there, exactly?" and so on.

"It's here in Cairo. Oh, this is Cairo!" he says. "This is Cairo! Yeah, I got it. This is Cairo. There's the mosque, and there's the street, and there's the fiacres, and there's the anti-British slogans, and... [laughter] Yeah, I see where I am now."

"Oh, fine. All right, that's dandy." And he forgets all about the ARC break.

Orientation. That's all it is. But if, of course – as I say, stressing again – if the auditor has no idea that there is a whereness called the bank or the time track, of course, he doesn't – he isn't actually capable of finding the whereness in the pc because he only knows that it exists intellectually. So, yeah, having a look at a time track, and having a look at some pictures and engrams and secondaries, and getting a sensation of thenness, and so forth, is worth a thousand hours of TR 0 to improve auditing quality. See that?
All right, now, I'll give you a few processes by which an auditor could be audited and would wind up with a reality on the bank you couldn't shake with a bat. And actually he'll have to attain this anyhow before he even vaguely gets Clear. He'll – an auditor who is skipping out of the bank and skipping out of the engram and skipping off the track and skipping into PT – he reminds somebody of a parachute, you know, with compressed air blowing up against the top of the chute. He's – never goes down, he just always floats up. No matter what you do, he comes up. And he'll have to get over that before he gets Clear anyhow, so this is a great kindness.

Here's a command: "What unknown would you escape from?" and "What unknown would you attack?" This is simply a basic command form. And this is, of course, reach and withdraw on unknowns. Any verb form on either one of them is just "escape the unknown," "attack the unknown," see?

Now, you put it over into the valence rules and you say, "Think of an unknown. Who would escape from it? Who would attack it?" Got the idea? That gets valences coming into it. And you can go at this in reverse and you could say, "Think of a being. What unknown would he escape from? What unknown would he attack?" All kinds of command forms. But it's just escape and attack from unknowns.

And, of course, you – the pc in this particular case is sitting in the middle of some wild unknown incident of some kind or another, and he'll start attacking and escaping from engrams. He just cannot help himself from doing so. And he'll plunge around in the track like a bumblebee in a bottle – won't know what the hell's cooking. Of course he's never realized that he's right in the middle of the track; he is not in present time. He has kidded himself for years. He is not oriented at all because he's totally surrounded by engrams he isn't looking at. And anybody who's obsessively in present time is simply stacked up with engrams and that's all there is to that.

People who have obscure somatics or not-so-obscure somatics are, of course, sitting in an engram. Now, when you find that person who has somatics, who has also (quote) "never been back on the track" and has no awareness of thenness in the bank – you know, has no awareness of yesterday in the bank – of course that person is not in present time at all. That person has escaped by total withdrawal from some environment which may be two hundred billion years ago, see, so they're not in present time. Not even vaguely. And, of course, this type of auditing command, "Escape an attack from unknowns" – well, of course they're trying to escape from the unknown of what they're in, and at the same time they must be trying to attack the unknown of what they're in, and it'll just unfold engrams like a bunch of picture postcards you buy in Venice. That's one of them. That's just one of them.

Now, you could have a valence-type process: "Who would escape from things? Who would attack things?" Milder process.

Now, you can throw this over into beingness – you can throw it over into beingness – and you'll also throw up track that comes into view. I'll go into this in a minute as to why, but you can write it down. Beingness: "Who would you be willing to be? Who would you rather not be?" will show up track. Your first one is the beefiest one. These others are simply variations of one kind or another.
Now, the reason why a beingness is functional, is that valences are packages and part of the package of a valence is a track. A valence has a track. This is a great oddity, but every once in a while you find somebody without his own bank. He isn't running in his own bank. Any pictures of himself will be wildly out of valence. He is never, never, never in valence. He always sees himself from afar. If you do get him on the track he sees himself from afar, and he gets the vaguest and thinnest impressions imaginable of being in anything – it's very unconvincing, don't you see. I mean, well, he has this picture of himself as a child; well, ask him, "Well, how do you see the picture?"

"Well, the child is down there."

Well, you can immediately assume you have somebody out of valence who is therefore having valence trouble. If he does have any pictures of his bank, you would not be able to find them at first glance. Why? Let us say he is in Mother's valence, so of course the only pictures he gets of himself are the pictures seen by Mother. He always sees himself through somebody else's eyes. So he has the bank of each person in whose valence he has gone. And this becomes the most disorienting, confusing sort of a thing that anybody ever had anything to do with. But first and foremost thing that it does is promote an unreality of location. Because, of course, the fellow knew he was in himself as a child, but as he gets the picture of it he does not see himself below his eyes, he sees himself over there on the other side of the room. Well, obviously he's seeing through somebody else's – this must be a picture in somebody else's bank, immediately, you see. Quite curious, some of the phenomena here.

But every valence is a complete package. A valence has a bank, has all these now-I'm-supposed-to's, has skills, has disabilities, and so forth. It's just a package person, don't you see? It's a package person that does not exist in fact, but is only resident in the mind and is mocked up by the pc.

Now, the pc, of course, entered this on the basis of not being able to have the person and not really controlling the person, and so if the pc doesn't have or control the person in any way, of course, he cannot have or control any of the mechanisms of the person. So you cannot move that bank. It's not his bank. See, he hasn't enough ownership of it to run it as an engram, don't you see how? He hasn't any ownership of this bank, because it's somebody else's.

He doesn't have any – there's no way he could change that person's personality. You could audit him practically forever, and you're trying to change somebody else's characteristics. Never his own ideas or characteristics, they're all packaged characteristics of the other.

Now of course there was a point where this person did enter or did accumulate or collect this other valence, see? And that's the only point where the valence will break. By following this principle that a valence is a total package, and then by the dealing with beings, who, you see, and persons, rather than ideas – the auditing of beings rather than the auditing of ideas and conditions, the auditing of beings rather than the auditing of pictures – these views of other banks, you see, will suddenly blow off. And the person will be left with some of his own pictures. Or you get two or three of these things blown off.

And one of the most effective ways of doing this happens to be Routine 3 complete. And that's why it clears people, of course. But there's a shorthand way of doing this. And you can really shake up a bank – you can really shake one up – just by running any beingness
process. Just any beingness process, just like: "Think of a being. Thank you. Think of a being. Thank you. Think of a being. Thank you. Think of a being. Thank you."
This'd be the most idiotically – it's a long drag sort of a process, it may not be very stable, may not be anything happening, but it is going to shift the bank. It will shift the fellow around, and it will cure somebody of standing outside looking in at his own life, and it'll give him his own track back.

You're every once in a while auditing pcs who have a tremendous number of pictures that they dimly recognize as not theirs. They don't have much familiarity with these pictures; they've got no real recollection of these pictures and it seems sort of dull, and sort of thin. You get a hell of an unreality going.

Well, there's – I run across a case in point: there was a person had a whole bunch of pictures of sexual activities. He couldn't fit them on the backtrack, he couldn't fit them on the whole track. This is one of the mechanisms by the way which invalidates past lives, every once in a while an individual gets into it and sees some thin pictures of past lives, of some kind or another, he can't integrate them in any way, and he says, "Well," dimly, "well, I, sort of have some pictures on the track, but I don't know," and so forth. The person's having beingness trouble.

Of course, in his past life he was another being. And his other beingness is so flagrantly a fact that it's the same as somebody else's bank when this has occurred: that when the other being he was being in the past life was in another valence. Figure that one out.

Now people that have valence trouble go very easily – accumulate very easily other valences, and go into other valences very easily, so he probably has been doing it for a number of millennia. So it's not just one life's worth of pictures that are wrong; it is utterly thousands. I'll give you an example of this, a subjective reality on the thing. This really had me puzzled for a while. Back about 1605, something like that, I was set up – I won't go into the story in any great degree. But it took a warship and a company of marines and a broadside to kill one girl. And it's such a fantastic ferocity, you see, to launch against one girl. She was protected by four redcoats and me. And of course, we caught it in the first three seconds of play. Don't you see, that was the end of us.

But it was such a terrific ferocity against this girl, who by the way, was blind. Now, this really starts pouring it on, see. She was! And her face was so disfigured through a bomb assassination attempt, when she was a child at seven, that she had to wear a mask. And she was a rather pathetic little character. A whole man-of-war and a company of marines landing in boats and a full broadside to kill this one girl.

She was the last of the family of Charles V. She was the granddaughter aspirant of the old Holy Roman Empire, and one of the innumerable French that lived down here about sixty miles had decided she was a great menace to the throne. So they set her up to be assassinated. Well, that was quite an assassination. It was with – it was skyrockets, see.

Well, I was being audited one day. I found myself sitting around with a picture of a girl on a rock, apparently about 1870. Didn't compare with any track I had. Nice exterior view. It just didn't make sense. Didn't have any track I knew anything about. Here was a girl, sitting on a rock in exactly the same location, in exactly the same place, and I knew what
happened to the girl and I knew all about it and so forth, but I hadn't ever known the girl. Fascinating.

What this was all about was very, very simple. Apparently I'd kept a spot of attention on this person as a thetan for the next couple of hundred years. I didn't have the girl's valence particularly, but there was a – there was a cross, there, right at the moment of confusion, don't you see. I had her future bank. You know, I'd tracked the bank of this particular – which gave me a whole set of totally disrelated pictures that had absolutely nothing to do with my pictures and nothing to do with the track. It was very intriguing. They were very thin, very unreal. I knew all about them but they didn't have any real substance, don't you see.

And right now I could say, well, possibly this is the way the track looks to an awful lot of people. Don't you know, it's very thin, and there's nothing much to it, and so forth, and it's all just kind of an idea. Well, it was this girl's track, from the time she had been killed, straight on up. I still had it on file.

Funny part of it is that this girl, picking up another body after that, had gone along for a very long time and had then happened accidentally to be taken by her parents to exactly the same rock that she was killed on in 1605. And she became very ill and she sickened and she died! Just keyed her in complete. You possibly know the place. It's right across from Gib., and the Hotel Reina Christina is on the Spanish coast side. And it's one of those rocks right close to the Reina Christina Hotel. And of course, it's a tourist resort and her parents had taken her back there. What a dirty trick. That must have been some vacation, man! [laughter]

All right, so you take an incident of vast confusion of motion that one is not willing to tolerate. Well, one is willing to tolerate such motion in battle perhaps, one – in a naval battle and it's all the way it should be. But the motion occurs at a moment, or with a target, which isn't suited to the motion, don't you see? There's this much bombardment and yippity-yap, and it causes a hell of a disorientation. And you say, "Well that shouldn't be," you see, and big protest about the whole thing, and therefore you start tracking it.

Now, a valence could occur that way. And ordinarily, however, what would have happened is that whoever had been there would have picked up the girl's valence, don't you see, and would have gone ahead with the girl's valence, and that would have been the person who died because her parents took her back on the rock, don't you see. That would be what a valence – a solid valence picture would look like. And this person wouldn't have any more pictures than the man in the moon. They'd all have somebody else's pictures, don't you see? It'd all be something else, and it'd all be from the wrong point of view, and what would this add up to? This'd add up to a disorientation, all of which springs from a spot of total disorientation. Some incident which has in it total disorientation, then is liable to breed a total, out-of-valence situation from there on up.

All right, somebody who's in that kind of condition of course is having valence trouble. And an auditor who's having too much valence trouble, of course, has no great reality on somebody else's bank because he thinks this bank is not a bank, you see. It's kind of – well, it's about as real to him, you know, as a thin, indistinguishable picture cast up on that wall with the room lights on, with a cracked magic lantern slide. Never bothers him to look at pictures. Doesn't bother him at all.
You start running this person back, however, they wind up in the middle of some kind of an explosion. Eighteen spacecraft all of a sudden collide instantly and immediately on one point in space, because as he was picking up his paperweight off of the chart room desk, you see, it wasn't the paperweight, but it was the fleet signal alarm, or something, you see, and he shouldn't have done this! And you'll find him at this point of disorientation. And he'll be in – and there was a cabin boy there, or something of the sort that he was quite fond of, and you find him in the valence of the cabin boy. Only he isn't quite sure, maybe it's the captain, you know, and it's all a tingletangle, and it goes back to such a point.

That is the type of incident it takes to make a valence transfer. They are not just the conditioned reflex. Well, Joe just keeps hammering at Mary, you see, and keeps hammering at Mary, and pretty soon, why, Mary goes into Joe's valence. That's ordinarily how we look at this thing. We're too prone to believe that aberration is a gradient scale because it can be taken apart by a gradient scale. Aberration is no such thing. For Joe to go into Mary's valence there is either a long track association with plenty of violence, murder, poison and sudden death on it, or there is a very similar person or something, and there is some fantastic overt of some kind or another against such a person which contains a tremendous amount of violence and motion. That's what it goes back to.

But, of course, the "psyrologist," looking at the tame, stupid life that he himself leads in our modern world, you see, sitting at his hydraulically operated desk with his chromium, self-pushing graph pens, and – he couldn't concede of this much experience, don't you see. And he doesn't find that there is anybody in life ever has any real experience, so of course it just must be the business of living itself, day-by-day living, is what is aberrative. This is what he winds up at.

And of course, you take this character, he would have no reality on the backtrack. He'd have no reality on anything of that character. You shove him back on the backtrack and he finds out there was experience of some kind or another on the backtrack. If he continued to see it through an other-valence bank, you see, of some kind, you wouldn't wind up then with any kind of reality on it. He wouldn't have much reality. But of course, the keynote of the case is he doesn't have much reality anyhow. So he never conceived of this sort of thing.

Now, one of the things you want to watch for in auditors is the auditor who says that he has no reality on past lives. Watch it. Because that person has not collided with his bank very hard. He has a touching acquaintance, he has, you know, sort of a polite hat tip. You get him in the tonsillectomy and he's out there on the outside of the hospital, you see. And he knows how to run a tonsillectomy: You get on the outside of the hospital and you just watch the picture, you see the picture of the hospital, and you kind of look through the window and that's fine, and that's it, you've run the engram, you see.

"Have you ever seen a picture of an operation?"

"Yes," he says, "yes." You see, and that line of questioning is not very productive of anything. But the line of questioning of, "You have any reality on past lives?" – that is productive, see, because he'll tell you quite frankly he does not have. All right. Well, that's not reprehensible. Nobody's trying to force anything on him. I'm just giving you a symptom of the thing. This fellow is having valence-bank trouble. And having valence-bank trouble, you're
not now likely to discover an in-the-middle-of, 3-D sort of picture, unless you look pretty hard. All of a sudden, if he gets in the picture, he'll come out of it. See, there'll be no idea of attention stuck on pictures or attention in pictures or anything like that.

Well, until he himself has got some kind of a reality of this character, he will worry about his auditing flubs, and these auditing flubs ... He knows that he has a perfectly decent wish to help his fellow man. There's nobody disputing that in any way whatsoever. And he'll wonder why pcs ARC break or why he can't quite handle this pc or handle that pc and this will be very mysterious to him, and hell say, "Well, I better have eight thousand hours more of TR 0, see. And I'd better grind the midnight oil," you know, "and I'd better read Scientology 8-8008 or something. Or maybe there's something on a tape I haven't heard, or..." And he'll get into a considerable anxiety about this particular activity. Why does he – why do his pcs blow up? And then he'll get a lot of loses, and then he'll decide, "Well, I maybe shouldn't audit," you know, and so on. What's he trying to do? He's trying to orient himself with a datum or something of the sort. Well, the datum he's actually looking for is just this: As long as he has a low subjective reality on a bank, of course, when a pc gets into one, his understanding is not instantaneous, so he will do a fumble. He'll do a little fumble, and a little comm lag, and this little fumble and little comm lag will be just that instant necessary to permit the ARC break to go bloom! See. The pc drops down in tone and is not making very much forward progress and then maybe blows up or blows session or something of the sort.

This is the – a common experience. It is not true that this person was trying to do something bad to the pc. That is not true. It isn't true that this person didn't know his Scientology – he did. None of these things that you would normally consider true are true. It's just this one little fact – is the individual's mechanisms of handling life have been: "Escape from self into others," "escape from situation," "out," "up," "don't get any real good contact with the horrors of yesterday, because they're just too 'orrible, man! And the best thing to do is just stay out of valence and out of picture and out of thenness. And if you just stay out of thenness enough, you'll be all set."

Alcoholics Synonymous have themselves a considerable time with this, they have little mottos like: "Live twenty-four hours at a time," and so on. They also have another little motto which gets in your road occasionally, and if you don't know about it you'll have trouble processing alcoholics. They have another motto which – "Alcoholism is incurable. And that's the first thing you have to know and that's the first thing you have to admit to be a member of Alcoholics Synonymous." You can get in the wildest arguments with an alcoholic. Well, you say, "Well, we'll audit you for a while, and then you'll be all right." And you wonder what the devil's the matter with the man, you know. What's the matter with him is he had to swear on a stack of – well, I don't know what they swear on, actually – I guess empty bourbon bottles, [laughter] that they will never be cured of alcohol. It's – practically amounts to that. When you read the textbook of Alcoholics Anonymous your hair stands on end. All looks fine right up to the point when you read the fact that they can never be cured, they will never get over it, and they've had it, and they must just succumb to the whole idea that they are an alcoholic. They have to admit this. Ah, you're digging somebody out of that, what are you doing? They're just plowing him in, harder and harder and harder, into the valence of somebody that he thought was an alcoholic.
Anyway – that aside beyond the point – the difficulties which you encounter all come under the heading of auditor comm lag. And you yourself will recognize it, looking back over the times when you've had pcs ARC break on you, that if you'd just been in there a little faster it wouldn't have happened.

And if you yourself have been ex – inexpertly audited, you can look it over, and you can look at it very bluntly, and you realize that if the auditor just said something before all of that silence, and so on, or, you know, if they hadn't fumbled and given the appearance of fumbling, there wouldn't have been any ARC break. Well, what's that fumble? Now, we're really getting down to fundamentals, see.

Well, that fumble is just the unreality that he has on what the pc is doing or going through. And the fumble is sufficiently long to permit the pc to get out from underneath his control. So actually you don't have time to look up the datum in the textbook, or even to remember it, don't you see, your response must be instantaneous. You must be in there, so on.

So when I say there is no substitute for knowing your business, of course, you've got to know Scientology, but you've also got to know instinctively the reactions of the mind. "What is this guy doing?" See? "What goofball situation is this?" you see. And you haven't even got time to say, "Well, let's see, what is hap-pen-ning here?" you know. Well, the only thing that teaches you data to that degree is experience. A race driver who has read a lot of textbooks on the subject of racing car doesn't take Dead Man Bend, you see, out of the textbook. He feels the wheel slipping, it's gone off and it's hitting just slightly into the gravel, it's only an inch deep in the gravel, and he's back on the track. Ah, but if he read it in a textbook, and it said, "When you feel the wheel hit the gravel on the edge of the track you should turn the wheel slowly to the opposite direction."

"Oh, yes, I remember that now. It was on page 73."

Well, by this time they are of course are putting him in the ambulance. [laughter]

And that's just exactly what happens in your ARC breaky auditing difficulties. When you get into these you don't yourself have enough subjective reality. This isn't true of all auditors, you see, because they do have subjective reality. The edge of the wheel hits the gravel, and they of course, they say well, the edge of the wheel has hit the gravel, but they're already doing something about it, you see. They've already turned the wheel. Pc isn't going in that direction anymore.

It's very simple. It is so simple that an auditor who has good subjective reality hearing this tape will wonder what the hell I'm talking about.

They say, "Of course. Naturally. Yes. Well, so what?" And then they sit down opposite Mr. Doakes for an auditing session. They're the pc in it. And Mr. Doakes, in the auditing session, the wheel edges over, and one inch of wheel – tire moves over into the gravel and Mr. Doakes looks up in the textbook on how to drive racing cars – how to drive a Mark Sixteen racing car particularly – and the conditions of the track. And that's all on page 173, and so forth, and he happens to get stuck on the datum of the worm gear of the steering wheel, and so on, details of, you see. Well, of course your poor auditor at this point is being picked up in pieces and put in the ambulance. That's about all that happens. Because really, you – what –
what the hell is going on, see. And then you have great difficulty settling back and feeling relaxed enough to go into the bank. Because you know the next patch of gravel he's going to do the same thing.

No amount of explaining on your part, and no amount of teaching on my part or anybody else is going to teach him anything – enough data, and enough textbooks, and enough huge plots and blueprints as to how you do it, to overcome that little comm lag, see. You could maybe drill him that every time the pc says, "What are you doing?" he says, "Where are you?" But I think this would lead to an instantaneous ARC break, you see, because he really doesn't want to know. You get the idea?

So, the only basic, fundamental cure is to get somebody over the jumps.

Now, auditing has to be done before clearing. That, of course, is the fundamental problem. Everybody can look at this and say, "Well, of course, that is the problem. Let's clear everybody and then let's audit. Let's clear everybody on Earth and then let's audit."

Somebody figured it out the other day that you couldn't possibly clear everybody in New York City because it would require so many thousand auditors, working so many thousand years, and so forth. And they figured it all out, and they had it all taped, and this was conclusive fact that you couldn't clear New York City. They had absolutely, totally omitted the fact of making any new auditors. [laughter] This had been omitted from the calculation.

It isn't true that an auditor has to be cleared before he can audit. That is definitely not true. And if it were true it'd be "God 'elp Earth!" That would be a stopper that nobody could get around. It'd be nice, you see, and where auditors do get Clear you find out they make Clears very rapidly.

I'll give you a datum here. Brenda Scott, who was cleared on the last Australian course, back in Sydney, has cleared two more people. Well, she's hardly been home any time at all. But similarly an uncleared auditor off a South African course who didn't get Clear has also cleared somebody in South Africa. See? Get the idea?

So it isn't – a requisite to clearing is not "to be Clear." It's nice. It's nice. It's always nice when you're out in a storm to be in nothing but a Camper and Nicholson vessel that is fully equipped with all stabilizers and is fully proofed against everything, and so on. But at the same time, why some old hooker that you picked up in a back bay with half its bottom falling out, it'll very often ride storms, too, you see. But it would be nice if you were in this other yacht but not absolutely necessary.

Well, anyway, the road toward making a good auditor is to get the auditor a subjective reality on the bank. Now, don't think that that is going to occur automatically by reason of straight auditing. That is not going to occur automatically. Because people can be audited for many, many, many, many hours, with no reality on the bank, without getting one. This has been demonstrated time and time again. And where Routine 3 is being terribly, unthinkably, ghastly, awful, slow, it's just that this particular facet of a case has never been hit. The escape mechanism of the case has not been triggered off. It is still very much in full bloom. And so the case, as he runs the processes, of course, never does take any kind of a tour of the track but is dealing with other things and you still got an escape mechanism going.
Now, the escape mechanism is not necessarily a difficult mechanism to overcome. It is – surrenders rather easily because it is based on another idea than that which degrades or aberrates a thetan. Escape is simply a method of handling a bank. That is all, it's just a method of handling a bank. It's not a method of getting aberrated.

Now, you can go reductio ad absurdum and trace it back and say, "Well, yes, and if he'd only stood and confronted it at the time..." But I'm sure that there are Clears and they will not walk out in the middle of Market Street and say, "Well, I should be able to confront all this oncoming traffic from the middle of the street." I'm sure they won't carry this on as a practice. They find themselves in the middle of Market Street in San Francisco, they will go over to the curb. Got the idea? Well, you could say, "Well, they're practicing an escape mechanism. They didn't stand there and get run over."

No, the deterioration of a case is based on another mechanism. The individual no longer has confidence in himself as himself and so he adopts another packaged beingness which could handle the situation. And then this beingness he conceives to be useless in the handling of life and it is not a solution, so he adopts another packaged beingness in order to handle life and then that one is thoroughly invalidated, why, then, of course, he gets another one and when that one is thoroughly invalidated, why, he gets another one. See how it goes? And your backtrack of clearing could not be followed by the idea of escape because that's much too simple a statement of the situation. A person can find themselves inadequate in numerous ways besides the fact that they are trying to escape. I know lots of things that a man would be a very foolish fellow and a thetan would be a very foolish fellow not to escape from.

When you're wearing a body which is inflammable, it is not good sense not to escape from fire. That is what comes under the heading of preservation of property. [laughter] But the deterioration of self-confidence in being able to handle life in all of its facets and aspects goes down into a degradation, and it makes one believe that he now must have another beingness in order to handle things for him. And now he starts living life on an irresponsibility. And that being goes out and he gets another being on top, and that being goes out and eventually this goes into the life-death cycle that right now is so normal and usual on this planet.

Well, it's of course about as normal and usual as a girl in pink tights standing out on a – on a Buckingham Palace's flagpole. It is not at all usual. You don't have to kick the bucket every few years. This is not any part of your contract.

But life, invalidating the body and the beingnesses, the valences, gets down to an invalidation which says, "Well, the best thing to do is to chuck the mock-up." Well, that just marks a failure.

A person ages to the degree that they feel invalidated. And this could be stated processingwise: The age of a man in any lifetime is directly proportional to the accumulation of unknowns. Which, of course, is invalidation. You could almost measure the physical age of a person on this basis.

Now, of course this is exaggerated in childhood, and probably in childhood that is why you get fast growth. Kids have a terrific amount of unknownness, and they move up rapidly through this unknownnesses, and so forth. But you're getting proportionate aging. You're getting very rapid aging, actually. The change but – of six months in a child's life in his first ten
years makes a considerable difference. Well, frankly, he's getting a lot of pretended knows and unknowns, and all that sort of thing. They're pounding at him one way or the other. But he's carried through all this with hope and confidence, you see, because he's going to grow up. And his growing up process, of course, doesn't necessarily carry with it all this validation of this confidence he felt. He possibly shouldn't have been quite so confident. Unknowingnesses start to accumulate. Unknowingnesses now that he has no hope of overcoming. And these go on and on, and the unknowingnesses get greater and greater and greater and greater, and he finally kicks the bucket.

Aging, the amount of gray hair, and so on. People are sometimes amazed at me. I get gray hair and then few weeks later I don't have gray hair and then I get gray hair, and then no gray hair, and so on. It's the Central Organizations that are doing it, you see, I don't... [laughter] It's how much I know about their operation or how many not-knows they're running on me, see! Directly proportional.

Anyhow, all joking aside, I think you would do very well – if you're seeking to prove up the auditing skill and – of an auditor – I think you would do extremely well to just check into this factor of reality on thenness and what he considers a picture is, and so forth. And then use those processes I gave you, or some other process, similar, to whoop this thing out, and all of a sudden – straighten out his track, in other words. Do a track straighten-out activity of some kind or another, and you'll all of a sudden find his auditing ability will suddenly go zzzoom! He won't necessarily get Clear, but at the same time he will clear faster. Get the idea?

Now, this pays benefit completely aside from auditing in that it permits an individual to experience more benefit per unit of time in auditing.

Now, one of the ways you grope with this situation is in doing Goals and Terminal Assessments. The more valences a person is in the more goals he is likely to come up with or have, or the more submerged his goal is likely to be. But if a person is susceptible to invalidation, then you do have a coordination between roughness of case and length of time that it would take you to find the goal if you didn't take up the invalidation factor with rudiments. In other words, a person's goal is so easily and so swiftly invalidated that it plunges out of sight with the greatest of ease. So as the goal vanishes, you apparently then have many more goals than you should have, don't you see. But it'd be a susceptibility to invalidation.

Well, his susceptibility to invalidation is directly proportional to the number of valences he has accumulated, because of course the invalidation of valences – of self was what caused valences and then the invalidation of valences is what caused more valences, you see. So if there's anything going on, it is a basis of invalidation. If you wanted to draw a common denominator of all aberration, it would be – it could be said to be in the vicinity of invalidation. The person is as aberrated as they are invalidated – as they feel invalidated.

It wouldn't be proportional. You could take a whole line of men, invalidate them all equally, you'll find out they'd all react differently to the same amount of invalidation. It would be how much invalidation a person feels, not how much a person has. And you just breathe on some people – you're just passing by them accidentally and you just breathe; you don't even breathe at them – and they're promptly invalidated. You see how this would be. And some
other fellow, you walk up to him and you slap him on the back enough to break his spine and you kick him in the stomach, and he looks at you admiringly and says, "Come on and have a beer!"

I know that would be rather foreign to your experience in this particular lifetime, but out on the frontiers I've run into such men. I hauled off and hit a guy hard enough one time to knock him from one side of the ship to the other. He went on bragging about people – he bragged to people, "God, he sure can hit!" you know. Never bothered him at all! It was very invalidative of me, you know! [laughter] It was quite a remarkable experience. Never occurred to him, you know.

Had a dog one time, his name was Al for "Albino." And crazy old Al was a malemute. Half malemute, half Spitsbergen. Pure white, meaner than mean, you know. Big, tough, strong. And my poor old mother used to try to make this dog do something, you know. And she would beat at this dog with her fists, you see, and she would push at the dog and she would maul the dog and she would drag at the dog and ... of course, all this dog knew how to do was the second he felt weight against his chest he knew what you're supposed to do, you're supposed to pull. And if anybody was crazy enough to have him on a leash which had a harness on it, you see, you just – just the second you tighten up the leash he'd mush! [laughter] And he could really pull! Of course, my mother weighed about 110 pounds – wringing wet.

And I have seen her just practically clean up on this Al, trying to get him to do something, you know. Trying to get him to walk on up the road with her or something out in the country, you know. And he's busy barking at cats or something like that. And all Al would do was stand around and laugh at her, you know. And he'd pant, and he'd just be so happy about the whole thing, "I'm getting some attention!" is about the only thing that ever registered on him. He'd just be so happy.

And when I first ran into Al one day, he – I was a stranger. He'd been around there for quite a while and I hadn't been home, and he showed, oh, 1,652 sharp wolf fangs, you see, and he came at me with a low charge, and he was ready to eat me up, and of course he meant to stop two or three feet away, you see, and just scare me half to death. And you learn about dogs, living in Europe and Alaska and things, and I just grabbed him by the jowls, you see, on the loose skin on either side of his teeth, and then using his impetus coming forward, then swung him sideways, you see, and threw him about twenty-five feet. He landed in the flower bed with a terrible thud.

And Al got up and he came over and he looked at me, and he spent quite a bit of time looking at me, and then he finally started to smile about the whole thing. [laughter]

He had a very short memory. I was home every few months so I'd have to repeat the process. [laughter] But we always stayed friends. Yep. By God he'd – you could just hear him say, "I swear by this Ron!" you know! [laughter]

He didn't have any clue – he didn't have any clue of ever being punished; you couldn't do anything to Al. And he was about the healthiest brute you ever laid your eyes on. Now, he's probably still living yet. They sent him up into the woods to live with lumberjacks. I know he was at it for five or six years and just thriving. So you can imagine.
So from animal to animal, person to person, being to being, the factor of invalidation is entirely different. And, as invalidation is rather a common denominator of aberration, therefore you find the factors of clearing are registering on people differently, but more important to this lecture, that a person's responses as an auditor or as a pc measure up this invalidation factor to a large degree – but not so much a pc, much more the auditor.

An auditor who is terribly susceptible to invalidation has a dreadful time of it. If this auditor at the same time has no quick, instantaneous reality on the whole track, ah man, I feel for the person! This practically breaks the person's heart all the time. Because he makes a mistake, triggers the mechanism, the pc disorients, cusses out the auditor. Don't you see the cycle? Then the auditor being susceptible to invalidation feels very, very upset about the whole thing, feels it's very personal, takes up the ARC break, gets cussed out more, has pcs blowing session... The auditor's already susceptible to invalidation; this is practically killing him, see.

Well, the right way to do it is for the auditor to get some auditing in some kind of direction that gives him a validation of the track. Gets some idea of the track. All of a sudden his invalidatability will decrease. But more important, his sessions all of a sudden will get very mysteriously smooth.

And you watch this happen. You watch this happen. It's mysterious magic. All of a sudden on Monday she can't audit, on Thursday, audits gorgeously.

See, on one Friday, why, this person, this fellow, gives a session in the Academy, and God almighty! God almighty! If you'd stood back and made a list of the number of flubs, you see, you just would have run out of paper. There was hardly enough paper in the Academy to list them all. Person gets an orientation on his own bank, gets a subjective reality of the track, gets out of present time, back into present time, gets ideas of pictures, gets ideas of these mechanisms. A few days later they give a session to the same pc – person's been taught no more – and all of a sudden [claps] they can pick up the session every time it starts bogging down. They're in there doing a job, and now they're know – now they know what they are doing.

And I think this is the main factor that's standing in the road of a large percentage of auditors.

Thank you.
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[Part missing]

Ah well, first time I ever missed a Thursday bulletin, I think. I didn't write a bulletin today. I was up all last night till about six A.M. looking at pictures that had just come back from a production on Tahiti. Looking at rushes. And had to write a whole picture last night and this morning, and I more or less did, so maybe that takes my mind well enough off things and changes the scenery enough that now I can get to work again.

You know, every once in a while I get stuck on your mind, you know. [laughter] Let's see, "What problem could Ron have about my case?" Why don't you run that? My attention will free up. [laughs, laughter]

Okay. What is this? The 6th?

Audience: 7th.

Seventh? Seventh of September AD 11.

Well, it sort of seems like old times telling you how to get pcs into an engram. It just seems like old times. We're back at the old stand. I mean there's the brass rail there, and there's the dusty bottles back of the bar, and there we stand amongst the spittoons discussing this ancient problem.

Well, it works like this. Engrams never ran with the pc (quote) out of valence (unquote). You could run a pc who was out of valence for just ages and ages and ages. And all long engram running stems from the pc being out of valence.

Now, there's two things to keep in mind about this. And one: "when pc is in own valence" – this is a misnomer. We merely want him in the body he was in when the incident occurred, but this doesn't put the pc in his own valence. You see, he's Joe Jinks. He's being Joe Jinks in that particular life. The primary swine merchant of lower Chicago, see. And there he sits. At least, for God's sakes, if he's Joe Jinks have him in the body of Joe Jinks. You got the idea?

That's what we meant by "in valence." Simply in the valence he was in when the engram occurred. Understandable?

Now, when we say "out of valence," we mean simply and entirely the pc was not in the body he was occupying during the incident. But as Joe Jinks, the swine merchant from lower Chicago – he has trouble this lifetime, he keeps going oink, ung, oink, and so forth. He only killed seven or eight billion swine in that lifetime, you see. And he says he couldn't pos-
sibly have done it because he did it all from a mahogany desk, you see. So he didn't kill any swine, so it doesn't have anything to do with him. You get the detachments about that?

So anyway, there he is with a picture, see. You've got your pc with a picture. So he picks up this reprehensible life – not only reprehensible since he came from lower Chicago but reprehensible on the basis of being a swine merchant, you see – and he wants nothing to do with any part of this.

So we pick up pictures of Joe Jinks, a body, sitting at a desk. And he is always over there. And we try to run the life of Joe Jinks, and if the auditor's not aware of these things, and he hasn't got good subjective reality on what can happen in the bank, he does all kinds of weird, oddball things, like said, "Well, go through the incident again." So the fellow looks at the picture again. It's way over there, it's very thin, there's not much to it, you know. Doesn't bother him.

So he goes through the incident again, and that's hun-hum. Well, not only does it have anything – nothing to do with the pc, but that is the basic postulate in it: It has nothing to do with him. That is his solution to the problem.

And that's what we mean by "out of valence." He's always seeing himself from the area of the reception couch, or he's seeing himself from the chandelier, or he's seeing himself from someplace else, and the picture's very thin, and the body that he was in that lifetime is over there. You see, there is no virtue in being in valence, but the pc has to be in valence in order to run a picture.

And I repeat, this does not mean that he is being himself. Pc in valence and pc being himself are two entirely foreign, different statements that have nothing to do with each other, because as long as he is occupying a body and thinks of the body as himself, he is of course not being himself but is being a body, and that body, of course, is a valence. Do I make my point?

All right. So you're running him "out of valence." That is, it has gone to this *reductio ad absurdum* and complete abstranormity – extremity that not only is he not being himself, but he is also out of valence. Now, how does this express itself when he sees a picture?

Well, it's sort of thin and there isn't much to it, you know. And it's a little thing and it's over there and it's pretty black, you see, and nothing to do with him. And it doesn't have any somatics in it. "This stuff Ron talks about about somatics, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! I never had any somatics, and so forth. Actually, my lumbosis is a physical illness. This thing that is gouging me in the back, you see, has nothing to do with engrams, you see, because I'm not in any engrams, you see. There's that thing way over there. It has nothing to do with me," you see. This is quite remarkable.

Now, if the auditor is not aware of the phenomena of this character, he can make some of the most classic errors ever made. That is, he runs a pc this way and he runs the pc that way, and he goes through this and asks the pc, "Do you have a picture?"

And the pc says, "Yes, I have a picture."
And the auditor never says, "Well, what do you think a picture is? Well, where are you viewing this picture from? What mass of meat are you occupying during the script of this picture?" See?

That's interesting, isn't it. You never ask this, so of course, obviously, the pc is running off his pictures, and obviously the pc is handling his bank, and obviously it's all going all off all right, right according to textbook.

And we say, "Well, do you have any pictures?"

"Yes. I have a picture."

"Well, what's happening in the picture there?"

"Well, there's a fellow standing there with a headsman's ax, and he's about ready to chop off the – my head, and so forth."

"All right. Does the ax fall?"

"Oh, yes, yes, the ax fell. It's all right. Everything's fine."

And the auditor says, "Boy, are we really making knots." And he just never finds out that the fellow with the headsman's ax – well, he's sort of thin, you see. He's actually kind of an idea of a fellow with a headman's ax, and is way over there where it's good and safe. [laughter] Way, way over there. Fascinating.

Of course, nothing happens with the picture. Why? Because you were not running the picture the pc saw. You are merely running some cooked up, safe version, you see. And the safe version, of course – it isn't that the text is different. The text'll be the same, but the safe version is, we never view it from the same viewpoint that it was viewed from. And if we don't do that, the thing never as-ises. So pcs who are run in that condition, no matter whether it's some old process or Routine 3, apparently never get anyplace.

Don't pay any attention to a picture – the pc is not in his own valence. It's not a picture. Won't do him any good. You could run them by the hundreds of billions. It won't do him any good. You're not running engrams. It has nothing to do with it. He won't even be able to get off grief charge.

Now, the funny part of it is that all this phenomena I'm telling you about is very old and very well known. Way back. But it has never been punched up. Never been punched up. Because we haven't connected the pictures and anatomy of Dianetics with the conceptual processes of Scientology.

Now, the conceptual processes of Scientology have this magnificent virtue. They will move a guy straight back into the picture he is in that is charging up the chain he is stuck in that make him out of valence from that point there on. And no matter what pc you're running, no matter how many pictures he sees, and so forth, eventually he will wind up in his own valence. And now if the auditor doesn't know his business, he won't make him handle it.

Now, we've run and run and run, and all of a sudden the person is in a picture, and he is in his (quote) "own valence," don't you see, meaning some body that he's in, with eighteen valences stuck inside of it, don't you see. But as far as the picture is concerned, he's at the
point of view from which he viewed the picture while it happened. See, that's important. And he runs back to this, and he goes zoomoomp! and out of there. "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Well, I got out of that." Well, of course, he did exactly what he did before. The way to get out of that was never again to be in that body. That was the solution to the case as far as he was concerned, and so we don't then try to persuade him in some particular fashion, by directing his attention mainly and only, to stick with it, until the process you're running knocks it out. Because they don't sort out endlessly. They don't do it. That is all there is to it.

Now, there are several approaches to this if you understand it. Actually, you can build up little cardboard models and demonstrate this to students if you wanted to. You could show – oh, I don't know, get some of these kid cutouts of some kind or another, and you say, "Well, in own valence is the thing viewed from inside this body and the pc was occupying this body and therefore if you get the idea there, you look and you will see that everything he sees is from the viewpoint of this body here. Now, of course if you are trying to run this engram with the pc's viewpoint up here, while he was actually viewing it from down here, of course you are not running anything that ever happened. See? You're running an entirely dislocated thing."

Well, all right. That's fine. You could make a very graphic representation of this. It becomes very simple. And make sure that you say, "Well, the pc is not himself if he is in any valence. So don't confuse being himself with being in a valence or having his own valence."

You see, anybody who's sitting there looking at the scenery from inside of a body has a valence. That's for sure, but the pictures he is making from where he is looking at them, of course, is the track. That is the track. And trying to run a bunch of branch railroads – you see, where he's never looking at things in pictures from where he looked at them in the actual incident itself, of course this is just running branch railroads. This is running the shunt line from south Birmingham to north Colchester, you see, which had nothing to do with the railway, and you won't get anything even vaguely resembling an erasure. And so these things last forever.

This is the secret of a hanging engram. Of course, it isn't a hanging engram. The auditor never asked anybody about it. It isn't an engram. It's a picture of an engram. And you're running a secondary situation – misuse of the word secondary, but you're using a removed situation. You're trying to erase a picture that never occurred.

Of course, the incident that the picture is of occurred, but the only safe thing to do about this is to get off someplace when he sees it in the bank, you see, and be way over here someplace and look at it very safely. It's not going to erase.

Well, how many ways would there be to remedy this situation? Well, actually, practically countless. I'll tell you one of the oldest methods of re – of handling this situation, and then you can see a little bit more about the mechanics of it.

Maybe I ought to tell you the simplest method first. That'd be best. I'll tell you the simplest method.
You say, "Have you ever seen a picture from inside the body that you were in at the time the thing was occurring?" You know, explaining own valence to the fellow. "Have you ever seen a picture of this character? Have you ever had one during processing?"

And very often some pc who has been a long time in processing will say, "Aye, aye, I have. I have. Yes."

"Well then, which ones are they?"

"Well, there was one there when I was in this automobile, and there was this road and – out in front of me, and the other car hit us. And I ran into that one."

"What did you do at the time?"

"Well, I ran into that one, and that was – hasn't very much to do with the case, you know. Ha-ha-ha-ha!" Hasn't had anything to do with it since. Great.

And now, what that was, is a restimulated engram. And of course, the restimulation died out in a few days, but he still remembers this.

All right, and you say, "Well, were there any others?"

"Well, I had an – I had a thing that really upset me. I was very shaky on the subject of past lives till one day I was sitting on this horse, you know, and this chariot ran on from the right, came in from the right and knocked me off the horse. And that was quite real."

And you say, "Well, what was the picture exactly? Were you seeing the picture from where you were sitting on the horse?"

"Oh, yes, yes! That was what was upsetting about the whole thing. Ha-ha."

And you say, "Well, all right. That's good. That's good now. What did you do during processing about that?"

"Well, I answered the auditing question. That was it."

Ah-ha! We've got two of them in the pc right now. We've got two of them that we can lambaste and finish up. All right, let's take the earliest one. That is always the best thing to do unless it's too early – you know, like the rock or something. Take the early one, and – which is the guy sitting on a horse. And you say, "All right. Now, do you remember the auditing session in which this occurred?"

"Well, yeah, vaguely, dimly."

"Well, I don't want the exact date. But you do remember that? All right. And do you remember anything about the auditing question that you answered for that? Good."

"Yeah. Well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right. Well, what is unknown about that incident about the horse?" and so forth.

"I – well, just what you asked me. I really don't know what auditing session it was."

"All right. Good. And what else is unknown about that incident with the horse?"
And "Well, the auditing command. I actually haven't really remembered the auditing command."

"All right. And what else is unknown about that incident with the horse?"

"Well, it's uh ... Zzzzzzzzzz. You know, if you keep this up, I'm going to have a horse over here."

"Well, don't worry about that, you know, don't worry about it; everything will be all right. Now, what else is unknown about this?" Crash! See. Aaaaaaaaaaaa.

Man, he'll be out of present time. And don't you do a bad job of auditing right at that point, see. Just run the incident – the command I was giving you just flat. "What else don't you know about that incident with the horse?" see.

"I don't know this, and I don't know that, and I don't know something else, and I don't know something else, and I don't know something else." And in a very few minutes, that'd be flat. But also he will find out something: that he'd skipped out on it; that it did exist; that it was there; and not only that, but has been with him ever since, and has always been with him, and he's never been anyplace but sitting on this horse. This will dawn on him eventually if you run it good and flat, with just Unknown. You can also run, "What shouldn't be known about it?" and "What should be forgotten about it?" or any other variation of the Not-Know, see.

And you'll have yourself quite an incident there. And it'll build up 3-D and scare him half to death. And remember, boy, will he be out of present time. That's the time to do real smooth auditing, and yourself have a pretty good reality on the fellow actually being in a thenness which isn't a nowness. And it will keep you from collapsing his thenness onto nowness by adjusting the cans of the E-Meter because they might be getting too warm. It's these kinds of things that collapse thenness and nowness and keep the guy from running an engram. You got the idea?

All right. Now, we look at this: There is a fundamental method – I don't at this time know of any better method than this. And I'll give you an old method. It's a simple method of doing it. Just find out if he ever has been and put him back into it.

Well, if he's never been in one of these things and he can't recall any and it's all just garbage and black and invisible ink, well, there's something else you can do about it. There's an old process that does this, rather arduously, but it eventually accomplishes this exact thing, which is, "Recall an ARC break." Now, that's an awfully stylized auditing command, almost totally limited to processing Scientologists. But "Recall an ARC break" would be pretty well guaranteed to unstack a track to a point where he would find himself in the incident that was upsetting to him. It's an interesting one, isn't it?

Don't interfere with whether he's calling these things from motivators, he's calling motivator ARC breaks, motivator ARC breaks. Well, he'll get it back to a motivator incident. Don't try to put him in the overt side of the sequence. Don't do anything about it at all. Just run "Recall an ARC break" and pay attention to where he's landing on the track, and he will eventually land at the base of some chain where he is in his own valence and something is happening. That is pretty good.
I suppose you could vary the auditing command so that it'd make it comprehensible to a non-Scientologist, but I've never put in any time on that. And I'm giving a lecture now to Scientologists, so let's skip it.

That one will do it. All right, there's another one that will do it.

Had a fellow last night, and I noticed that he kept asking me about his eyes. I didn't tell him it was a Security Check question that cures up eyes and eye difficulties faster than anything, is what – the exact auditing command I've given you in lectures before. It's something on the order of: "What shouldn't be seen – what have you done that shouldn't be seen?" And that will just ruin more glass prescriptions than anything you ever had in the way of eyesight. Just keep security checking on that basis and clear the meter left and right and in the middle, and so forth. "What have you done that shouldn't be seen?" And, of course, he's preventing seeingness like mad of something he's done, that's all. People hearing this lecture probably have just now thought of what one of them is, and others have heard a ticking automaticity, because it'll very often send off an automaticity. Well, it's restraint of inspection. But I didn't tell this fellow about it. And instead of that, he was complaining about a mass that seemed to be resident behind his eyes someplace. So I gave him the easy one. Here is another method of doing this exact thing. And I said, "Get the idea of some action going on way out there in front of you two or three hundred yards away." He did.

I said, "What was it?"

"Uhh!" he said, "Well, oddly enough," he said, "I get my mother and driving a car."

And I said, "All right. Good. Now, conceive of an action two or three hundred yards behind you." And he got a dog or something.

I said, "What's happened to this mass that you're complaining about, back of your eyes?"

"Well, it's shifted. It's moved."

I wasn't processing him and told him so, but obviously, the man was stuck in the picture, wasn't he. But as near as he could look toward the picture he was stuck in was way out, and that is quite common. Action that is that far away is safer than action that is up close so people will see it.

Now, you could just follow this thing through – which I didn't. I just moved the somatic around and changed it all around and did something with it and explained to him that these things are pictures. He was quite amazed. He had been processed, but he was quite amazed to connect up these odd sensations he had with this, you know, with the idea of pictures, see. He couldn't conceive of himself being stuck in a picture. He obviously was stuck in a picture or he wouldn't have had a mass. That was it.

But he could look at that distance. And you could follow this through and take a process of this type, which is inspection at distance, and you would eventually wind up with the guy in the picture he was stuck in. It would peel it right on down to where he was. Interesting idea, huh?
If you yourself have a somatic, and you're prone to self-auditing, why, you can always inspect something way out. Only make it two or three hundred yards. Of course, your attention at once will start collapsing on two or three hundred micro-millimeters, but uh – I mean in close, you know. You look out there, oh-uh-thu-thu-du. And the next thing you know, you're floundering around, you don't know what's happening to you, you know. Get your attention out there again, you see. Get your attention way back there and way over to the right and way over to the left and way below you and way above you, and so forth. And you're peeling off some environment of some kind or another that has been a stuck environment.

You can also get in lots of somatics and lots of trouble and have to have auditing, and be able to gasp[laughter] – be able to gasp over the telephone to a friend of yours, "For God's sakes, come over and audit me before I die in the middle of the living room." I – this – randomness can set up with something like that, but you'd survive it.

Anyhow, there is a method of peeling one down. Now, because you are extremely devoted to repetitive processes and we have to have repetitive processes and they are the thing to do ... But when you get into handling a case, you have to interrogate and do other things, and a repetitive process is not enough. It has to be punched up. But I'll give you a repetitive process. I'm not running them down.

Pc has a disabled leg. We discover this by interrogation of the pc and observation of the pc, and we are limited in this solely and entirely by this one point. It is obvious to us that he has a bad leg, but the pc never mentions it. He keeps talking about his burning ear.

Well, we'd better not go into bad legs because it's not real to him. But the pc tells us he has a bad leg, we observe that he has a bad leg, and so forth. Or if he tells us he has a burning ear, and we happen to observe this, we could run exactly the same regimen on either of these.

Now, what we're asking for is if he has any odd pressures. Now, these could be his face, his chest, his stomach, his legs, his back, his gluteus maximus, his mea culpa, anything, you see. It doesn't matter what, anatomically. This will be what is called a psychosomatic and will be his chronic psychosomatic illness. And will also be probably his hidden standard and will also be numerous other things that we wrestle with. See.

All right. Here's the way to handle it. This is brutal, by the way. It is quite brutal, and the auditor has to be very good and stay in there pitching with the pc.

All right. Now, it's "Who would have an unknown motion around his leg?" We use this new thing, this valence thing, and it is the valence, you see. And then we could compound the felony by asking what. "What would have an unknown motion around it's leg" "Who would have an unknown motion around his leg (her leg)?" I wish English was a little more adaptable on genders. English is gender happy. You can usually become colloquial and say "their leg" and this covers the whole thing.

English actually – the people do try to put a dual gender pronoun in there. You know, they say "their," making it plural.

All right. This sort of question will knock out infinite numbers of chronic somatics providing you flatten it. And it's flattened on the tone arm just as any other process. Now,
you're getting into something you're more familiar with. This is an easy one to do. But it is quite brutal. It is quite brutal.

Pc complains all the time that he's got this sensation in his nose. Well, this would be what you did with his nose, see. Got a sensation on his nose.

All right. Pc complains all the time that there is no – absolutely no sensation around the right arm. Same process. No sensation – absence of sensation and presence of sensation both respond to the same process.

Now, there's a way to amplify this idea and be a little more positive about it, and that is to shake down on the E-Meter what is the most real to the pc. Motion or confusion or some other thing, some other word, meaning action. Could be the word action, don't you see. It could be lots of things. Anything denoting commotion, action, confusion and so forth. Find the best word.

The Secondary Scale of the Prehav Scale at the level of Motion gives you most of these synonyms. And you would assess out the command, and then you would use the same command form. You would say, "Who and what unknown ..." whatever word you found, you see, commotion, confusion, action. I suppose you'd find some pcs that have attitude. I'm sure that'd be as close as they could get to anything like motion would be attitude. Because the idea – they pull back into ideas. They're down below effort and into think, you see. Don't omit attitude.

I should say in passing, by the way, there's a way of running the whole Prehav Scale without assessment. If you were ever caught out in the middle of the bush, the veldt, or the deserts of New York without a Prehav Scale, there is a way of running it, rather crude. Use "action or attitude". Just use the words "action or attitude" for any level. Got the idea?

"King." All right. You're running – the pc's terminal is "king." And you say, "Action – what action or attitude would you have toward king?" or something of that sort. "What action or attitude would the king have toward you? What action or attitude would king have towards another? What action or attitude another toward a king? What action or attitude would a king have toward himself?" You get how you could do that?

Actually, it runs the whole Prehav Scale in a very haphazard, impositive but workable fashion. It's probably only five times as long as a proper assessment. But if you ran total out of assessment material, and you couldn't get an assessment, and the pc wasn't going Clear, you see, and the needle was stuck, and the tone arm hadn't moved for ages, and so forth, and you assumed there must be some level that you knew not what of or wasn't on the scale or something of the sort – after you made sure the rudiments are in, and after you've made sure you'd handled any hidden standard or anything like this – psychosomatic, present time problem of long duration, all this sort of thing – after you had all this straight, you still couldn't get anything on the thing, you could still use action or attitude.

What it is, is just doingness pure and simple. It's the idea or doingness. And the whole of the Prehav Scale is devoted to idea or doingness. So action or attitude phrases it up so that it can be run as a sort of a blanket command, and it's an interesting thing for you to know just in passing. It's a datum you should have. Remember it isn't good, it merely works – to no
great, high level of workability, but it goes on through. Extends the auditing time rather tremendously, but it will work.

Okay. When I find these little bits and pieces of this character, I like to pass them along to you whether they have vast usages or not, because you may sometime or another be, as I say, in the deserts of north Hollywood. I don't think anybody in Hollywood has been able to read for the last hundred years. They deal exclusively in pictures.

All right. Now, let's get a little bit further on this line. This would be then a method of handling the hidden standard, the chronic somatic, the complaint of the pc, the difficulty which he is always bringing up, and so forth. It'd be something on the order of "Unknown (assessed word)" which adds up to motion. What you're heading for in that, I'll point up to you again: You're heading for motion. You want unknown motion; that motion itself may not express itself well to the pc. See, it'd be best – work much better with "unknown confusion."

For instance, I was dealing with somebody who had no concept of motion. That can be run into. Wouldn't bang on an E-Meter, nothing like that. "Motion? What the hell is motion?"

"Well, motion is a vague idea that people have that something is changing position in space."

"Well, yeah, but what is motion? What is motion? Have you ever seen a motion?"

"Oh, I'm sure that I've seen a motion. How silly. Of course, I must have seen a motion at some time or another. Naturally. Everybody has seen a motion at some time or another."

"Well, name a motion you have seen."

"(sigh) Name a motion I have seen. Well, I don't know but everybody has seen a motion."

Didn't have any concept of the idea of motion at all. Had no concept of motion. I don't know what all these – this person did a lot of driving. That's why I resigned finally from the Road Safety Committee. [laughter] People never would undertake any program that had anything whatsoever to do with road safety. I'm saving the fact that I resigned in order to send in a scathing statement at some time or another which lays down a program which actually just puts more punch to the program I've had in mind for some time. "Why I resigned as Road Safety Organizer," see, I mean, this is the keynote of the thing. Then everybody pays attention to it because this is obviously a complaint, you see, and is a bunch of entheta and... Somebody's mad, you know, and that's fine.

All right. Now, we look over all of the – these aspects, of bank and pictures, and so forth, and we find out at once why the pc will not view his bank. He will not view his bank because he has tremendous intolerance of two things. He has a tremendous intolerance of motion and he has tremendous intolerance of unknowns.

Now, his intolerance of motion is best expressed to you on the basis of: motion can become intolerant to somebody – he can become intolerant about motion – to somebody who is extremely fixated on the subject of pain.

If this person is fixated on pain, then he believes that all motion adds up to pain. He has no other concept of motion than it is pain. Well, motion, of course, makes pain possible.
And pain cannot occur without motion. And you see somebody that you're kicking in the stomach stiffen up and try not to have any motion. Next time you're kicking somebody in the stomach (out of session, of course) notice the fact that they are trying to stop motion. Well, that's very interesting. The reason they're trying to stop motion is incomprehensible unless they love pain. Because that's the only way pain occurs.

If you had a thetan who wasn't trying to stop motion around the body, the body would experience no pain. It's just as simple as that. If he weren't trying to stop motion, he wouldn't suffer from motion. Of course, he's picked out motion as randomity and there he is.

And the next time you have an ache or a pain, why, notice the fact that it seems to occur from two opposing motions. Just get analytical about it and observe it. It's two opposing motions and they sort of grind against each other or something of the sort, and the sensation on that tiny, tiny, tiny motion between those two opposing areas gives the sensation called pain. That is what pain is. Pain isn't anything more than that. And there hasn't been enough of it so thetans don't like it. Well anyhow – it's true of all things – there haven't been enough of, why, people don't like them. Okay?

Now, in handling a pc who has no bank visible, these factors then must be present: that he has an intolerance of pain, therefore an intolerance of motion, therefore an intolerance of unknowns. Not necessarily therefore – these two things are different spheres. But doesn't like motion; doesn't like unknowns.

He has a fantastic importance attached to motion. And he has a fantastic importance attached to unknowns. He'll give you a fabulously exaggerated idea of the importance of an unknown. And you'll find him nattering something like this: Well, if he doesn't know about what all the fish are doing off of Dover just now, why, anything could happen. And you say, "Well, wait a minute now. He's not in Dover. He's not in the fishing business. He has nothing to do with Dover. He had never been clear – or near Dover and Dover has nothing to do with him," and so forth. Here he's talking about the fish off Dover, and he's worried about what fish are doing off Dover. And he wants to find out about what the fish are doing off Dover because it is very important and you can't quite make out how it's important. Well, don't assign the fact that the fellow's crazy. Just assign the fact the fellow has one Christ-awful intolerance on the subject of the motion of fish and the unknowns of fish, and that's it. It just sums up to that. He has intolerance of these things. These things he can't confront, and he happens to have picked out for his randomity the vast importance connected with one body of motion, i.e., the fish off Dover.

You finally plumb into it and he learned when he was a little boy that they had soles off Dover or something. He's never quite sure about this, and in church, why, they were telling him all the time he had to save his soul, and it's as close as he could get to the souls are those fish off Dover. You know, it would be some squirrel cage – I mean it would be as idiotic, you see, as this. But it'll be some superimportance about this particular unknown. We see this all the time and we pass it by. We just sort of not-is it. We see people terribly, terribly worried about the terrible, terrible conditions of the natives in Upper Slobovia. And don't be too surprised sometime to go to Upper Slobovia and find the happiest natives you ever ran into. You got the idea?
And similarly, everybody's very complacent about the natives of southern East Germany. Nobody's worrying about the natives of southern East Germany, and they're in a terrible condition, you see. So it's just a fad. It's what – it's – "What natives we are worried about at the time" and "What natives we are not worried about at the time" are regulated totally with how much unknown seems to be connected to these things and how important that unknownness seems to be to the person. And the most unknownness there can be is the unknownness about motion. That is the most important unknownness.

You'll find the fellow is suffering a somatic all out of proportion merely because he didn't even know he was going to be hit. And he was hit. And you find out that he'll stick with this somatic, and the somatic is there. Yet he's been run over by a truck, and that somatic isn't sticking. But somebody has walked up to him suddenly and said, "Hello, Joe," and slapped him in the face hard enough to crack his jaw, see. And this somatic is stuck. But it wasn't actually a very brutal thing, and five minutes later, why, he didn't even realize he'd been hit. You know, I mean he didn't have any physical damage from the thing. And you find in vain trying to evaluate the importance of an engram to the preclear is the most fruitless task you can possibly engage upon, because he's been run over by trucks since time immemorial, and he just never, never, never, never, never seems to attach any importance whatsoever to this fact.

Oh well, yes, he was run over with a truck when he was a small boy, and they sent him to the hospital, and he had a cast on his arm for a couple of weeks, couple of months, couple of years – depending on what doctor he hit. [laughter] And, yeah, he had another accident. He was run over by a truck when he was seven, and he was run over by a truck when he was ten, and he was run over by a truck when he was eleven. Well, he's become accustomed to it. [laughs] And you won't find these somatics very rough.

But a switching he got when he was five he has exaggerated into the most familial battle royal that anybody had ever heard of. My God, to hear him tell about this thing, why, there was blood plastered all over the ceiling, and the only reason the neighbors came in is because of the bits of flesh that kept flying [laughter] out of the woodshed, you see. This kind of thing. To hear him tell it, you know, this was the wildest activity, you know. They imported an executioner from Italy just specially, you see, to whip him. And you boil this thing down and you in vain try to find any real brutality about it. All you do is find a switching that you yourself would not have considered very important. But it's very important to him!

In the first place, somebody blew up at him that he didn't ever expect to blow up, you see. So that's unpredicted, which gives you the unknown. And somebody switched him for something he didn't do, which, of course, is not-known, too. Unjust. Injustice is just an unknown penalty of some kind. It's a penalty for an unknown crime or a not-existent crime, you see.

So there was injustice connected with it, there was unpredictation connected with it, and in addition to that there was no real familiarity connected with it, and amongst these various points we get the unknownness and the motion all adding up to tremendous importance. He's still trying to figure it out. You can say the importances of anything is as great as the individ-
ual is still trying to figure it out. And you'll find those engrams which are most seriously stuck on the track are those engrams which are composed of incomprehensibles.

The fellow went – kept calling on this girl, and he kept calling on the girl, and he'd wave to her from the window, and so forth. It was rather a strict planet on the subject of sex, they didn't have much. See, he keeps calling on this girl, and it seems all right with him, you see. And he thinks he's getting someplace with... He didn't intend anything very gruesome, you know, and he was sort of paying court in the way they were doing on this particular planet or country, and it all seemed very routine and regular. And one day he drives up and runs into an ambuscade. A real one. A real ambuscade, you see, complete with muskets, you know? And he's slaughtered!

Well, he didn't have any intentions that match this slaughter, and he doesn't know what would cause that family, you see, to be this upset about somebody paying court to their daughter. And he adds up – tries to keep adding this up. He keeps adding this up, you see. Keeps adding it up. Keeps adding it up. And it doesn't ever add up, of course. And he'll get some kind of a fixed idea about it, and he'll say, "Well, that's it." But the number of times he tells you that is the fixed idea about it and that is it, you can start being suspicious about that time because, of course, if he has to have a fixed idea about something, the unknownness of it must have been terrific. He says, "Well, in actuality her father and she practiced incest and they were afraid to find it out. And nobody could quite discover what this was all about. And if I had paid court to her much longer, why, something like that would have happened, and that is the way it was, and that was the thing, I think. I guess. No, no. It's actually a fact. Everybody in the neighborhood knew that she and her father practiced incest and, therefore, her father set her brothers on me, you see, to shoot me down in order to keep me from finding this out, and that is what it is. That's true, it's true. Everybody in the neighborhood knew it. As a matter of fact, it was in all the papers, so forth – I think, I guess, or something else. But that was the way it was! I guess."

And you audit a little while. All of a sudden he comes out of the, out of a fog and he says, "You know, she'd actually been pledged to marry the local duke. And this was all being kept secret, you see, because the duke's politics were completely contrary to most of the people's politics, and there might have been quite a revolution, you see, and they had me figured out as an agent that was merely trying to reach the duke. I think. I guess."

All the time he's telling you this, why, these musket balls are still lodged in various portions of his anatomy, and he has got somatics from all of them, you see. And every time he gets on this subject, he gets hectic because these musket balls were hot at the time, and he's never quite dared to feel that littleness of the motion of the heat, you see. And these musket balls start warming up every time he gets onto the mystery of this. So therefore he solves the mystery, but he never solves the mystery right.

So he's just been floundering around in this engram – I can see him now. He's on some other planet, and he is a member of the space guard of this particular planet in its polar caps. And he has an igloo in which he's supposed to stand by, you see, as a warning, and he's sitting in this igloo. And life has been going on fairly well while they were building the igloo in the station. He's sitting there, and about two months later, all of a sudden he starts to wonder,
"Well, now, I guess it was that she was going to marry the... No, it was father's incest with uh – the uh – uh – uh – situation. I wonder what that was. Now, let's see, it must have been..." you get the idea?

And eventually he gets an illness of some kind or another and has to be carted out of the polar caps and hospitalized for a long time. And the medicos issue very learned papers on the subject of "Polar caps cause illnesses which are hot, burning spots in somebody's chest." And they, of course, become very learned on the subject, and they have very, very vast conferences, and so forth, and they bring this up at their meetings, and they read papers on it. And you've got this piece of pretended knowlingness borne as an effort not to face the unknownness of it, you see. And this goes on and on and on. And the primary recipient, of course, would be the medical profession. I think there's probably a fact or two in their books, but most of them are based on some wild effort to solve what: A psychosomatic with a physiological explanation. And what could there be a wilder lie than that?

The fellow has got hot musket balls in his chest, so they say, "Well, there's a new illness called 'polarolosis,'" and here it is.

It's very amusing to read medical records when you know a great deal about the mind and so on. They present you with everything but the facts. They sure give you a lot of learned names to back it up, too. And if you want to know a real piece of pretended knowlingness, look at the heading on it and see how many authorities had to be called on to vouch for it. And then if you get four or five authorities or hospitals which have vouched for all of this, you can just be sure at that time it should have been garbage cans at the beginning, and somebody should have audited the patient. You see how this thing goes?

It is the idea of the importance of the unknownness, and the idea of the importance of the motion. And these things drop back to the degree of threat to survival. And then this, therefore, goes back to the idea that one must survive. And you start taking this apart from all lines, and you get down to the basic idiocy. A thetan who can't help but survive – he just couldn't help himself. He may be surviving kind of deadly and in different forms and out of valence, and so forth, but the one thing he cannot do anything else but, is survive. He always will survive. That is for sure. The one thing he can absolutely count on is the one thing he is always trying to solve, which is, of course, itself is a basic idiocy. And, of course, everything else which follows from that basic idiocy, of course, is idiotic.

But if you want to take this apart, you take it apart along the road of unknown and motion, and these two items give you a very broad four-lane highway right down through the middle. And of course you combine any phraseology that has to do with unknown – which is not-know, forget, forgotten; any of the odd numbered postulates – and you combine this with any word which sums up to a motion or transplantation in space, and you will get a process, which is a wild one.

Now, if you put that against valences, you will get pc in pictures, and it gives you your basic magic formula for getting the pc into the track and onto the track and in the bank and moving on the track and out of detached views and all these other ills that we are – have been discussing. Make any sense to you?
When you see one of these things wheeling off, it's a lot of fun. This gag of telling somebody to look out there two or three hundred yards in front of him and two or three hundred yards behind him is not very new. But let me warn you against having him look ten or twelve feet in front of him or ten or twelve feet behind him. That's too close. He'll jump like he's shot. Usually in space opera when they are conditioning thetans – or when thetans are conditioning others – they – sometimes there's a tumbler incident, that nearly everybody has some cognizance of or is stuck in or something like this. It's quite common.

And they throw somebody in a body down a shaft, and of course he's spinning, so the bottom of the shaft is lighted and the top of the shaft is lighted, and he is falling in the shaft. And therefore, the image of the top of the shaft and the image of the bottom of the shaft leave an awful lot of bright spots because he's trying to stop himself from falling all the way down. So he gets a vast number of bright spots stuck around him at varying distances, and he doesn't quite know what these are afterwards. And that is the way the picture looks.

Well, these are not very far from him, and some of them are quite close to him, naturally, because he fell only a short distance to get the closest ones, and he fell further to get the further ones, and I haven't made any estimate of how far one of these bright spots would be, but probably something on the order of about – well, I don't know – a hundred feet, something like that.

And you tell anybody to look in closer than a hundred feet just on casual inspection, he's liable to run into these things, and they will really hit him. Very casually, you could be riding on a bus and tell some dear old lady, if you felt particularly diabolical, you say, "Close your eyes. Do you have any bright spots around you ten or twelve feet away from you?" And she'll get it right there. Splank! She'll see one of these things. She'll get the sensation of motion, you see, and she'll stop herself suddenly. And it'll be a jolt. That's an interesting phenomena. That's an old, old space opera installation of an engram. And practically everybody's got that one.

There's whole long – oh, there's long, long lists of these. Any possible way you could get somebody, what? Dislocated.

Now, I told you the other day about dreams. Dreams. An effort to locate oneself. Then what is a delusory bank? Let's carry it just one step further. Instead of dreaming it asleep, how about having it in the bank awake? Effort to locate oneself.

Out of this you get the workability and magic of 8-C, TR 10, other things. They have some workability because, of course, they're locating somebody and they feel better.

But how about locating somebody in the bank. Well, nearly every picture he's got is an effort to locate himself in an area where he felt dislocated. So unknown locations could play a considerable role and unknown times could play a considerable role in other processes. I don't particularly mean to cover those now, but I should mention to you that you can have unknown locations, and you can do weird things with pictures. Have the pc spot unknown locations. Of course, he shakes up every delusory effort to locate himself by pictures. And you'll get pictures flying by in all directions.
"Are there any locations you don't know about?" You see, that type of interrogation. Bing-bang, and all of a sudden you get a bank shift. It's quite amusing – then the fact that an individual is sitting in a bank which locates him so he'll be in the wrong place.

Now, if you went further than that, *reductio ad absurdum*, you could get down to this interesting supposition that a universe is an effort to locate oneself. And you'd possibly get the basic consent of why a thetan is willing to be in a universe.

It's an effort to locate himself. Therefore, because a thetan doesn't have to be located, and it's totally idiotic – I point out the 1954 HPA tapes when this is mentioned – it's totally idiotic to have to be located. There's no good reason why anybody would have to be located. It must be a dirty trick then to locate a thetan, and it is. It is. Give him the idea that he has to have a location.

But that is such the fundamental idea and goes back of every universe, and is back of every bank, and is so wrapped around and hedged around with reasons, explanations, valences and all the rest of it, that we must assume that it is practically unreachable as a concept in processing. And there are many such very senior concepts in processing, that if you could just think them and realize them, flash! you see – not on any gradient but just suddenly say, "Well, there's no reason I should have to be located," and bang! you're Clear, just like that, you see.

These are the thoughts that you think you should be able to think. But of course, you set all these other things in motion every time you think those, but then you stop them if you have an allergy to motion. See, so you think, "Well, I ought to be – why, I could be cleared, very easy, all I have to do is get the idea that I don't have to be located." Diiing you see, and things go bzzuuup and bzzuuup, and you don't like all that motion, so you say, "Stop." And also you stop it because you don't know what was moving. So there's again the unknown and the motion which blocks the road out to the release of a concept.

Now, you go a little bit further than this, and it must have been some kind of overt to locate thetans. And all of you must have been busily locating thetans madly, viciously, and so on, in order to pile up enough overts that the thing would stick with you to this degree, you see. Well, that's all very fine, but this must be prior to the overt act-motivator phenomena. So you think the thought and you run into the overt act-motivator phenomena just up the track a ways, you see, bang! And you try to think the thought again or the concept of "Well, I don't have to be located," and bang! you get into the overt-motivator phenomena. And that is another blocker which is a cousin to what I have been talking about.

Now, you could run somebody: "Think of locating somebody. Thank you. Think of locating somebody. Thank you. Think of locating somebody. Thank you." For a little while, why, the thetan says, "Gee," you know, "that was good of me, you know? This old lady. she couldn't cross the street. She didn't know where she was, and I told her where she was, and, ah, that's nice of me, you know." And he gets all these "nice of hims," you know, and these "nice of hims" and these "nice of hims" and then he finally gets nailing this fellow down, you see, to this plank, you see. And "What's this? Well, I – I don't know why this fellow's being nailed down to the plank. I didn't have anything to do with it. Actually, my men wanted me to do it, and I didn't have any choice. No, I didn't have anything to do with it. It's torturing him
for some reason or another," and all of a sudden it dawns on him, "I'm locating him. But they – they wanted me to locate him. I – I didn't have anything to do with it myself, you see. I'm just an innocent bystander. I was an officer on this ship, and the crew had mutinied, I think. I guess. And that was why we were nailing this fellow down, I suppose." So you get this and then you get another one.

"Well, as a matter of fact, that – that – that's locating somebody. Yeah, I can get the idea of locating somebody, pretty vicious, you know. Get the idea of locating somebody. That's pretty mean, you know. Get the idea of lo – . Gee, that's mean, you know."

Then the fellow goes into a total dispersal on the whole thing, and he himself can't feel he's located anyplace, and he becomes very difficult to audit. In other words, it's not a very good track for auditing, but it's just a potential road.

It's one of these potential roads that is very nice, that you could drive from – straight from here to Italy with no difficulty whatsoever on a straight line. You wouldn't have to mind falling off many precipices, or running head-on into any mountains, you see, or drowning in any rivers. If you didn't mind that, why, the best way to get to Italy, you see, is just to drive straight to Italy. You take somebody who has a tremendous allergy to unknowns and tremendous allergy to motions, combine these things and then ask him to run one of these senior concepts, you see – and of course, he'll run into the other one all the time and bing-bang.

Now, the reversewise works: If you've got the unknownness and the motion allergy is cleaned up pretty well – which of course cleans up valences and gets him in his pictures and all that sort of thing – why, then, of course he starts reaching back and changing his mind concerning these various things. And we get back to Change of Mind Processing.

And the route we're looking for is the route to just change of mind. The thetan can change his mind, and that is it. He just gets another idea about it, you see. He just as-ises the idea he's got and gets another idea about it and he feels fine about it.

Well, what booby-traps this? In the first place, he must have escaped from innumerable pictures and he's off-track in numerous places, and he doesn't have a concept of where he's been or what he's done, and the unknownness of that must be very important because actually he does have the – he has set the example to himself of having escaped from these things, so therefore they must have been dangerous.

You get how he proves it to himself? He proves it to himself reversewise. "I ran away so it must have been rough." See, it proves the point, see. If he ran away, it must have been rough. Not, it was rough, so he ran away. You get the idea? But, it must have been rough because he ran away. And he's also always proving these things to him. You say, "My God! That must be a terrible engram! Prima facie evidence: It must be a terrible engram is because I can't get in it. See, I'm outside the thing. I'm not in my own valence in the engram, and it's way over there, and it just must have been a bitch kitty. This must have been a rough-rough. There must have been nothing there but big jagged rocks being pounded on somebody every three seconds, you see. Shame, blame, regret and degradation are being poured into that area with coal shovels. That's obvious. Proof of the thing is I'm not in it."
Now he gets in it and he finds out that nothing happened. Yeah, there wasn't very much in it. He just struck it at a time of life or a frame of mind when he thought unknowns and motion were terrible. And so therefore he didn't want anything to do with it, and he didn't want to be in it.

People do not escape to the degree that things were dangerous. These are not proportionate statements. You know, the more dangerous a thing is, the more escape you will have from it. You get that? That doesn't work that way at all. The most dangerous thing there is, is war on this planet, for sure, in terms of human activities, and yet you never have any difficulty getting people to sign up to fight a war. That's interesting, isn't it? And you never have any difficulty getting contractors to build things for war. So what does this mean?

Well, the most dangerous activity man engages upon has the most recruits. Well, this is kind of backwards, isn't it? It's – then it's not true that man escapes to the degree that things are dangerous. He escapes to the degree that he conceives they are motion-ful, that he doesn't like – motion-that-he-doesn't-like-ful – and the degree that they are unknown.

Now, actually a war may be very dangerous, but it's fairly well known. Man, you've got sergeants and captains and generals and general staffs and governments and presidents and kings, and so forth, and their whole effort is to locate you.

And the whole effort of the enemy is to dislocate you. So you've got an effort to dislocate being resisted and an effort to locate being obeyed. And, of course, danger hasn't anything to do with it at all. It's just the degree of location involved with it. And of course, you get all kinds of recruits for a war. You could probably dream up and synthesize another activity that would be just as attractive as war if you put your mind to it.

It would have to be something where you were supremely well located. Marvelously located. You'd just have to fix it up so the guy was – could locate and was being located. Known whereabouts, you see. Known whereabouts. Known whereabouts. Known whereabouts. You just have to play that one off the middle with efforts to make the whereabouts different. In other words, to fix and unfix. The whole idea of power – this is an old one from way back, Phoenix – the whole idea of power stems from the ability to hold a position. All power derives from the ability to hold a location. When I say position, of course, that gives you a double entendre. It's location. The base is what derives power to the electric motor. It is the base. It is not the spinning armature – armature. It's what keeps positive and negative separated that is deriving the power.

Now, you can conceive an electric motor with a positive and negative terminal in the thing that would have enough rotation through magnetic fields applied to it that it would collapse its base. Now, you've got two little things, and they're sort of pinned up there on little weak pot metal. There are two heavy magnets pinned on weak pot metal pins, you see. And you get positive and negative going between these two magnets at a hell of a rate of speed, you know. You turn your armature through the field and those two poles will collapse on each other.

You take a powerful magnet, and the reason things come to a powerful magnet is to the degree that it can stay still. Otherwise, your magnet will race forward toward the thing. These are various laws in the fields of mechanics which actually derive from the ideas of
thetans. All mechanics derive from the ideas of thetans. All matter derives from concept of thetans, and the behavior of matter is based entirely upon how a thetan thinks it ought to behave.

Chemistry is very interesting. There isn't a single product that doesn't have a set of postulates connected with it. There isn't a single chemical compound or a single chemical element that you cannot take apart into the number of postulates that the thetan put in it. And you can find out what the postulates of it were. It's quite interesting. An interesting study.

No more of that. That's rather dry.

The idea of holding a base or holding a situation. All right. There's these – a body of troops is holding a hill and they cannot be dislodged. Well, the degree they cannot be dislodged does not have anything whatsoever to do with the number of troops on the hill. It may be influenced by that, come to think about it, but that isn't actually it. It's whether or not they believe they can be dislodged. That is the first requisite and whether or not they have enough weapons of one character or another to resist dislodgment. It only takes one man to fire an electronic cannon.

Now, you need lots of men to the degree that the hilltop can be approached. So the power generated by a body of troops on a hilltop is totally dependent on their ability to make the enemy hold his position, and their own ability to hold their position. And that body of troops actually has to take responsibility for holding the enemy where they are. And bodies of troops almost never take this responsibility very wholeheartedly. They think they will shoot at the enemy if he approaches. It never occurs to them too much – although this is part of tactics, strategy – to pin the enemy down where he is.

Now, of course, they have won the war to the degree that the enemy cannot advance and that they can continue to hold their position. Wars are won on the basis of held positions and dislodgments from positions.

Now, countries look very weak after wars because one of the countries has dislodged the other terminal, and there's no power resulting.

The whole subject of electricity, flying saucers, the electric motor that turns over your fridge, whatever is running your automobile is merely based on the ability to hold a location and to resist an encroachment upon the location. You look at an internal-combustion engine in this wise, and you learn a great deal. Of course, the pistons are trying to blow the crankcase down, you see, and the crankcase, however, is held up with bolts, and the crankshaft goes zzzzzzz, you see. It doesn't go psst down, so this must be the thrust bearings and the main bearings, and so forth, of the crankshaft that are holding a position, and the piston isn't holding the position, but it's being dislodged, but there must be something that keeps it from coming up all the way, you see, and something that keeps it from going down all the way.

You'd normally conceive that the power of an engine is based upon the thrust of the piston. And this is the way they normally calculate the power of engines, and that isn't why the engine is powerful at all. It's the degree the base can be held and the amount of effort that can be applied to dislodge something from base, and then the amount of effort that this base has to resist being dislodged, and it's an interplay of held positions.
And if a mechanical engineer were to look over motors from this exact way, he would arrive with very advanced power plants of one character or another. It's the ability to hold things apart and the ability to thrust them at each other while holding them apart, and so on.

You always get generated energy by thrusting something at something that will not move. If you don't believe it, start an argument with somebody. The power of the argument is totally proportional to the degree that they won't relent, you see. Well, you'll see actual power being generated. It can get pretty sparkly, pretty sparkly.

All you want to do, if you want to keep generating sparks, why, just keep pressing against the held position. And of course, you know how to settle any argument: in the final analysis you could always run away. Can't dislodge the position so you could always move off, and of course that – there's no more power being generated. You see how that would be?

No more power being generated at all. There's no more argument. Nobody's shouting. Nothing happening, and so forth. You're just gone. You were one of the terminals, you see, and you were holding a position there, too. So you abandon the position, and you don't have all of this upset. All you have after that is detached pictures. [laughter]

Now, a thetan's friction with life and his crush against life, and life's crush against him does generate energy. You know, he himself has got masses of energy, and he is holding a position, and so forth, and that's where the energy basically comes from. But you want to know where a picture comes from, the characteristics of pictures and masses and all that sort of thing, well, they're to the degree that he is resisting a position. Therefore, if you want to get a three dimensional picture in some pc, which is 3-D in solid, man, solid, well, get a time when he was ... Well, I'll give you an example. I had a good subjective reality on this.

A company of men lined up in company front firing at a company of men lined up in company front. Neither one of them giving way. They just stood there for hours and fired at each other. And boy, the fronts of those uniforms were just absolutely solid, all standing-wave electricity, of course. They thought it was guns that was generating the power in the battle, but it wasn't at all. It was these two bodies of troops confronting each other, neither one of which would give away, both of which were trying to drive the other away, you see. And neither one of them was driving away. And it was pretty combustible. And of course, when you run into a picture like that and you start to run the picture like that, the thing actually develops a considerable amount of zing.

See, there'll be all kinds of electricity running around, and you'll see it register on your E-Meter. The effort to hold a position.

All right. If you want to see an E-Meter go bing-bang, take somebody that is real to the pc in this lifetime. And then find an argument between the two. And you'll get the same phenomena and you'll get a discharge of energy, and that discharge of energy will be registered on your E-Meter. The study of the mind goes in, unfortunately, without – and you don't have to feel bad about this and think that you should learn more about this. Girls are very – mostly upset by this.

I start talking about electric flows and so forth. And I'm inferring ohms and ergs and all that sort of thing, and girls get rather distressed. They think that, "While I was in physics
class I got A on all those things, but I didn't understand any part of it. And I don't have much
to do with mechanics." And they start thinking. "Well," rather sadly, "well, I can't really grasp
this because I don't know much about electricity," and so forth. They back down on this par-
ticular point, and they think that in order to understand Scientology, they have to know some-
thing about electricity, physics and mechanics. Well, I'll let you in on something. I'll let you in
on something.

In order to understand something about electricity, and mechanics, and ohms and ergs,
electrical engineers would have to understand Sc ientology. See, it is a completely reversed
idea. But a girl in this particular lifetime is not too much or too averagely dedicated to knock-
ing guys' blocks off and knocking positions out and holding the front line trench, and so forth.
They haven't been doing it for a few centuries and are out of practice. And so they think that
the subject of power or force is something that they shouldn't have too much acquaintance
with. And that's about all there is to it, is they're just out of the habit. And this is why they
say, "Well, I really ought to know something about this but he's now talking about something
very technical that I really shouldn't know anything about," and that isn't the case at all.

I think that girls in this particular society probably generate more power and more
sparks than anything else. Kipling's comment upon "The female of the species is more deadly
than the male." I would amend this to reading "The female of the species generates more
sparks than the male." There's nothing like a girl who just can't seem to get a different idea in
her head and insists on hanging on to that one particular timeworn idea. You can explain to
her inevitably and at long length how that idea is moldy and went out of style and it hasn't
been worn in Paris for generations, and so on. And you can go on, and you can get quite elu-
cidative on the subject. You can flower it up and use rhetoric and threat and so forth. And she
finally succumbs, and that's too bad, and it's all set now and we've now agreed, you see, until
the following morning when she brings up this idea again, you see.

Yeah, there's an awful lot of energy hanging around one of those things. So don't think
that a girl won't hold a position or try to drive somebody else from there.

No, a thetan will do it, male or female. And banks have energy in them and are
charged. And a person has masses in his bank and is being bothered with masses to the degree
that he has experienced this interplay of energy motions and has tried to hold positions and
knock people off positions, and so forth. And you will get resultant bank. I mean, that's all
there is to that. A bank is a sort of a mold of what you were trying to hold a position against
or a mold of what you were trying to dislodge from position.

Well, of course, when one is dislodged from position, in actuality, even conceptually,
the person then dramatizes this to the degree of having a picture from another position. Now
do you understand where I've been going here?

So you'll have an out-of-valence view of the situation. And you'll see these energy
masses all right, but they're parked over in some safe place, and they don't have too much to
do with anything. And it's better just to have a picture of those energy masses, don't you see,
rather than to confront the energy masses. And you start to move anybody in toward this place
where he was dislodged or where he failed to dislodge somebody else from a position, you try
to move him in that with duress and command and hammer and pound and argue with him
and that sort of thing; well, that's what the substance was of the engram. So of course, it doesn't work. See, the more hammer and pound and duress that you put in to getting him to hold this position again, from which he can view the engram, the more you restimulate the resistance of the engram, the more you blow him out. It's very – see, it's very comprehensible. It's just a one, two, Q and A, direct.

But if you can take him on a gradient of what led up to this solid state, he'll find himself in it again. And when he finds himself in again, he'll find that these are masses of confrontingness, and the reality connected with it will be high, and so forth. And then he finds out that he did confront it, and then it properly gets into the thenness where it belongs and doesn't influence the nowness in which he is living, and the engram discharges. You see what this is all about?

It's actually a very elementary subject. And it just boils down to the fact that universes may be universes, I guess, but in actual fact thetans are thetans. And that is far more true, you see, than universes are universes because universes are simply the creation of thetans.

And if you can subscribe to the idea that you had nothing to do with the creation of the universe but it was done by a big thetan, [laughter] why, that's all right, but processing will catch that up, too.

Well now, in handling pcs, let me warn you against handling them with no idea of how a bank works. Two auditors, neither one of whom have any idea on how the bank works but both of them trying to find out how the bank works can probably audit each other rather successfully amidst the various ridges which build up, because one is trying to hold the position and the other is trying to blow him out of it. So they would probably get there nevertheless. But good skilled auditing toward clearing would have as a requisite some reality on all these points I'm making.

Now, the only realities you have to get on these points is just what is a bank, what's it look like, and what is out of valenceness – because anybody has out of valence spots on the track, that's for sure – and how does a picture look, and where would a pc be when he is down the track, you see. And do pictures run consecutively from one part of the track to the other, and is there a thenness as well as the nowness? And do energy masses exist? And what are these strange masses and feelings and sensations which the pc has around his body?

You have reality on those various things, and boy, you'll be able to audit.

You don't have to go into the esoterics of why they're there. You just have to get the subjective reality of the fact that they exist. And as soon as you see that they exist quite plainly, of course you are able to handle them, not only yourself, but you are able to handle them in somebody else.

Now, the oddity is that you can handle them in somebody else much more easily than you can handle them in yourself because you are not being affected by the various byproducts that the pc is being affected by. You see, it was the pc that was having the argument, and you were the – you're not even a party to the argument. So therefore, you can direct attention and see the reasons that the pc cannot see. The pc cannot redirect his attention because if he was totally regressed into the incident, his attention would be totally fixed in the incident, would-
n't it? But you didn't happen to be in the incident, so therefore it is very, very easy for you to
direct his attention in the incident because your attention with regard to that incident in which
he is in, is free. And oddly enough, the bank will always obey you much better than it will
obey the pc.

And these are the fundamentals of why auditing works. And this is how auditing
works. And if you don't know what you're directing his attention toward, or away from, and
so forth, you will occasionally make flubs, get into all kinds of tangled skeins of auditing, and
have to run ARC breaks; 99.44 percent of the auditing session will be devoted to present time
problems and ARC breaks. See, the pc actually will have as many present time problems and
ARC breaks as – to the degree that the auditor cannot direct his attention. The auditor has no
idea of where he is directing his attention or how he's directing the pc's attention or if the pc's
attention is being directed, why, of course, he has a great deal of trouble handling the pc.

Now, you have an idea of "Controlling the pc is very necessary to the conduct of the
session," don't you? Well, you just redefine what is controlling a pc beyond keeping his body
in a chair and keeping him from getting up. There is no other control of the body that you're
trying to accomplish or attempt.

It must be, the control of the pc is simply the direction of the pc's attention by the
auditor. And that would be the whole statement of how do you control a pc. Well, you control
a pc by knowing where his attention is and doing things with his attention, and of course that
controls the pc. And that's all there is to controlling pcs. You can go endlessly into the subject
and you won't thrash up any more data than that.

Well now, if you don't know where his attention is, can you control the pc? See, it
can't be done. So of course, then the pc is left to flounder on the track and flounder with this
and flounder with that, and his attention is not under any kind of control, and as a result, what
do we wind up with? We run – wind up with endless auditing. And auditing takes as long as
the auditor doesn't control the pc.

Well, when we say this, then it must follow that the auditing takes as long as the audi-
tor does not control the attention of the pc. To control an automobile on the road it is rather,
well, and you really should, know where the automobile is. Works much better that way. And
"in driving a pc," you might say it's much better to know where he is and where he's going
and what he's doing And a repetitive command will do a great deal. We shouldn't undermine
these things. It does a great deal. It is directing the attention of the pc left, right and center.
But also, the attention of the pc may be doing some other things which are rather fantastic.
And we have to find out about this.

And we're only trying to get the auditing command executed. But in order to get it
executed, we have to find out where the pc's attention is, and where the pc's attention is going,
and keep track on this.

Otherwise, he has the idea of running under a driver that doesn't know where the road
is, much less where the automobile is. Both are missing. And he sort of goes around, and he
goes through it, and he doesn't quite know. It almost might be enough simply to create the
illusion that you know where the pc is, and so forth. This might be all right, but there is actu-
ally no substitute for a subjective reality on what a picture is, what a real picture looks like,
what an energy mass is, what a track looks like, the sensation of thenness, and these little odds and ends of phenomena go along with subjective reality. Once you improve that, your auditing will go up in a steep climb like one of these new aircraft they're building over here. They don't take them off on runways anymore. They set them up on their tail and they light a match, and they go off into the sky. [laughter]

Okay? All right. Well, I wish you good luck tomorrow and this weekend. And you're overdue for clearing somebody, and I will have to have a Clear Tuesday morning. Okay?

Thank you.
Thank you.
Well, what's the date?

Audience: September 12th.

This is the 12th?

Audience: Yes.

Twelve Sept. 61 AD 11, more properly called.

Well, it's very nice to be able to come down, have a quiet cigarette and talk to you about nonessentials. [laughter] And to discuss a few things with you.

I have, actually, a complete new plan of clearing, which makes this a rather interesting day.

Practically everything that has been done or known in the last eleven years – perfectly valid. But an integration of all this material is periodically necessary because new discoveries are made and these lead to new simplifications. They don't lead to new complexities.

As you look over the history of Dianetics and Scientology you'll see a cycle is in operation. We get more and more complicated, more and more complicated, more and more complicated and then suddenly we get to a new, higher level of simplicity. And then this simplicity gets complicated and more complicated and more complicated and then we get to a new, higher level of simplicity. That's just a history of me outguessing you. [laughter]

Probably the only games condition which exists in Scientology is along those exact, direct lines. [laughter] Auditors can find more things to do wrong that aren't explained and you lay down new rules for these things, you see, and these new rules all become much more complicated and then they find new things which they consider vagaries or differences and then these become much more complicated. And then all of a sudden, why, a common denominator of all these things is arrived at and you have a new plateau of simplicity.

So we've been climbing a mountain which consists of a number of tables stacked up, each table higher than the next. And we have arrived at such a table. I can give you a new plan of clearing, which will probably be the title of this lecture. It's very elementary. Extremely elementary. It's Routine 3, just as you have learned it or as you haven't. And it is only possible because there is no shadow of a doubt now of any kind as to why people could not find goals readily and smoothly in preclears. The rudiments are out, that's all. I mean, that just
the rudiments are so wildly out that the goals submerge in their readings. That means it's very rough auditing has been the history. It means this auditing must be awful damned rough.

Now, a new simplicity has been found in that particular line: Why is auditing rough? Auditing is not rough because your TR 0 is out. Auditing is rough because you haven't a clue what a bank looks like, where your auditing is bad. I can make that just as a didactic, horrible statement.

The remedy for it is to give an auditor a reality on the bank. As soon as an auditor has a reality on the bank, ten thousand, seven hundred and sixty-five million rules all disappear. And he said, "Oh," he says, "that's the way it is."

He doesn't have time to think of rules when he's handling somebody's bank. He just doesn't have time, that's all. He's got to know. And he's got to be able to understand what is going on and if he understands what is going on, he does the right thing. And if he doesn't understand what is going on, all the rules in the world will not make him understand what is going on.

Well, that's a rather tough beef that you are suddenly assigned in Scientology and throughout the world. Because it means that the initial and basic auditing will have to be done by possibly the bulk of auditors with no reality on a bank. So that means that's going to be a rough spot, overcoming that, in any given area of the world. You've got a bunch of people, they're perfectly willing and they fumble around and finally one of them manages by some mystery and at vast torture of the pc to get the pc actually through an incident with good reality on the bank. After that, that pc will be able to audit. Now, that pc can turn around, of course and audit somebody else and give them reality on the bank. But what have you got now? That's an easy progress.

What is the first hump? The first hump would then be, with no reality on the bank, giving somebody a reality on the bank. Great!

All right, but that one has to be overcome. Now, there's probably a thousand ways that can be overcome, but it is the main point and that is the hump. That is the one where the wheels slide. That's the one where it's all grease clay as the jeep tries to go up. Do you understand? Once that one is overcome, the rest of it becomes very easy. I think we will get a lot of reality on that in very short order.

All right. So much for that.

Routine 3, in essence, remains unchanged. But that of course, Routine 3, simply consists of finding the goal, finding the terminal and giving the person Security Checks. Now, to that old Routine 3, we add this one: That we run some incidents. When? When the pc has been run long enough on the Prehav Scale that he's found himself in valence in several incidents and skipped handily and neatly out of them. And the way we handle that is very easy.

I'll give you that again in very, very brief review. And this time I will give it to you exactly as it would be done in an HGC. Exactly as it would be done.

Pc comes in, we give him the pc Assessment Sheet. We tie into them at once on a Goals Assessment: we have him bring in a list of goals. All right. We start a goals check. At
the same time, during a different period of the day, we do a Security Check. Only we do an ordinary, routine Security Check. On an old-time Scientologist we do HCO WW Form 6, old-time auditor Security Check. On a staff member we do some of these staff member checks. You're going to see them, more of them. There's more Security Checks coming out. There's even an Executive Check. But we do that kind of a Security Check.

What are we trying to do? Why are we doing this kind of a thing? We're just trying to get the fellow's withholds off so he won't blow. I'll tell you the liability of doing a bad Security Check or not doing a Security Check. Recently a girl in Johannesburg sat down in the HGC and the auditor read his ashtray and missed a withhold.

All you've got to do is miss one withhold as you go by and you've had it doing a Security Check. It's just no good from there on. The pc knows now that you can't find out and you've had it. You must get every withhold off of every question that is available at the time of the Security Check. Normally a case improves and more withholds start to appear.

That's the way you tell whether or not a case is improving, is whether or not you do the same Security Check again and find out he's now got more withholds. That doesn't mean that it wasn't clean the first time you did it. It merely means the case has improved in terms of responsibility and now has more withholds.

All right. This auditor sat down there and he asked something on the second dynamic and the girl said, "Oh, no, nothing like that." So he read his ashtray and he went on to the next question. And she went around telling everybody there was no such thing as Clears and it was terrible and she wrote lots of letters to people and she got very excited, she got very upset and there were all these rumors were floating around for a day or two or three. And finally our detective corps got into action, ran it down, found her, made her sit down in a chair, went back over the same Security Check, pulled the second dynamic withhold and that was that. Interesting flurry, isn't it?

Well, your pc will blow. All kinds of weird things will happen. The pc will ARC break. You'll get all kinds of upsets, and so forth, because you're not doing a Security Check.

So it's necessary to do a Security Check. That's the point I'm trying to make here. And it's necessary to do the Security Check well. And it's necessary to get all the withholds available at the time the Security Check is being done without going on to the next question.

Now, this means, with the routine I'm giving you now, that we're just returning to the old-time Security Check. It's just a straight Security Check. "Have you ever raped anybody?" and that's it. You get the idea? Asking it any way you can to get the thing reading and clearing up and getting off any of the material. Don't bother with Not-Know. Don't bother with anything on that Security Check. It's just a straight Security Check. You got that? Because I find out auditors can do that very, very easily and because the Not-Know version has now moved over into a tremendous difference [different] importance and I will tell you about that in a moment.

All right, we go right on and every session that we run this person in the HGC we just beat the rudiments to death. As of today you've got a whole new set of rudiments. They have come out in a bulletin and there's no reason for me to go over them right now. I've given you
more satisfactory rudiments. Having told you a few weeks ago that they were necessary, why, I got them in line and they're very good rudiments. They will clean up ARC breaks and they will do various things. All right?

There's only one difficulty. One of those rudiments will walk the person right straight into the engram necessary to resolve his case. That is, "What would you be?" and "What would you rather not be?" It - it's rather gruesome. So if "there's something wrong with the auditor" and you run that till the tone arm ceases, you will actually find the pc sitting in the engram necessary to resolve his case.

Anyway, that's beside the point. [laughter] It's just a point in passing. The rest of them have no great liability to them at all. And I have done the anatomy of an ARC break and I find out exactly what an ARC break is. An ARC break is the inability to tell an auditor. I don't care whether it was a withhold or otherwise and it isn't necessarily the auditor who is running the session. It's an inability to tell an auditor something. Inability. Not unwillingness. Inability. You pick up ARC breaks that go back for years with this exact process and the pc feels that the auditor has done something or has not done something. Actually the way it is given is "What has an auditor failed to do?" is the other side of the question. "What have you been unable to tell an auditor?" "What has an auditor failed to do?" Actually, there is a third question that can come up, which isn't mentioned in the original bulletins and that is "What did an auditor do?" You see? It isn't necessarily only what an auditor failed to do, it is also what an auditor did. So you ask these two questions. It doesn't sound like a dichotomy, but it is to the pc from the viewpoint of an ARC break. In other words, "What have you been unable to tell an auditor?" and "What has an auditor failed to do?" That is the way it is given. And that can also be "What did an auditor do?"

All right. Now, that will cure up ARC breaks. In other words, you can get the rudiments in and as far as present time problems is concerned, well, there's a new process for that and we won't bother to go into it because it's all in the bulletins.

All right. Now, there is a new set of rudiments. You can get the rudiments in. There is no excuse now for not getting the rudiments in. And it is very important while doing a Goals Assessment to get the rudiments in and keep them in, keep them in, keep them in.

Now, there's such a thing as middle rudiments. Not only end rudiments and beginning rudiments, but you have middle rudiments. Middle rudiments, however, don't get articulated as middle rudiments because what you actually do is end the session and give the pc end rudiments and then give him a break and then start the session by giving him beginning rudiments and so forth. But those two sessions are only five minutes apart and what it consists of is two cracks at the rudiments in the middle of the session. You get the idea? It's really middle rudiments. But it's end rudiments, beginning rudiments. You see that?

All right. While keeping these rudiments in gorgeously, you take that first list of 150 goals and you find the pc's goal in that list and don't monkey with it. Let's not go to 5,782 goals, eighteen weeks, rarr-rarr. To hell with this racket. That goal was in the first 150 goals. The pc gave it to you. You've got it. Now, what can get in the road of these things? Rudiments. Pc's got a present time problem. I'll give you one right here. (Person is present, but I don't care.) Pc was being audited on the second deck (for the benefit of Americans, that's the
third floor) and [laughter] – that's right. They have a ground floor, first floor and second floor in England. And that's because, I suppose, at one time or another there was a floor tax. But anyway, it's actually the third floor and it was fairly high and the pc could look sideways out onto the terrace. And the terrace was a long way down and the pc was so afraid of height that during the entirety of the Goals Assessment only this goal would come up: something to do with not falling, whatever it was. Some oddball goal that had to do with not falling on her 'ead or something That's the only one that would come up.

Well, why do I have to furnish all the genius? See? You have some latent quantity of genius back on the track someplace, dig it up, man. [laughter]

So I suddenly said, "Well, this is odd." That I got the report that had nothing to do with this, but the goal was something to do with falling and every time the pc was checked out on the goal the goal wouldn't stay in. So I said, "Well, where is the pc being audited?"

"Well, the pc's being audited on the second floor."

"Where's the pc being checked out?"

"The pc is being checked out in the basement." [laughter]

So I said, "Well, audit the pc in the basement." So they did and they found the pc's goal. Which wasn't "falling." Had nothing to do with falling.

*Female voice:* It was the first one on the list.

You see how this thing would mess up? Well, there's all kinds of screwball things, but do you realize that should have showed up as a present time problem every session? It should have shown up on the room. "Is it all right to be audited in this room?" Well, every time, if anybody had been looking at the meter, he should have been able to read, *pang!* "No, it's not all right to be audited in this room! This room is several feet above the height where I like to be." See? Should have shown up. Present time problem. Should have shown up. "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes, I'm scared I'll fall out the window. We're already ten feet from the window, but I'm liable to pitch out of it at any minute." [laughter]

Had absolutely nothing to do with the pc's assessment. It just had to do with the pc's case. See? Assessment's different than case.

All right. Now, let's take a look at this. It means that any pc goal can be found in the first 150. And it takes me an hour and forty-five minutes, so you shouldn't take more than fifteen or twenty or thirty hundred hours. [laughter] Sarcastic, huh? But that's only in revenge because all summer long I haven't been able to figure out, "What's all this?" See? "What's all this? What's all this? Why this long, long, long Goals Assessment?" Well, it just boiled down to just one thing: rudiments were out. Every pc on a Goals Assessment being run with the rudiments so badly out that the goal disappeared.

Now, a goal is very easily invalidated. Very easily knocked in the head. And so is a terminal very easily invalidated and knocked in the head. So you've got to have these rudiments clean as a whistle in order for the thing to emerge and keep on reacting. That's as sim-
ple as that. Pcs are delicate on the subject of goals and terminals. But you can find it providing you don't knock the rudiments out and providing you keep them in.

So, all right. This pc is put immediately into a Goals Assessment. And we find the pc's goal and then we put him into a Terminals Assessment and we find the pc's terminal. This is HGC auditing I'm still talking about. Anything odd that is coming up about this, it all centers around the rudiments.

The rudiments – there aren't – there aren't more rudiments that you should get in. There are just those rudiments which already exist in Model Session even though they have new processes to run them. Nobody has changed the number of the rudiments. The last addition was withholds and it looks like that's static from there on out.

All right. This means, then, that a pc would not be audited on 1A or any other breed of process which is preparatory or anything else. You just audit them into the goal and the terminal. When you have the pc's goal and the pc's terminal and when these have been proven up totally, checked by another competent person... Always have your goal and terminal checked by some other auditor, no matter whether you're in an HGC or otherwise. And the other auditor should simply check the rudiments and if the rudiments are out go no further.

The way you do a check like this, you just check the rudiments, you don't run them or get them in on yourself, see, if you're checking some other auditor's. You then pass the thing back to the original auditor and say, [whispers] "Your rudiments are out, and when you get them in, I will check the goal and terminal."

And he says, [whispers] "Oh, well they weren't out for me." You can always – always depend on him making that remark. "They weren't out for me!" Well, maybe they weren't out for him but they were out for you doing the checking. And when the rudiments are then put in, the pc is turned back for the goals and terminal checkout. Okay?

Okay, if there's something odd about it and they're going out and they're going in and the auditor hasn't been sure and he's sent the pc to you with two goals. You say, [whispers] "There are two goals reacting. End of check. When you have one goal reacting I will check it out."

Same way with terminals. If he turns a pc over to you with two terminals reacting and doesn't know which one. You say, "Well, after you've got them flat, I will check this out." Simple.

That's the way you do one of these crosschecks. You don't audit the pc. You find out what should be done with the pc in order to check it out. Don't you see? And then you get the other auditor to do it whose pc is that. Otherwise you get cross-transferences and all kinds of oddball phenomena.

All right. When you've got the pc's goal and terminal and when the pc has successfully completed the HCO WW Form 3 Security Check, you will have a Release on your hands and that is all there is to it.

So redefine the definition of Release. You cannot have a Release who has not found his goal and terminal and who has not completely passed through the most vigorous of the
Security Checks. That is not the basic definition of Release and that is not in its original intent a Release. That is just meanness on my part. So just assign it to that. Because you cannot guarantee any stability on a pc whose goal and terminal have not been found. So therefore, you cannot say that the pc will hold that state at all. You see? But if the pc's goal and terminal had been found, even though no runs have been made on it one way or the other, you have already changed the living daylights out of this person. This person now knows they are going in some direction or another and you can say safely, "Well, the person's a Release." Got it?

So it doesn't take very long to make a Release, does it? Remember, a Form 3 Security Check, totally completed and the pc's goal and terminal found.

Now, you'll find out that along about this state, and along about this stage, they don't want to pause long enough to get checked out for Release and other oddball things of this character. They will go right straight on along the line. So we're not going to worry about this particularly.

But supposing somebody was in the HGC and they could only be there fifty hours and the D of P had been careless with auditor training and the Assoc Sec had been careless with auditor training and the HCO Sec had been interested in the congress or something like this and it took fifty hours to find the goal and terminal and complete the Security Check. Well, and the person has to go now or something like that. Well, you can at least give him a Release certificate if these things have obtained. If they are correct. So that gives you something you can do there.

But mind you, everybody would have to be sort of asleep at the switch in order for this kind of a condition to obtain. Don't make any mistakes about that or settle for the fact that fifty hours to finish one Security Check, do a Goals Assessment and a Terminal Assessment is anything like good, fast technical auditing. It isn't. But at this time it's acceptable. It's acceptable as of this time. Why?

Because we have an awful lot of people around with no great reality on the bank, don't you see? And we have a lot of people around who are studying at the same time they're doing and all this kind of thing is going on. So you can expect this sort of thing to happen. Okay? All right.

Now, we've gotten this fellow this far now. We've got a Security Check – and, by the way, the Security Check doesn't have to have been completed by the time we start running the goals terminal. The Security Check is just something we do as industriously as we can do and devoting as much time to it as seems natural, but devoting never any more than fifty percent of one's auditing time to the Security Check. You see, that's the maximum, and the minimum would be one hour in five. So you've got a maximum and minimum for how much to security check the pc.

Now, if there's a hell of a hang-up in this case one way or the other and the case has been around for a long time, you, of course, do more Security Checks. The way to solve a case that is obviously hanging up on the goals-terminal setup is more Security Checks, done better. You understand? Don't just keep slogging at them with goals and slogging at them with terminals or something like that. Let's get down and get smart with Security Checks. Let's find out the actual conditions where this person ran into Scientology. Let's find out the
actual circumstances of this person's association with what's happening. And then let's security
check accordingly. Got the idea?

Well, let's say we found out this person had been around an aunt who was interested in
Scientology for five years and herself was never interested and then all of a sudden one day
came in for some auditing oh, this sounds awfully interesting. What was going on during
those five years? And we're liable to get all kinds of upsets, resentments, negative postulates
with regard to Scientology. You see? And the whole thing is holding up. It's all a holdup from
here on.

See, all kinds of things like this can occur. So if there's holdup, look in the area of
withholds via Security Checks. Even if you have to tailor up some kind of a special check for
processing. You understand?

A person – you'll get cases like this. You will get cases like this. A person has been an
assistant instructor in psychology for the last eleven years and suddenly has come in for some
processing. You'll get cases like this. Every time a ship is going to sink, why, just look at
those hawsepipes, you know and those mooring lines and you'll see shadows on them.

But eleven years? Hey, wait a minute. He's heard of Dianetics, he's heard of Scientol-
ogy, he's heard it lambasted. He himself has engaged in some of it or he has been in a "Well I
don't know, I keep an open mind." They do, they do keep open minds, drafts go through them,
and ... [laughter] Well, look at this. Look at this. The guy's actually hung up on his own overts
of some kind or another.

But I wouldn't bother too much with this. Just except in the normal course of auditing,
it suddenly looks like this person is hanging up badly with goals and terminal. Well, the ru-
diments are out and let me point out something to you: that withhold is part of the rudiments.
So to get that one in, you sometimes have to be a little bit extraordinary if the case is hanging
up badly. And you have to actually look over the circumstances and conditions of the case in
order to find out what kind of withholds the person might possibly have had during a period
of time. Hm? You see that? Is that very evident to you? Yeah. The person isn't coming into
session because somehow they've forgotten all about it but, at one time, you know, something
was going on and so on.

I saw a case held up on this instance. This was a very interesting instance. A fellow
and his father. And Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health had come out so they both
read it – you know, read it, read a couple of chapters and decided to try some auditing. So one
audited the other and then the other audited the one and then they both agreed it didn't work.
Then the person went on and read the book completely and came in and got to be not too bad
an auditor and went on for years and years and years, but his case never moved. It was the
weirdest thing.

And then one day an auditor – very, very smart – got the earliest overts on Dianetics.
And that was it. Both he and his father both agreed that it was just bunkum and it didn't work.
That was enough. And it had actually held him up in processing something on the order of a
thousand or fifteen hundred hours' worth. How do you like that! And all of it was being done
across that basic postulate on the subject and of course, it never worked either. Grim, huh?
I get a letter from somebody every once in a while that is lambasting HCO and screaming about things being returned and all kinds of wild things occurring. And I'm saying, "Well, I wonder who that person's auditor is?" Because this person has just fixed himself up but good. I get them in every once in a while. Has nothing to do with us, particularly, but there's a person chattering around madly, lambasting everything in all directions. And, of course, it's usually a totally uninformed lambaste. Oh, we do lots of things that could be criticized, there is no doubt about that whatsoever. You handle this much volume, you certainly are going to make some mistakes, but they're very seldom intentional mistakes. Now, here — here's just a bunch of overts.

Now, somebody's going to get that person and they're going to be in session, they're going to be trying to find their goal, and remember it's the goal that's submerged. Ordinary auditing on a chronic somatic or something like that or a present time problem, this will all work, you see. But the goal is delicate. And it can actually submerge or disappear on this kind of a background of overts and withholds. See, that's all it takes. Interesting, huh? And unless you get that straightened out, you're not going to find the goal and terminal. Okay?

All right. You've gotten up to this stage now, you've got a Security Check done or in progress. You've got the goal, you've got the terminal of the pc. Now, what do you do?

You assess it. Now, let's enter into another very factual part of this particular rundown. You assess it on the Prehav Scale, just as always, doing your good assessment, running from the bottom — the lowest point of the Prehav — on up to the top, and then marking those points that reacted on the needle and then going back only over those points which reacted and marking again that they reacted on the way back and now taking up only those that have reacted twice (now got two dots after them) and separate those out and we'll wind up rather rapidly with the proper level. That's very easy. And we run him, just as before, five-way legs, and so forth. And we run this pc.

Now, I don't care how long we run the pc. It hasn't been established yet how long you should run the pc. But this must be very, very, very clearly understood. When we run the pc on the process, we must include in that statement that the pc is doing that process and not something else or something also. You see? When we talk about a run on the process, we include in that that the pc is doing the process and not something else. You got it? In other words, we actually process this pc.

Now, at this stage of the game we don't care whether he's in valence or out of valence or anything else. We're not worried about that or interested in that.

But we go on and we audit him very happily and cheerfully and time goes on. We might run him this way for, heh, ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five hours. He's making progress the whole way. Don't think about that for a minute because he is. But at some time, the exact method of determining same cannot be laid down at this moment. I suppose it'll emerge one of these days with a whole new series of complications. At some stage, why, we assume that he's been through some pictures. He couldn't have helped it, not with the Prehav Scale and so forth. And we probably will have run an emotional level and we will have run some odds and ends. I mean just on your ordinary assessment, flattening your levels. And now we're going to ask this pc a burning question. And if we ourselves have not had an engram run and have no
reality on the track and never been through one from Hell to Halifax and don't know it, we're now in trouble. We're now entering the land of never-never. Now, we can make more god-damned mistakes and upset more pcs and get more ARC breaks, and so forth, in this exact stage I am talking to you about, if the auditor hasn't got a tremendous reality on the situation, than I would care to list in a long Encyclopedia Ron-on-ica.

The only solution for it is as soon as possible yourself get some reality on this thing I'm talking about. And after that you won't be going into the theory-theory of it all. See? Because it just is what it is, that's all. And with Not-K now versions and the Forget, Not-Know, Unknown types of commands we chuck him into it.

Now, this is the exact way we do this. We ask him if he's had any pictures where he himself was in himself looking at the things that were going on around him. And we check these over very carefully and we ask him very searchingly about all these things, and we actually determine that there probably have been by now two, three, four, five or maybe just one picture in which the pc was in himself and something was going on and that answered the Prehav level command. And so he answered the command out of that picture, maybe once, maybe twice and that was it. But that picture existed and he was in himself.

Now, we're going to count those up, find out how many of them there were and we're going to assess them on the meter. And we're going to take that picture which produces the greatest needle reaction, because that is the picture which can be run.

And then we are going to roll up our sleeves and getting the rudiments in very nicely and finding out if all is wonderful in all directions and we are going to run that picture with Unknown, Not-Know, Shouldn't-be-known, all the rest of the categories.

And you're going to come along and ask me what are the commands that you should use for this and I'm going to respond – I hope I, my patience holds out – I'm going to say, "Goddamn it, get one run." And then you won't be asking me how many repetitive commands of this, that or the other thing. It's the number necessary to resolve that particular phase of what it's all about. Do you understand?

And you're going to get that picture run from beginning to end and all of it complete and all resolved and that is going to be that. And then you're going to find the next picture. And if there is no next picture, if he's only had one, you're going to have to give him another five or ten hours of Prehav run. Got it? And then you're now going to have another assortment of pictures. And you're going to take them apart like – just like I said. Got it?

And then you'll find all of a sudden the case starts to accelerate and the terminal blows and you're going to have to find a new terminal, but you can't find the new terminal because it's gone. And then you're going to have to find a new goal and then the new goal goes. And then the pc is going to be hung up in another picture and you're going to have to remember that and run that thoroughly. And then try to do another Goals Assessment. And then you can't find the goal because they keep blowing. And then you can't find the goals and they blow and you can't find any more goals. And meantime, you're trying to do Security Checks and the pc is doing them on a whole track basis. And you're in a mess! Next thing you know the meter's broken. [laughter] Won't operate. Won't operate. You could ask him questions and the needle just floats.
And you keep this up, actually, for a long time. And you try to locate any residual pictures and so forth. Keep on trying to audit the pc. You got the idea?

The end product of all auditing is fruitlessly trying to audit the pc: pc is cheerful, the rudiments stay in, everything is going along gorgeously, the pc stays well in-session and the meter's busted. Once in a blue moon the needle reacts. And yet when it reacts now you generally will have an incident of some character. And you run it just the same way that you ran the other incident. You're locating odd bits of track that are still extant.

Now, the length of time necessary to stabilize a Clear has not been established. But I'd say the only safe figure is, after the person goes Clear, at least another twenty-five hours of auditing and preferably another fifty. You've got it made then. Audit the twenty-five or the fifty hours with your broken meter that won't work. Got it? Because they will run into things and they will run into incidents.

All right. Now, there is a new plan of clearing, now. You'll find that is a much more rapid, much more factual plan of clearing. And it comes up and confronts for the first time the fact that an auditor must handle incidents and that the Prehav Scale will not handle incidents, except on a run of such tremendous length as to make it unprofitable. To shorten up clearing, you've got to handle the pictures they're stuck in. Okay?

Now, that is the setup. And that will clear. And that will clear fairly rapidly. The goal will be found as rapidly as the rudiments are in. The terminal will be found as rapidly as the rudiments are in and the pc will run as smoothly as he's got his withholds off, particularly in the zone of Dianetics and Scientology.

And then in running it, there is a point where running generally on the Prehav Scale ceases to produce much of a result. And that is because the pc has been in and out of one, two, three, four, five good solid 3-D pictures of one character or another and he actually is now hung up in every one of them. He feels much better, maybe, but he really is hung up in every one of those pictures and the easy way to get out of it is to run them.

And if you yourself have never seen a picture and you're trying to run somebody who has a picture, you're going to be sitting there trying to run TR 0 and thinking about giving the proper acknowledgment and how do you get in a bridge and you're going to be thinking about all these things. And hells bells, you shouldn't be putting in any bridges. You shouldn't be doing a thing but just in there pitching with the pc, you see and taking his attention and shifting his attention around and running the various phases of it all. Now, that's what you ought to be doing.

And you'll see at once the folly of putting in a bridge because you're going to run a different command. You've been running "What is not known about that incident?" and you're going to shift to "What is not known to others about that incident?" And you go and the wheels creak and if you have never yourself been through one of these things, why you're liable to put in a bridge and yank the pc's attention out of it all and fiddle with the E-Meter leads and worry about a lot of things, when all you ought to be doing is just simply say, "Well – here's another version of this command now and – What shouldn't be known about this to others?"
"Ah, well, that's so-and-so, and so-and-so," and the pc's right in there pitching, see. It's just smooth as glass.

And then eventually when you get to be an old-time expert, you will be able to do such things as we have learned over the many years, as you find out there's a hell of a fall in this thing and you know at once that the way to resolve the fall is to put the pc at the bottom of the fall and make him fall to the top. And after you've done this four or five times then he can complete the fall down, but until you do this he very often cannot fall. Why? Because his resistance is against falling. And his resistance against falling is run out by making him fall in reverse. Sounds weird, but that's very good.

Pc is going around in a circle counterclockwise, why, make him spin the engram reversewise. And you'll find out the engram will spin ten times as fast reversewise and this will be very, very funny. The pc won't comment on it's being funny but you've got all the resistance of going forward on the spin. Don't you see? And you can't slow up that resistance. And after that, why, the spin runs out. It's very simple.

And then there will come a time in the engram when you will say to yourself, "Well now, Ron said you had to run Not-Know on this and that's all you're supposed to run." And the pc will tell you there isn't anything else unknown about this whole ruddy, cotton-picking engram. And you'll keep on saying, "Well, what isn't known about the engram?" And, of course, he'll come right out of session and you'll have had it.

Now is the time you've got to run the "knows" out of it and run through it a few times. Just let him talk to you about it and the engram will just discharge from a certain point. And it just discharges from that point there on out, providing you keep the pc's attention on it, keep asking him questions about it and letting him tell you all about it and adding it all up and how it got that way, and so forth.

Now, that is the running of engrams in clearing. Now, why is this all of a sudden so important? Why do we make this shift? It isn't much of a shift, actually; it's a simplification of what we're doing. Why?

Well, I'd better give you this why now so that you won't be asking me again – you can if you want to.

Well, I've learned something new. I've learned that a somatic cannot be unburdened. Hmmmm. A somatic is where it is at the tension and velocity that it is, and it is nowhere else and is totally independent of all other incidents. I finally got the gen on it. A somatic is where it is on the track and is what it is and discharges only as what it is and not as any lock or any other additive. And a somatic, no matter how thoroughly it has been unburdened, will come on with the same intensity when you find it where it is. And that all the pc's hidden problems and present time problems of long duration stem from the first engram that you will be able to contact and run after the assessment. All the pc's chronic somatics and difficulties are in the first one that you will contact. Contacting it just as I gave you just a moment ago and sorting it out. You'll find all those – all those somatics and everything else, and so on. Nothing under the sun, no generalized process has ever made them less. They've put them out of the way and they've kept the pc living, but when you finally contact them again in the actual incident
where they reside, they are just as tough as they were the first time. And they are there and they are rough and you've got to run them through.

And when you discharge that engram, the pc's present time problem of long duration will vanish and that is the only way that thing can be solved. And I know that's very adventurous for me to say so but in actual fact it's true. The is-ness of the situation is in the time and place of the situation and nowhere else.

Of course, one could have concluded that years ago, but we do have success in unburdening, we do have success in doing those other things. And isn't it interesting that after we've done all these things, we go back and find the exact incident from which it all came and find it just as rough in that incident as it ever was. And then the whole thing blows up and that's it. It's still the engram necessary to resolve the case.

All right. Let me give you another datum here. The engram necessary to resolve the case didn't resolve in 1950 for one very excellent reason. The only reason an engram never reduced when run was because it was not on the goal-terminal line of the pc. It wasn't an earlier incident. Earlier incidents supported it and so forth and you could undercut it, but the engram necessary to resolve the case is on the goal-terminal line of the pc and unless you've found the goal-terminal line of the pc, the engrams aren't going to reduce rapidly. And if you find the goals-terminal line of the pc you're in for an hour's run. And if you're not on the goals-terminal line of the pc and he's not in valence, you're in for seventy-five hours to no reduction. Now, that's something to know, isn't it?

So, of course, the engrams that come up by running the Prehav Scale are the engrams that will resolve within an hour and they're very resolvable. They're not dependent on anything else. The somatics in them blow and everything else goes and the motion in them runs and all the difficulty you've ever had running engrams disappear. Because you've got the engram on the goals-terminal line of the pc. You've got the pc in the terminal valence that was the destructive valence of his case and of course, you're running him in that valence because it's on his goals-terminal line.

And what you've solved – in essence what has been solved here is how do you get a pc in valence on an engram and also how do you find an engram on the case that will run and also what is the engram necessary to resolve the case? You got those things? Those are all very important things.

Now, the reason you have trouble with engrams in the past in auditing and have difficulty with them is they didn't lie on the goals-terminal line, the pc was not in valence in them and they would not resolve independently because they were associated with some other chain. But on the goals-terminal chain they resolve, bang! And they are the engram that is producing the present time problem of the pc. So this is a terrific solution here. This is a big jump. See? And it's quite cute.

Anybody now can keep the rudiments in and run the – find the goal and find the terminal and run the terminal Prehav level, find it and run it. That's a very mechanical auditing job.
But, now, something else is needed when we take off from that point and that is a reality on what a bank looks like. You'll never ask the right questions unless you know. I could just sit here and tell you by the hour what a bank looks like and all that kind of thing and maybe should because it might help you out in the first stages, but at the same time one hour's reality on going through an engram with all the screaming fits in the engram and after that, you'll never ask any silly questions about, "Well, should I put in a bridge?" you see or a silly question like, "Well, maybe the pc wasn't getting my acknowledgments." Hell, he's not interested in your acknowledgments and you'd know that then! Nor would you be sitting back in your chair, comfortably and somewhat pompously, going off like a wound-up doll. You'd say – that would be about the cruelest thing you could do to anybody while he was running an engram. You realize that?

Because the only reason you can get through the engram is because you have an idea that the auditor is right there with you helping you out and so you can confront it. That's it. And you can go through it and you know that he'll go – ask you questions. And you'll be feeling snappy toward the auditor probably the whole time or you'll be feeling something toward the auditor the whole time. It'll all be kind of misemotional. Right up to the time when you find the misemotion is in the engram.

And then when you've located that – then the old line which Suzie just dug up in the old Book One: the auditor shouldn't pay much attention (rough paraphrase) to the emotion of the pc, because whatever emotion the pc is expressing while he's running an engram is to be found in the engram. It hasn't anything to do with the auditor. If there's antagonism in the engram, the pc's going to be antagonistic right up to the point when he as-ises the antagonism. If the engram is full of apathy the pc will be apathetic right straight through. Not anything the auditor's doing. But the auditor can compound it, you see, and snap the apathy in on himself or snap the antipathy in on himself by, of course, just not knowing what the hell he's doing. And the only way he can not know what he's doing, of course, is to have no reality on what the pc is doing. When he's got a reality on the thing himself, why, that's it.

I can tell you something else about this. There are people around who tell you all about their engrams. This isn't true of everybody who tells you about his engram. But some of these people are telling you glibly that during a Prehav run they ran into this situation and so-and-so, and such-and-such, and so-and-so, and so-and-so was the case. Now, they didn't run the incident and it's an engram hotter than a firecracker. And they haven't been near it and they haven't been in it. And they tell you that's an engram.

Oh, if you've run a real one you'll know that's – you'll know that's not true. Because a real engram is only an engram because one doesn't know and can't seem to find out a damn thing about it. Now, of course, after it's been run expertly by somebody else and the person has gone through it and knows all about it now, naturally he can give you the story. But the story of an engram is never [snaps fingers] quite like that. Oh, yes, a person can give you sequences off the backtrack that aren't engramic. But the engrams necessary to resolve the case are not in this kind of condition. They're complete not-know hodgepodge. They're a mess. A person just hasn't a clue. And that's the first thing that the auditor contacts about the engram – that there's just nothing known about it.
And then you'll get some kind of a silly interchange like this if you haven't got a good reality on that. "Well, what is unknown about that engram now?"

You see, you've got it – this person with the stilts. There's a pair of stilts and they seem to be sitting out in the middle of this plain and a snake – very Freudian, you see – and a snake seems to be between the two stilts.

Well now, Papa Freud or some of the boys in psychiatry run into this sort of thing and they would build a mountain of pretended knowingness on top of this.

No, it happens to be a pair of stilts out on the plain and there happens to be a snake between them. And what this is all about and why the person doesn't know anymore about it is this doesn't make any sense at all.

So the psychiatrist has been busily pretending all sorts of knowingness about all this. Well, you'll also find pcs who won't go near an engram telling you all about it. Ha-ha-ha. They're no better, you see, they're no better. They've still got this burning right ear, you see. And they still go like this all the time. [laughter]

"Yes, I was running this engram the other day in which I sunk Britain. I destroyed it utterly." Oh, man! How the hell could they run any engram at all unless they ran the engram necessary to resolve the case? And if he ran the engram necessary to resolve the case, they wouldn't be doing that. Got the idea? So it totally – it totally disproves itself.

And you get this silly situation – just to continue with what I was saying – you get this kind of an oddball, silly situation. And the auditor, who has no reality on engrams at all, you see, says, "Well, all right. What is unknown about that?"

And the pc says, "I don't know anything about it."

And the auditor says, "Well, come on now, certainly you must know something about it."

Well, of course, the oddball thing is, is the pc answered the auditing question, which is perfectly true, he didn't know anything about it! And the auditor takes this literally, you see and says, "Well, we couldn't possibly run the engram because he doesn't know anything about it." You got the – you got the kind of cross play that can go on here?

That – because the auditor wouldn't understand that when you really enter one of these bitch kitties on the time track that that is about your first reaction: "What the hell?" you know, "A pair of stilts and a snake! How Freudian," you know, "What is that all about?"

"I don't know. I don't know anything about it."

"Oh, come on, now," the auditor, you know, "you should have..." Yahyahyahyahah! What he could say is, "Well, all right. What else don't you know about it?"

"Well, I just – nothing. Nothing at all. It is just a total blank."

"All right. Good. What don't you know about it?"
"Nothing. Not a single thing." And the pc isn't ARC breaking or anything else. He's just answering the auditing question. This has got him totally baffled. He has never looked at anything in which there was no information of any kind before that could be extracted from it.

And a pc could go on this way for a half an hour. Perfectly happy. He's looking at it. He's getting his head kicked off, of course, there are somatics in the thing and he's being bisected and trisected and a few other things. But the nice part of it is if he's running the engram that is found in the fashion that I just told you – on the goals-terminal line – if he's running that one, when he contacts one they go and they don't come back. Isn't that nice?

Now. What we've really done with goals-terminal Routine 3 is find the direct route to find the engram necessary to resolve the case and find the engram in a sufficient condition that it will resolve and it's only an hour's run. It's nothing. It's nothing. It's agony but if the auditor's got some idea of what an engram is, the pc's perfectly willing to go through the agony. You just never saw anybody so anxious to go through the agony. He also never saw anybody quite so upset as an auditor who doesn't want him to go through any agony. Hm? "Oh, well, the poor fellow, he's uh – I don't know, he seems to be in trouble. Are you in trouble?"

"Well, for Christ's sakes, what do you think!"

"Well, I don't know." Auditor says to himself, "How can he be in trouble? He's sitting there in the auditing chair and this room is a perfectly quiet room." [laughter] And he has no idea whatsoever that the pc is in a thenness which is more real than nowness, but actually to the pc it appears to be now. And the pc is in the middle of this thing which might be a torture chamber, it might be a Safeway store and on the other hand it might be the cockpit of an airplane. Who knows? Lord knows, he doesn't.

And then you say to him something on the order of "Well, I don't think really that uh ... Seems to be too rough for you, you know, and uh, you ought to really, uh, come out of it somehow and you realize that we've only got a few minutes left till the end of session."

This would speak, you see, with absolutely no reality on the auditor's part what the hell the pc's going through. That's the hill that's got to be climbed. Because in a lot of places and a lot of times, these things will have to be run by somebody with no damn fool reality on them of any kind whatsoever. And somehow or other they'll have to muck through and get the thing run. They'll have ARC breaks by the ton and snapping the guy out of session and collapsing the bank on him and getting him twice as confused as he should have been and turning somatics up five times as high as they ought to be. But somehow or another it'll get run. You understand?

But in the bulk of cases we've just taken off maybe, oh, I don't know, a thousand hours of running to Clear. This is why people aren't going to Clear.

They go into an engram on a Prehav run and they say, "Well, that answered the auditing question. It's perfectly all right for me now not to have anything more to do with that. Good." They don't notice it's all their chronic somatics or anything like that. They're too glad, you see, to just hide the thing under the chair seat and skip it.

And they run into another one. And there's a bunch of arquebus men standing on the palisade and they say, "Well, when have you failed to endure?"
"Well, I failed to endure right there in front of that palisade. Yeah, there they go, plu-zoom! you see, and boom. And so on. I sure failed to endure. Yeah. Well, that's the end of that engram. Okay. Let's see. Let's have another one." Another command. "I answered the command. That's it. Nothing to do with me." Because, of course, the keynote of these things is total irresponsibility. "Nothing to do with me."

And then he goes on and he goes through another one. By the time he's hit about five of these things, why, man, it's about time somebody threw him a lifeline. Because he will now hang up from there on out and ordinary Prehav runs will not do a thing for him on any kind of a progress line that you would consider a fast progress line. So they could just actually be audited for weeks. Why? Well, they'll see these things again and then they say, "Well, I ran that once," and so on. You get what happens?

They're running an escape mechanism of some kind or another on these incidents.

Now, you sort them out on an E-Meter, find the engram necessary to resolve this out of these five the person has contacted and you just have to start talking to him about the incident, you don't have to do anything fancy about going into it. Well, hell, he's in it. He's got all the somatics of it. Where else would he be? How could he have the somatics of it if he wasn't in the incident?

Well, there's no trick in putting him in the incident. And, of course, the keynote of all engrams is "not-know." And you ask him all the not-knows out of the incident and what shouldn't be known and what isn't known and what he doesn't know and all of a sudden it starts to run. It starts making a story and he builds it up more and he can tell you more about it and does. And then you run more "not-know" and get some more stuff off of it. And then you find out that he just seems to be stuck in one particular place and he isn't going anywhere now. And no matter how much "not-know" he seems to run and you say, "Well, what is happening there? What is going on?"

And, "Well, I'm sitting at the wheel of this car and it just doesn't seem to be going anyplace."

"Well, where is the car?"

"Well, I don't know."

"Well, what don't you know about it?"

"Well, I don't know – I don't know where this embankment leads to. Car's halfway up this embankment."

"All right. Run the car backwards onto the track."

"Huh! I can do that!"

"Good. Run the car backwards onto the track. Thank you. Well, good, run the car backwards onto the track again. Do that a few times. Back on the track. Back on the track. Back on the track. Back on the ... All right. Now, what don't you know about this?"

"Oh, God!"
What you've done is run the resistance, the tremendous resistance toward going over an embankment into a crowd. Don't you see? And the resistance is such that you've got to run it backwards. You've got to get the pc's effort not to go into the crowd off. And the engram will now start running again. And all of a sudden the car does go up over the embankment and turns over eight times and comes down squash on the head of fifteen spectators. The pc very cheerfully will do that then. Got the idea? And you just have to keep it moving, keep these points of hang-up resolved and you have to know what you're doing, that's all. There's no substitute for it.

And we know all the tricks there are to run engrams. And there aren't very many. And you've got the common denominator of engrams. You know how to find the engram necessary to resolve the case, the engram that will run and the engram where the somatics are all residual that isn't dependent on any other engram for its somatics. You've got all those things. What the hell more do you want?

Well, what more do you want is actually a subjective reality on what they look like and how they go and where they go.

Now, it hasn't anything to do with the occlusion of a case. This is another piece of news. Case is occluded, "smuted," to hell with it. What is an occluded case? Stuck in an engram which is an occlusion engram.

You've got this fellow down in the engine room of a spaceship and the lights go out and he doesn't know what happens. Three seconds later his engines blow up and they've never blown up before. There he is. Of course, he doesn't ever move forward into the blowup of the engines. He sticks there at the point where the lights went out. He has a black field. "What don't you know about this?"

"Well, I just don't know anything about it."
"Well, what are you looking at?"
"I'm looking at nothing."
"What's the nothing look like?"
"Well, it looks black like any other nothingness."

Idiotic type of questioning that goes on, you see. If you've got a subjective reality on it, you know what questions to ask.

You say, "Well, all right, what happened just before this?" Because the auditor can always move to the somatic strip faster than the pc can. "What happened just before this?"

"Whew! What happened before this? Oh, oh, that's another thought!"
"What don't you know about it?"
"I don't know why the lights went out."
"Oh, you got lights on there just before that?"
"Yeah!"
"All right. Well, move back into that area there. All right. Now, what don't you know about that?"

"Well, I don't know where the ship is going."

And, of course, we've got an engram running right there, bangity-bangbang And this was an occluded case. Or the case with the little rockets that keep going across the line, the little rockets that keep going across the line. It's just a section out of an engram.

There is a condition here of pretended knowingness which can get in our road. And this must be looked on by you simply as an escape factor to end all escape factors. When the knowingness is too horrible and the not-knowingness is too thick and then the person feels too stupid about it, they're liable to dream it up. And these dreamed-up ones all go off like hot butter. There's nothing unknown about any part of them.

That's an engram?

Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. The hell it is. This is dub-in of Book One.

Now, you're not going to find any of it running this way because you're going to get the guy into the engram necessary to resolve the case. You're going to ask him if there were any of these pictures that he was in, in himself, and what he was looking at, at the time. You're going to get it located on the meter, you're going to hold him in that instant of time and so on.

Your Prehav Scale normally discharges obsessive change and other things of this character so that these things are to some degree taken care of. But you are going to run into people that are pretty hard to settle down into that one. Just the second you say, "Well, which one were you actually in and looking at the scenery? And the scenery was in 3-D during this Prehav run."

"Oh, you're talking about that one I ran into a long time ago, the last – couple of weeks ago. Oh, yeah, well, that one, that's nothing to that. Actually that was a time when I was a young subaltern and we were over in France and uh – I uh – was... I know what I was responsible for there, you see. I was uh...."

Well, just look at it. What is this? This is defense, defense, defense, defense. He doesn't know a thing about it or it wouldn't be an engram. It wouldn't be acting on your meter when you asked for an engram.

You say, "Well, now, just as you – where, where'd – how did you pick up this picture? Just what's – what did the picture itself look like?"

"Well, I was there, and there was – well, there was a trench in front of me. Parapet. Periscope. That's the picture."

Oh, "Is that the picture?"

"Yes. And I know what it was because, you see, I made a mistake in the firing parapet, and I telephoned it all back wrong, you see, and then the whole regiment was wiped out. And so forth. I feel very guilty about the whole...." [laughter]
"All right. Good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Well, what don't you know about that parapet?"

"Oh, know everything about it. Uh – except uh – where it is."

Now, you know you are getting somewhere. "Where is it?" "What else don't you know about it?"

"Well, what it's made out of. Is it concrete or something?"

"What else don't you know about it?"

"Well, why it's so fuzzy."

"Well, what else don't you know about it?"

"Well, what I'm supposed to be looking at."

"Well, what else don't you know about it?"

"Well, where I was."

"What else don't you know about it?"

"What I was."

"What else don't you know about it?"

"Who I was. Where I was. What this is. What am I doing here?" You know?

And we find out it is not a trench, it was not World War I, he was not a subaltern, it was not on this planet. It's an atomic power plant observation parapet. He was guilty of something, he did get the right angle there. [laughter] But that was about it, see. That's as far as the data was factual. Get the idea?

The keynote of an engram is the pc knows nothing about it. Pretended knowingness is going to get in your road and you're going to buy garbage. And then some day you're going to invalidate some pc's straight dope. You'll be sorry. It wasn't garbage, see? It was an implant script. Something weird, you see, this kind of thing.

But you can find these things and you can run them. And you can run them with no great reality on them providing you don't keep jerking the pc's attention out of it with a bunch of technical nonsense – like, "All right, is it all right with you if I give you two more commands of this unknown process?"

"Dad um-dad um."

"Is there anything you would care to say now before I end this process?"

"You're goddamn rights there's something I would care to say!" [laughter] "Here I was a here in the middle of this whirlpool minding my own business and where are you?" The pc can get pretty revengeful.

All you've done is a painful shift of attention. When you start running an engram, you'll run an engram.
Well, you can ask all kinds of oddball auditing questions. And you'll actually use repetitive questions in streams or bursts like you fire a machine gun. "What isn't known about that? What isn't known about that?" You know? "Thank you. What isn't known about that? What else isn't known about that? Well, what isn't known about that? All right. Is there anything else around there that isn't known about that? Is there anything else that isn't known about that? Thank you very much."

There isn't anything else known about that. And he seems to be kind of slowing down on this now.

And we say, "Well, is there something there that others don't know about that? All right. Thank you. That's good. Anything else others don't know about that? All right. Anything else others don't know about that? Anything else others don't know about that?"

Now, we seem to have that kind of cleaned up and we say, "Well, is there any effort to forget anything in here? Oh, there isn't? All right. Thank you very much. Well, what isn't known about that? Good. What isn't known about that? Good. What isn't known about that? Good. What isn't known about that now? All right. Is anything known about it? Do you know anything about it now? All right."

"Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right. What are you looking at there? All right. Good enough. Is there any spot there that's consistent, that just stays there, or anything else like that?"

"Yeah, well, this rock projection on the wall, that seems to be something."

"Well, what don't you know about that? Okay. Good. What don't you know about that? All right. What's unknown about that rock projection? Thank you. What's unknown about that rock projection? Thank you. What's unknown about that rock projection? Thank you."

"Oh. Oh, oh!"

"Oh, that's where you hit your head."

"Ooohhh!"

"Okay."

It's pointless to ask any further because the pc, of course, has got the unknownness off it.

You say, "All right, now what's unknown about that incident? Good. What's unknown about that incident? What's unknown about that incident? What's unknown about that incident? What shouldn't be known about the incidents? Good. What shouldn't be known about it? Good. Oh, all right. Well, what shouldn't be known about it? All right. Well, what else shouldn't be known about it? Oh, thank you. All right. What else shouldn't be ... What's you doing? What do you run into? What's happening? Oh? What are you looking at? What's it look like? Oh, all right. Well, what shouldn't be known about that? Okay. All right. Now, what shouldn't be known about this incident? All right. What shouldn't be known about that incident? Good. All right. What's unknown about the incident? Oh, you say everything's known about it now? All right. Well, what happened? All right."
He tells you, you know. "So-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so."

"All right. Are there any other unknowns in there that you can spot, one place or another?"

"Yeah, well...."

And of course listening to him you know damn well he knows nothing whatsoever about a certain sequence of it because he hasn't noticed that at one time he is standing on a cliff and another time he is standing on the top of a spaceship; he never noticed that he has never transited between these two places so it doesn't make sense.

You can ask him something blunt, you know. Don't be unreal about it. "Well, how did you get on the cliff?"

"What cliff?"

"Oh, the cliff. The cliff you're standing on every once in a while."

"Oh, that's right, I was on the cliff. Standing on the top of a spaceship. They're two different places. Ha-ha. I didn't know they were two different places."

"All right. What else don't you know about that?"

"Well, how I got from one place to the other."

"What else don't you know about that?"

"Well, the condition I'm in on the cliff."

"Okay. What else don't you know?"

"Ouch!"

"What happened then?"

"Well, I don't know. Gee whiz! There's a whole other sequence up here on the cliff. I didn't know I got up here on the cliff. For heaven's sakes, I must have gotten blown out of the spaceship and ... No, I didn't get blown out of the spaceship, no, I walked. No, I didn't walk. There was another space... No, there's a space... oh, I see, there's the space lifeboat down there wrecked at the bottom of the cliff – I get it. Oh, I see."

"Well, what else don't you know?"

"Well I – don't you see, you idiot?" [laughter] "You know, I – I – I thought I'd get away in a space lifeboat. And I didn't make it. But actually I teetered on top of the cliff and then just as I got out of the thing I was hit with this withering blast of fire. That's what that is all about. See, simple. That's why I got all these face somatics I've got right now."

"Well, what else don't you know about those face somatics?"

"Well, I don't know where they came from."

"Okay. What else don't you know there? Good. Thank you. What else don't you know? What else is unknown? Good. What else is unknown about the top of the cliff there? Good.
What else is unknown about the top of the cliff? Good. What else is known about the top of the cliff? What else is unknown about...."

"Well, I guess I've got it now."

"Well, what have you got?"

"Oh, well, there are a bunch of natives up there, a bunch of wogs and so forth, armed with electronic cannon."

Wogs armed with electronic cannon. Doesn't makes sense, but you say, "Well, all right, what don't you know about those wogs?"

"Well, I don't know if they're wogs." [laughter]

See, you'll see his impulses to write script. And then all of a sudden you'll see he does find out what happened. And you'll see the gradual as-is-ing of the situation and the gradual integration of it. Pretty soon all the somatics will be gone and the whole thing will be clear from beginning to end. Ask him to run through it a few times. Just – just running an engram as offhandedly as this. This is – of course, the thing is all cleared up. There's no pieces left in it that you can detect.

And you say, "All right, why don't you start in at the beginning of this engram and run on through to the end a few times, see if you can pick up anything else." He does. You don't say, "Go to the beginning of the engram and run through the engram to the end of the engram. Now, give me the phrases necessary to resolve the case...." See? Just go on, run through it a few times. He does. He does. He does.

"Oh, there is something here!"

"What?"

"Well, I don't know why this ship was only equipped with one lifeboat."

"Oh. Well, what else about that?"

"Well, there's two lifeboat hatches, you see and one is empty."

"Oh? Well, is there anything happened before this incident that you have omitted?"

"Oh, I get what this is about. The pilot of the ship had already deserted the ship and left me and I didn't know anything about running the ship." Now, it makes sense. And, bong! he gets the rest of the somatics.

And you say, "All right. Now, is there anything else that's unknown about that incident?"

"No, no. I've got it all taped now. Got it all taped."

"Well, run through it a few more times and see if you can get anything out of it that you might have missed."

"No, I've got it!"

"Well, just run through it anyhow."
And he does and he says, "Well, it's all gone. There's nothing else there."

And you say, "I'll check over these various points. Now how about the top of the cliff?"

"Oh, yeah, I got that."

"How about the wogs?"

"Well, they weren't wogs, you know. It was the other part of the army. We were mutineers, you see. I thought I told you." [laughter] And so on and the guy got that and we got this all straight. All fine. It's all running okay. It's fine.

"Well, you got any somatics?"

"Nope. Nope, don't got any somatics."

"Got any sensations?"

"Good. No sensations."

"Any places where you don't feel anything at all?"

"No. Well, come to think about it, I don't have any sensation from the waist down." [laughter]

"All right. Is that in this incident?"


"Well, how are your legs now?"

"Well, they feel all right."

"Well, what did you pick up there?"

"Oh, I just picked up crashing."

"All right. Is that okay now?"

"Yeah."

"Well, what are you looking at?"

"Oh, the ground down there about five feet."

"Well, is the ship on the ground?"

"No. No, it's about five feet up from the ground."

"Well, it hasn't hit yet, is that right? All right. Good. Crash backwards a half a dozen times."

"How do you mean?"

"Well, just – just go backwards from the crash spot."

"All right. Okay." Move. Move. Move. "Oh, I see. I see what you – I was stuck!" He had a big, big cognition, see. [laughter]
"All right. Now, how are your legs?"
"Well, they're all right."
"Now, tell me about the crash."
"Oh, went down and so and so. Oh, there's the last of it. Now, that's it."
"How are your legs now? Got sensation in your legs?"
"Yeah."
"Well, are there any more somatics in this thing anyhow? Look it over carefully and tell me if there are any more somatics in it?"
"Nope. There are no more somatics."
"Any more dead feelings? Any more sensations? Anything else in this incident at all? Good. Well, do you have sonic in the incident?"
"No. No, I haven't heard anything."

Leave it alone. Don't bother to turn on the perceptions any higher than they're turned up. Just mark it down in your book that after you've run two or three more incidents off this particular case, you're going to go back and find the sonic in this incident. Okay?

Perceptions are the last things to turn on. There will be a sense of smell in there somewhere and so on. You just – a careful auditor makes sure that he just gets all the perceptions out of it eventually. So he should keep it in his auditing record that he didn't get the perceptions out of this, such as smell. Got what I'm talking about? He didn't get the sound out of it.

Sometimes pcs will really flash back at you if you start asking them for smells or sounds or something like that. You're turning it up too real on them. That's just turning up too damn real and actually can be suppressed one incident to the next. At the time they had this crash on the plane, their sonic had been off for the last eight or nine trillennia. See, their sonic isn't off in this – is off in this incident, but didn't turn off in this incident. Got the idea? Because perception is something that declines gradually over a long period of time, but somatics are something which are right now. See how that would be?

It's very funny when the pc's sonic starts coming on. Of course, he hears everything all played backwards and upside down in one hell of a jumble. So he – his natural impulse is to turn it off promptly.

You'll get somatic impulses turned off during auditing. And if you're eventually smoothing the case out and giving him sonic and all the rest of this thing, you'll have to pick up the turnoffs in the auditing, too, you know?

There was this awful crash and they decided they didn't want to hear any part of it. And the sonic went off. Sonic is very easy for a pc to turn off. Okay?

Now, running an incident is your fast way out. And that shortens this down considerably. And we continue on with our efforts to shorten clearing as much as possible. And I think when you see this thing in action you will really know you've gotten someplace. The first thing that you've got to learn, however, is how to do a good Security Check and how to do a
good "keep the rudiments in." How do you keep the rudiments in, in a session? And then how to do a good Goals Assessment. How to do a good Terminal Assessment. How to do a good Prehav Assessment.

If you've got these things, why, you've got the thing taped right up to that point where you have to know how to run an engram. And the one thing that's going to teach you that is running one, yourself – inside, you, with somebody else auditing And that will teach you everything you want to know about it.

And then you will be telling me all the knuckleheaded stunts auditors can pull. Well, that's fine as long as you get through it and as long as you push pcs through engrams.

Shouldn't take more than an hour, two hours, something like that, to run one of these incidents. If it's taking longer than that, your rudiments are so wildly out, you shouldn't have been running it in the first place.

I'll give you an example. I was doing this last night and before I started the session I took up for the fifteen or twenty minutes with the pc – this was auditing but it was not in session – why the pc did or did not deserve auditing. I just wondered if the pc deserved auditing or not. And so we discussed this for fifteen or twenty minutes in oblique ways and got a lot of locks off and did a lot of little Straightwire stunts, and so forth. Cleaned this sort of thing up and then started the session. Because I was going to run an engram in that session, I didn't want anybody running an engram in a session who didn't think they deserved any auditing. Okay?

Do you see this is a finite package of skills?

It is a finite package of skills. It is not very many. Of course, we assume that you can do your TRs. We assume that you can do a Model Session. We assume you know E-Meter essentials. We assume these things.

And I'm almost of a mind to just go on assuming them and kicking people's heads in who don't know them. Because I'll tell you, for all of these things, a person's got to know how to run an E-Meter, a person's got to know to do a Model Session before they can do any auditing at all and their TRs have got to be in before they can do any of these things at all. But these you can look on as elementary skills.

Now, you're looking at another level of skill. The level of skill of keeping rudiments in. The level of skill of actually finding somebody's goal rather rapidly. It's easy to do just to the degree that they're not ARC broke with sessions. Finding somebody's terminal very rapidly. Assessing the person. And then, first and foremost, of course, after that comes the ability to run an engram. These are finite.

But, of course, that whole thing falls down if you can't do a Security Check. I think that whole package there sort of rounds it up. If you can do these things, you can make the grade. If you can't do these things, you can't make the grade.

Clearing consists of that. There is what clearing consists of. Because every case I find now that is hanging up in clearing has contacted incidents and these incidents are now blooey – you know, they're unrune and should be run – or the pc has not done any of the auditing
commands. That's part of the basic skill of auditing, is making sure that the pc does the auditing command, isn't it?

But in this one lecture I've actually discussed all of the elements of auditing. I may not have given you all the details. I've given you an awful lot of the engram running and, actually, the engram running is not really more complicated than I have given you; it is no more complicated than that.

Using these materials you should be able to clear. Clearing is overdue. Overdue in a lot of your hands and so on.

And now I have an announcement to make. That anybody who makes a Clear from scratch automatically gets a DScn. And there's no other way to get one.

Thank you. Okay?
SEC CHECK AND WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 13 September 1961

Okay, well, how are you doing today, huh?

_Audience: Fine. All right._

All right. It's apparently the what? The 13th?

_Audience: 13th._

September AD 11.

All right. Now, you're well immersed into the idea, and one or two of you into the practicalities, of running an engram. I don't know how you got away with it or how good it was or wasn't, but did it run all the way out? Is it still reacting on the needle? This engram. Speak.

_Female voice: Evelyn, she had one._

_Another female voice: Well, I ran several._ [laughter]

How long did each one take?

_Female voice: Well, they certainly took. Unfortunately, I had to watch the time of the next preclear coming, so that got in the way a bit, but we flattened off quite a bit. And one did go completely flat._

That was the first one?

_Female voice: Well, I had two preclears running, you see. First one didn't, because his session came to an end, so I popped him out of it. But the second preclear ran one flat, and there's another one still sparking on._

How many…?

_Another female voice: She's auditing two people._

Well, I'm talking about one pc. Now, did one engram get run on one pc?

_Female voice: Yes._

And did one engram get partially run on one pc but not flattened?

_Female voice: That's right. Oh, yeah._

When's it going to get flattened?

_Female voice: Next session, I hope._

All right. Who's the pc that's got the unflattened engram? Oh, you!
Female voice: Yeah.

Ah, well. That accounts for you not speaking up, I suppose. [laughter] All right, well, so much for that.

The routine I've been talking to you about, a plan of clearing, is a very important thing. I have been very leery, you see, of putting too many sawed-off shotguns in your hands. But there is no way to walk around this. And we have to just front up to it, and realize that you've got to use all the weapons and tools that are at your command in order to do the job. You can't fool with it. Apparently there is no shortcut to clearing, any more than there is a royal road to geometry.

Well now, the only way that you can front up to the fact of Clears, is to clear people, and apparently there is no short road by which this is done.

There is a fast road in terms of exactly what you do, and I gave it to you in yesterday's lecture. But there is no circuitous, easy road. Do you get the idea – the difference here?

There could possibly be some milder, more in keeping with repetitive, command – less demand on the auditor is what I'm talking about. There could be.

I've been looking for something like that all summer and have been testing with it and trying to do something about it. And cases make progress, but I will tell you that this is a final conclusion and I don't care to make any further conclusions on the matter.

Unless you have found the pc's goal and terminal, you're auditing a hodgepodge and they get better, they don't get better, and they go up, and they go down, and they – you know, and so on, etc., blah.

If you find their goal, and find the pc's terminal, why, they're on the road. And if you run the terminal on the Prehav Scale, you can only run it just so far, and the person runs into a certain series of engrams and gets well into a chain of engrams, and these engrams then are available to be run. And they have to be run and that's that. Because a pc all by himself, puttering around, is going to play – I don't know whether they do schottisches on the outskirts of these engrams, or what, but they certainly don't do anything in the engram. It requires an auditor's skill to push them in.

There is no substitute for Security Check. A Security Check has to be well done. But again, a Security Check done on any other version than just a straight Security Check form runs into this other phenomena of just running random engrams and stirring up the bank and that sort of thing. And although you get off more withholds, and although there are very tricky ways to run Security Checks, just on the straight things, the best Security Check is the straight Security Check, for my money.

There are various things you have to do sometimes, because not all the questions are present on the Security Check, and pcs can think of a great many random things to do with a Security Check.

There is no question on it that says, for instance, "Well, have you ever made a pc guilty for giving you a withhold?" We just ran into that one. And that was hotter than a pistol, wasn't it? And the Security Check wasn't working. Wasn't working on this person, and finally
Mary Sue, with a large, long, blue spark – I think her sparks are usually tinged with slight pink – said, "Well, let's see if he's done anything unusual with the pc's withholds." And he had done something unusual with the pc's withholds, and it was keeping the Security Check from working. In other words, you have to be smart to run a Security Check, but the best and fastest Security Check is just a straightforward check. All right.

In running engrams, you again have to have a good subjective reality on what an engram is all about in order to run an engram well. But that doesn't say that you cannot run an engram without any subjective reality because that is going to have to be done, and remember that I have run engrams with no subjective reality of any kind whatsoever. 1947. Never been through birth, and I'd run people through birth, and so forth. So this can be done, you see.

Now, as we look on the pros and cons, and the pluses and minuses on this type of an approach, it is a very blunt approach, and it demanded certain tools. And – the Instructors of the Washington course, by the way, are – I just smell it – they're just being a little bit sparky. They don't believe that the goals possibly could have occurred in the first 150, because none of the thirty people on the course were able to find a goal on the first 150 given by the pc, you see. They didn't believe their rudiments were out. They just didn't believe their rudiments were out. They can't believe it. They can't face up to it.

Yet, on that course, they were not cross-checking rudiments. In other words, student A on the course was not taking student B's pc and checking to find out if the rudiments were out, and then telling student B. You see. That routine was missing. And the most Clears were made in the South African course where that was done. Cross-checks of rudiments.

So rudiments are not always out for the auditor. See, it isn't that the auditor is being careless. They're not always out for the pc's particular auditor. The pc gets into a frame of mind where he believes that this auditor is skilled or confident, and he swears by this auditor, and therefore doesn't feel ill at ease at all, you see. And knows that if he gave up a withhold, that the auditor isn't going to chew him up with the withhold, you see, and he gets into this state of somnolence with regard to rudiments. They're wildly out. He's got present time problems and everything else, but he has confidence in his auditor and so he doesn't register. You get the idea? He'd just as soon go into session for this auditor, apparently, but in actuality the rudiments are out.

Another auditor checks the rudiments on that particular pc and they are wildly out. They're not necessarily now wildly out for an auditor or another auditor, they're just out. It's the fact that the pc's confidence or attitude toward his auditor or lack of confidence in the auditor or something else, has put him to a point where he just doesn't have present time problems and withholds while being audited by Joe, don't you see? He just doesn't have them. They are affecting the living daylights out of his case. It's just a peculiarity.

Now, we haven't even really gotten to the bottom of the peculiarity, and probably there are a great deal of odds and ends of mechanisms involved in this that haven't been brought to view.

One of the mechanisms I did bring to view on it, however, is that an auditor-pc, as a team, get withholds. You see, they get withholds on the rest of the world. So that anything given off by the pc to the auditor is looked upon as a further confidence. See, it's not being
given up. It's just being passed to one person carefully, so as not to be passed to anybody else, don't you see?

So eventually they get a whole bunch of, (quote), "withholds off," but how far off are they? They're off on the understanding that they won't go any further. And just to satisfy and placate the American Psychotic Association, we put that "keep the secrets of your pc," you see, in the Auditor's Code. Well, it's a good idea, everybody's been doing it, and so forth. But that's the only part of the Code of a Scientologist or the Auditor's Code which I just wouldn't, myself, much believe in. Because right away it's defeating, isn't it? It says, "Well, this withhold can go one person, and that's it."

Or on the other hand, you start making hay with somebody's withholds, and another evil develops, so on, so ma – because a person is being punished for his withholds by the society which is all triggered to punish people for their withholds.

Now, a little bit more further than that, several times in research we have found this to be the case, but I don't know if you're aware of the fact that pcs quite often get off withholds which are total lies. And they go on reacting because they are lies. And they get all messed up because they've told a lie.

And there are some people around who get off withholds to get other people in trouble. (Quote) "Get off withholds" (unquote). It's quite interesting. I mean you – some auditor is guilelessly auditing this pc and this pc says, "Well, yesterday Joe stopped me in the hall and kissed me and slapped me on the gluteus maximus and told me something or other, something or other." And the auditor says, "What do you know!" you know?

Well, he can't quite get it to clear, and he thinks there's more to it, and it goes on and on, and then it finally just sags out of view somehow or another, and he isn't reading his meter carefully, you know. And he goes around with the complete idea that this has occurred.

Well, of course the pc has now put himself out of session by miscommunicating to the auditor. And the auditor unfortunately will very often go around and say, "Well, that Joe, he's really a character, you know? He makes passes at women in halls." Nothing like this ever occurred.

I mean, there are "withholds," (quote) (unquote) circulating around in Scientology which have never occurred.

It is used by some pcs to spread entheta which isn't true. I'll tell you where this is most prevalent. I'll tell you how to spot this. You get a pc who never tells what they've done, but always says what somebody else has done. "Did you ever rob a bank?" "No, but my father robbed a bank." You know, that kind of thing, you know. And you watch this going on any length of time with a pc, and if it's consistent, you can be fairly sure that some of that pc's withholds that he gives you are just lies. And you want to cross-check on withholds for lies. And you can just put it down as a little rule. Because a case can hang up by having given you a false withhold. That's something to know, you see? And you say, "Well, have you lied to me about any of these withholds you've given me today?"

Well, we have a little, pint-size pc. He's about as big as a suitcase. And so help me Pete, if he didn't give his auditor – I don't know how many withholds he passed out the first
day that he was being given a children's Security Check, but it was something on the order of fifteen, twenty, maybe something like that. Comes back in the next day, he's more honest than most, and he says, "Well, I – huh-huh, huh-huh. Two of those withholds I gave you yesterday are lies." He woke up to it.

So you want to cross-check on this sort of thing. Be particularly leery of anybody who's always giving withholds about somebody else. See?

"No, I have never held up a bank, but my last auditor uh…" [laughter] I'd be particularly alert to this one. In the first place, that's not a withhold. A withhold is what the pc himself did. That is a withhold. Plus, the pc being an accessory to a fact. That is a withhold. Now, the pc being the accessory to the fact does not include the pc passing on all the bad data and all the rumors, and so forth, the pc has ever heard, because of course the pc's not an accessory to the fact of any part of these things. No, the pc didn't rob the bank, the pc stood out on the corner and made sure the police weren't coming while the bank was being robbed, don't you see? All right, that's an accessory-to-the-fact withhold, and which is part of the withhold. It's quite a valid withhold.

But it is something the pc did, isn't it? See, the pc did stand on the corner. The pc didn't rob the bank, but the pc stood on the corner. You'll get this sort of thing. You'll get as a withhold occasionally, "Well, I sat and listened to some violent criticism of…" And that the pc considers an overt – and it was. Pc didn't speak up and shut it off or put anybody straight or anything; they just sat and agreed with it all, you see, and all of a sudden, why, this turns up as a withhold, but remember that was something the pc did. The pc accepted tamely, or agreed with, you see, or didn't do anything about, a situation. But again, it's something the pc did, don't you see? It isn't the information that was given the pc. That had nothing to do with it.

So you – and then you always want to check as I have said. Check the Security Check for lies.

"Have you told me any lies during this session of Security Checking? Are any of these things lies? Have you misrepresented the facts in any way while I have been security checking you?" Well, of course, let the pc take umbrage. But the harder the pc umbrages, why, the harder I push. Pc says, "What, no such thing! I've never told a lie in my life."

I said, "Well, all right, which one of these withholds was a lie?"

"Well, but I've never said anything like that. I – oh, I never! Well, I've never been so insulted in my life!"

"All right, well let's check them over. Now, let's take the first question. Did you lie on that one?"

"Well, not much." [laughter]

That's the usual routine, one, two, three, four. The more upset a person gets about a Security Check, up to the point of refusing to take one, which is the ultimate upset with a Security Check, the more withholds the person has. It is a proportionate scale. It is directly pro-
portional. The more protest, the more withholds. Right up to refusal to have any check of any kind whatsoever that's – that's up...

Now, listen, that's not some punishment mechanism I'm thinking of. I have never had it fail, now, in much more than – well, it's two years and more experience now with Security Checks, I have never had it fail, that the person who refused – I don't care if that person was straight off the street – the person who has refused to have anything to do with a Security Check was the most loaded of the lot.

You say, well, how do you find this out? Well, that's not necessarily a secret. You take a non-Scientology staff, or a non-Scientology personnel, don't you see – we've had a lot of experience with these, not just here – and they're pretty wild. The person who has got a fairly clean slate or a halfway clean slate will come in and sit down and have a Security Check. But the person that you can't even see the black for the chalk, you know, and they say, "No, well, that's against my rights. We have rights here. You might not understand it, but we have rights. Rights!"

Now, at first I sort of bought this. But as time went on, and I got crosschecks on these people, I found out the more rights the more crime. Soon as somebody tells me something like that anymore, I just, "Well, what do you know! So that's where the sugar has been going." In fact I'd be perfectly liable to say that right out loud to them. "What else have you done around here that I don't know about?" And oddly enough, they'll start breaking down, drrrrrrr, boom!

"Ah, I didn't mean it," and so forth. "And the spoons just leaped off the sideboard and into my pocket." [laughter] "And what do you mean by having spoons that do this?" [laughter]

That is something to know. That is something to know.

Now, the general mechanism of the Security Check – in that withholds can be abused: A person has the horrible choice of remaining static as a case from there on out or getting them off, and taking the chance that it ruins his reputation, that he'll be hanged, and so forth. Well, in two years of experience I have never seen anybody hanged for getting rid of a withhold. I have noticed, occasionally, on staffs, and so forth, an HCO Sec or somebody reading down a sheet of withholds and finding one that's so damn contrary to organizational regulations or what we're supposed to be doing or something of the sort, that the person just goes up like a small skyrocket and lands on the person's head in a gigantic atomic explosion, and the person is rather taken aback by all this.

"What do you mean, stealing mimeograph paper? Don't you know that stuff costs money? No wonder I've never had any mimeograph paper around here," you know?

Well, that's actually bad. They're abusing a withhold. But why do anything about it? Why do anything about it?

Another thing that happens with regard to withholds is very, very funny, and it was happening to us down in South Africa. I'm looking at a student right now who was very baffled on two or three occasions, but I think he came in on at least one occasion that I know of, maybe two occasions, and found his desk as Director of Materiel, Johannesburg, practically covered with unidentifiable, nonsource items. [laughter] All kinds of weird things. Organiza-
tion property, don't you see? And I think this one thing was terribly mysterious, awfully mys-
terious, was that his office was locked [laughter] and nobody had a key to it except two or
two top executives. And yet, he came in in the morning, the office still locked and desk cov-
ered with all kinds of litter, bric-a-brac, you know, missing tapes and missing books and miss-
ing this and that.

And somebody, you see, trying to get out from underneath it – being found on the Se-
curity Check, or something. I don't know what all that wound up on, but sooner or later of
course somebody would collide with it anyway.

But when it comes to health, or case advances or a decent society, and so forth, actu-
ally a society which makes it impossible for a person to take any road out, of course, is a
doomed society. That society can kiss itself goodbye. It will go along with Chaldea, Babylon
and Egypt any day.

And, of course, this society, the present society, is absolutely boobytrapped. Well,
goodness gracious, the police are running around in circles up here right now, I'm sure, trying
to solve some vast crime or another, and get back some property or something. And there's
probably some thief sitting someplace saying, "Good heavens, why on Earth and what pos-
sessed me to steal a Queen Victoria hat? I'm sure I don't know, you see, and all this other
junk. And what am I going to do with it? And the fences will have nothing to do with it, and
I'd happily give the stuff back," but he can't. The police couldn't accept it back, and – oh,
they've got a big ridge going of some kind or another.

I'd pull a different deal if I were figuring out which way to go on such a thing. I
wouldn't let people off scot-free on such things, but I would sure send them someplace where
they could get straightened out. In other words I would make a road out. But in the existing
society there is no road out.

Well, handling Security Checks in a society of this particular character, then, runs into
a little bit of heavy weather. And you very often run into some heavy weather. Somebody's
sitting there and, good God, they're the fellow who did it, you know, and what are you going
to do as the auditor, you know? Well, one of the things that occurs to you at once is they're
the one who did it, and so forth. They, therefore, are guilty and they're a criminal involved in
the situation, and what is your responsibility as an auditor?

Well, it's – your responsibility as an auditor is first and foremost as an auditor, is get
the person out of it. You're not the police force. Don't you see? And then you actually are not
honor bound from that point there on to be under a stamp and seal of total secrecy with regard
to the fact that the First National Bank was robbed by Joe, you see.

But don't go calling up the police. They're on the wrong road. Cops never get a society
anyplace. Cops are a short-term proposition, strictly. The more cops, the more crime. Not the
more crime there is the more cops. See, it's the reverse. Quite the reverse. If you had a totally
lawful society, all you'd have to do is look around and hire a thousand police, and you'd have
criminals. Well, these fellows have to have something to do, don't they? There's a game called
cops and robbers. And if there aren't any criminals, we're going to make some. And they don't
protect the society.
Various times on the track when I've done police work, always operated on one basic mechanism: that the responsibility of a provost marshal or a military governor or something like that was to public security, public safety. First and foremost, public security. That was the target. Not criminals, you don't have anything to do with criminals, you had to do with public security.

Of course, that makes kind of a vigorous kind of law if you look it over. And you find somebody standing on the crossroads with three people in the held up coach with bullets in them, and he's got bloody jewels in his hands right at that moment, well, you don't bother the courts, you think of public security. And of course if you think of public security you also think of public economy. [laughter] That's a sort of a vigorous kind of justice. But nevertheless is a much more positive kind of justice than hire a thousand cops in a lawful society…

Oh, somebody has sent me a whole series of clippings on this, by the way. This had escaped my memory. And there's some town in Texas that had a jail, and they had two or three police officers. And they finally cut the police force down and they noticed that the crime disappeared to some degree, so they chopped the police force out entirely and haven't had a crime since. [laughter] A whole series of clippings on this. Quite amusing.

But you're not in the business of justice with a Security Check, is all I'm trying to impress you with. You're not in the business of justice, you are totally and completely in the business of straightening somebody out. Now, if you later on are in the business of justice, you have to reconcile with your fact you've used an auditing confidence or something that you forced the fellow to give you. And if you use this later on, wearing some other hat, well, you just have to reconcile it somehow or another, or figure out whether you should or shouldn't. But it would be while wearing another hat that something like this occurred, don't you see?

This society is rather goofy. Along one line, it believes second dynamic withholds are far more valuable and more important, you see, than other types of withholds. And the second dynamic is one of eight. And I don't know that second dynamic withholds have any vast importance. Of course, sex is a little bit closer to creativeness, and creativeness is a little bit closer to reactivity than other things. But I'd say that a man who created bad machinery on the third dynamic, don't you see – this shouldn't have any – should have about the same weight as somebody who is doing some weird second dynamic activity. What's all this emphasis?

Well, the society gets this from Papa Freud. And Freud brought this up and said the single source of human aberration was the libido theory. You didn't get that joke. Wasn't sex, it was Freud's theory. And they've been playing it on their zithers and guitars ever since. That was just what the Victorian age needed to top itself off with and finish itself off. And they bought it, and that's it. But you find a great deal more freedom being expressed along in these lines.

And if you think the case is going to get better suddenly by getting off some bad second dynamic withhold, be prepared to often be disappointed. Case gives up a second dynamic withhold and doesn't get any better. According to Freudian theory, you see, once you found the childhood sexual abnormality… Penis envy, I think, was one of the greatest crimes of the whole setup, you know, that kind of thing. Terrific, awful. And you get this off, you know,
and you say, "Well, gee," you know, "that ought to really make a difference with this case. This case really ought to run now," you know? Case doesn't run any better. [laughter] Wrong target.

You find one fine day that the case had an unkind thought about a pc in session. And you get that one off, you know, and the case all of a sudden starts to run. And if you don't recognize – recognize that the value of a withhold is the value assigned to it by the pc; and the value of releasing it is the degree it assists auditing – the way it assists his life or something. And if you recognize those principles, why, you won't get carted astray with all this nonsense and so forth.

Now, I suspect that in some group or another they could start vying with one another about the meatiness of the second dynamic withholds that they could get off, and I – about the time I saw some of these things, I would say, "Oh, hell, why don't you people stop lying and start auditing, you know." Because, pooh! it's not that important.

The whole world, its perpetuity as far as bodies are concerned, is based on certain now-I'm-supposed-to's, all of which are self-protective. And if you're trying to hold a unit together like a family or something like this, there should be now-I'm-supposed-to's, and they should hold together. And if that is the game that's being played, it should be played by the rules.

But as far as the total aberration of man – you got off a second dynamic withhold off of somebody, like he was the fellow who set up the perpetuity of bodies for any given planet, and he's been sort of feeling guilty about that ever since, of course he'd be the source of all second dynamic withholds or upsets or aberrations from there on out, wouldn't he? And yet that would be a social activity in the field of science. It's not a second dynamic activity at all. It'd be a fifth and sixth dynamic activity.

Well, it can't be very aberrative. I was a party to something like that once.

But the upshot of it is, the withholds that you get off are what they are, not what the pc embroiders them into, and they are as good as they assist auditing to take place. You're just trying to put the pc in-session, that's all you're trying to do with withholds. And you could overvalue this.

As a matter of fact, they have, here and there, you get a tremendous resurge when you're doing Security Checks. You find out some mechanism or another, and you release this thing, and you get a big case resurge. And it is a good thing to have happen to the case. There is no doubt about this. But remember, he won't go Clear on withholds. And that's all we're interested in.

You get off of – all of his withholds off the length and breadth of the track, the whole distance, and you wouldn't have a Clear. Isn't that interesting? You'd just have somebody that audited better. So look at your relative values.

Now, a case will not progress unless a certain proportion of the withholds are off the case. And you'll find any case that is holding on to withholds, hard to audit and hard to clear. Getting off withholds does not make a Clear, but having withholds can prevent clearing from occurring. Now, do you follow that? You see, it's just like building barricades across road-
ways, and the person's trying to travel on this road. Well, actually removing the barricade doesn't get him much further on the road, it just permits him to travel on it.

Therefore you have to know how to do these things, and you have to know how to do them well. And it is a subject – I won't mince around with it – it is a subject which requires cleverness. You have to be clever to be a good Security Checker. You have to be clever. You can't sit there and run over and over and over like a wound-up phonograph and say, "Well, have you ever cooked a company's books? Thank you. Have you ever cooked a company's books? Thank you. Have you ever cooked a company's books? Thank you." That's not going to get anywhere. You read the question, "Have you ever falsified a company's accounts?" And the person, well, looks a little tense, and the meter might or might not have reacted, and you say, "Well, what do you know. Well, have you ever juggled a company's books? You ever juggled any accounts?" Bing! "All right, when was that?" you see.

A security question sheet can never be put together to answer up to all human beings at all times and all places. Just skip it, you can't do it. Couldn't be done. You've got to ask the question so that it applies to the pc.

Now, supposing you did a Security Check in Oxfordian English with polysyllabic address at all corners? And then you were checking a Bantu? Right away, of course, your Security Check breaks down because all these beautiful words go over his head and that's it. Of course you don't get any reactions, he's innocent of everything including being a Bantu. Doesn't think of himself as a Bantu; he's a Zulu. See, so, "Are you a Zulu?" He'd fall on that, but not on "Are you a Bantu?" You got the idea?

Has to be adapted to the person. And when you give a Security Check, you have to give a Security Check to the person you are giving the Security Check to. And the list of questions are never to have any omissions. Always ask them all the questions on this sheet and any others you think it would be good to ask them.

Auditors are always adding. Well, let me open the gates right there; let me open the gates wide: you can add all the questions you want to to a Security Check as long as you ask all the questions that are on the sheet. So your "prolixity for additity," [laughter] can be given a free and complete rein. I don't care how many security questions you interlard into a Security Check. I just don't care.

And you're going down the line, and you say, "You know, I bet this fellow has an awful lot of Security Check questions on the subject of horses. I bet you he's been stealing horses, and beating horses. I just – cause – because every time he blows his nose he goes 'Hyn-hyn-hyn-hyn-hyn!'" [laughter] Good lead. All right. Do a bunch of little questions about horses. Next time you open up the session on a Form 3, why, just sail into your questions about horses. And get them cleaned up and go on with Form 3, you get the idea. You can throw questions into a Security Check anywhere.

Very ordinarily in handling cases, why, I will dream up a series of Security Check questions that'd exactly fit that case and ask the auditor to run them, and usually there's pay dirt on them that would have made the forty-niners look pale. Well, I'll give you an example. Well, let's say cigarettes are disappearing around upstairs, and – you know, packages of cigarettes are disappearing – and I read an employment Security Check to a staff member. Only
I'm worried about cigarettes. I don't say "Have you stolen anything?" I say, "Well, have you stolen any cigarettes around here?" Get the idea? In other words, Security Check is being given against a series of known circumstances. So those known circumstances which are current, of course, are interlarded into a standard Security Check.

There's one exception to this, and that is Form – HCO WW Security Check Form 7. Because that is so deadly, it mustn't be added to. The Security Checker there is taking the fellow's life in his hands. He can deny him a job or he can suspend him from staff just from failing one question, whether the question is cleared or not. So you start adding a bunch of questions to that thing and, of course, you close the gates in all directions. Because there isn't a human being alive, nor a doll on some other planet, or any human beings on some other planets, that could pass a Security Check from beginning to end without – well, Security Form 3 – without about a 30 percent casualty. There isn't anybody alive who hasn't got about a 30 percent casualty on that thing – you know, flunk that. And if you're just giving the Security Check, you see, de-de-de da da, ba-da, da da, and just flunking just because they had a needle reaction, an instant read reaction, of course you'd flunk everybody. Everybody in the universe would become unemployable at once.

So don't mess up a Form 7, but you might – somebody might pass a Form 7, and then you still aren't sure. Well, if you're still not sure, why you, after they've passed the Form 7, why, you get somebody else to do something about it, or tip off their auditor or something of this sort. You're not sure. But if they didn't really give an instant read on Form 7, Versions A or B. You can't do anything about it. And those are read verbatim, and they are read just that many checks. But of course, that is a Security Check for the purpose of security. And we're talking about Security Checks for the purpose of processing. And purpose of processing, that's another reason. You're much more cognizant with Security Checks from the basis of processing. And that's the viewpoint from which we're looking at it.

Now, if you were doing a Security Check from the standpoint of police work, of course, you would know exactly what questions you were looking for, because you were asking from a set of known conditions. And therefore the Security Check should be dreamed up for whatever activity you're engaged in that way. You're trying to find a thief or something of the sort. Well, ask the questions necessary to find the thief.

There's another rationale about Security Checks that I should say something about; and that is, that rights shouldn't be invaded. Now, of course you get that from the people with all the withholds. But you should have this datum, if somebody ever argues with you consistently and continually on a broad public front, like a meeting or something like that about the Security Checks and invasion of privacy, and so forth. The answer to that is contained in, in an essay I wrote in a bulletin, "Honest People have Rights". That has been so neglected on this planet that only the crook now has rights. Honest people have rights. There is no doubt about that. And that is not part of any police curriculum, rule book or mores on this planet today.

I was very amused. I followed for some weeks newspaper stories about crimes, and I found in each case – I was out in Arizona – and I found in each case the total interrogation was of the person who had been robbed. Fellow had had his car stolen; they'd have him right
down to the police station, being – interrogating him under the lights. It started out a fellow had parked his car momentarily alongside of a road, and a couple of tough guys had come up and beaten him up. And I think, drove off with the car or something like that. And the police came along very shortly afterwards and they shadowed this fellow who'd had his car stolen. They interrogated him, they took him down to the police station, and then thereafter shadowed him, cross-questioned him, had his name in all the papers, until reading the stories you would have been absolutely certain that there was something very wrong with this man that he had committed the crime of being beaten up by two toughs. You see how it gets bent around?

I wanted to see if things were going that way, so I followed the press rather rigorously for a while on just that one theme. Honest people have rights.

Now, give you a consequence of that. Any domestic difficulties there have been at Saint Hill amongst domestic staff, which of course are non-Scientology staff, have been occasioned by people who had fantastic withholds. This was a long time ago. And it worked like this: They immediately got rid of good staff members. You can always count on a staff member who has a great many withholds and who is doing criminal things, getting rid of good staff members. You can always count on it. When you see good staff members disappearing, look for the guy with the withholds. Because they will tell lies about them. They will try to get rid of them. Because they can't bend them down to their level.

And a person, for instance, in some large British company right at the – this instant, you see, who has a criminal background, who has lots of withholds of one character or another, is a terrible liability to the rest of the staff. He's a terrible liability to them.

The situation is not a faint one. They let these boys ram around inside of a – the perfectly good employees, and that sort of thing, and the next thing you know the place is a dog's breakfast. And it isn't that management should be suspicious and mean, but management that is going to protect their working people and their employed people, must use security measures. They must. They must not employ criminals. They just mustn't do it. Because they are victimizing the people they are supposed to be protecting.

Well, I'll give you an idea. I imagine there's a student or two that was given a fancy story around here not too long ago about how horrible Saint Hill was thought of from the region of East Grinstead. You know, the people in East Grinstead are – boarding houses or people in East Grinstead thought that Saint Hill was terrible and Hubbard was terrible and this was an awful place and that sort of thing. Well, this type of story had been current mostly around here, and some staff members had been upset by this. And if you remember the "death lesson" gag – that piece of nonsense. Well, I finally turned a private eye loose in East Grinstead for a period of about ten days to interrogate one and all to find out if there was any slightest libelous or slanderous things taking place, and whether or not any of the parents of those children were still upset, and see if we could get down and find out if there was – anything had developed along in this line.

Well, you know, a private eye who gets on a hot lead (actually they don't have too many clients; their pockets are always wide open for the next five-pound note, you know) and you give a private eye carte blanche and tell him to carry on, and he'll sure carry on as long as
he can find out anything. But after ten days this fellow had been totally overwhelmed. And that was the maximum that he would put in on it, and he quit. He was overwhelmed. Everybody in East Grinstead – he contacted everybody he could think of: trades people and boarding houses and hotels and restaurants and everything you could possibly think of. And all he got was, "Saint Hill? That's a wonderful place. They do very good work. Doctor Hubbard? I know him. He's a fine man. Oh, yes, oh, they're nice people. Yeah, that's fine, Saint Hill is lovely." I can show you the report. It goes on page after page after page. And this poor fellow, you see, looking for slander and libel, you see, is getting overwhelmed by all of this good opinion, and it finally just drove him out. Too much theta on the line.

So we find out that the rumors were coming from just one person who happened to be on staff here. These rumors never came from East Grinstead, they just came from an insecure person. That's what we have to assume from this, don't we? We put it to the total test. That person isn't here now and there are no rumors. Isn't that fascinating?

Yes, but what is the end product of this sort of thing? Well, good staff members are made nervous, upset; they think they're working for a place that is not worthwhile; they think they're liable to be under criticism from this; they get nervous; they don't know quite what's going to be said about them. And all of a sudden they lose a job, something like this. Or, factually, they will be lied about to a point where they're falsely accused and do lose their jobs. But inevitably you will find this kind of thing taking place in the absence of Security Checking.

Honest people have rights. And if I were working – knowing what I know about Security Checks, and so forth, if I were working for some large office of some kind or another which had no security system of any kind whatsoever, I'd sabotage the joint. I mean I'd sabotage it. I'd go to the top and find out why. Why there was no security program. Just as bluntly as that. And fellow would say, "Security program? What are you talking about?"

And I would say, "Well," I'd say, "got a contract with me to hire me, and keep me on the job, and let me do my work, and I can't do work without a security program. Can't be done."

"Well, how is this?"

"Oh, well, people come around all the time and say you've just swindled a quarter of a million pounds, and people drifting around by the water cooler, and giving you all the hot dope about all the wrong contracts that didn't get signed, got thrown out the window. And nobody ever types my letters, and so forth. And you've got some sour apples in here, man, you expect me to associate with this scum? To hell with it." I'd tell him bluntly, "Get them processed. Get a security system in here. You – maybe you got something running. Maybe it might even work out that your ulcers wouldn't be bothering you so much."

It isn't that – it isn't that it's a nice thing to have. You can't work without it. That's as – it's just as blunt as that. I've proven it time and time again. I've just proven it over and over and over. There'll be one, two, three characters who are just so damned aberrated that they should be inside looking out someplace, and they'll just be tearing the place to pieces. And they can have twenty, thirty people just going in a circle, just bum data, bum data, bum data, bum data, alter-is, alter-is, bum data. Oh, phooey! Everything is in a commotion all the time.
Well, all of a sudden you have to wear the wrong hats. All of a sudden you're wearing a police hat or you're wearing the management's hat. And under these circumstances you'll get so uneasy about management that you feel you don't have any direction, so you feel you don't trust the direction, and so you don't have any orders. And whether you're doing right or wrong you don't know. What the hell, nobody can work under those circumstances.

If I want to fight a war, I like to fight a war with machine guns and mortars – honest tools. Not lies. Not lies. I just don't like to fight wars with lies. Or fight wars with covert investigations or fight wars with other backslaps or figure-figures, or intelligence services at work or something like that. I like an honest war. Of course, honest war has gotten discredited. I don't know why it's gotten discredited. I suppose the munitions makers discredited it or something of the sort. But they got in there, too. If two guys want to stand up and kill each other, well, what the hell. Who are you to tell them they can't? Well, that's a point. But just the point of them standing up and killing each other shouldn't enturbulate the rest of the world.

There's all kinds of sides and general descriptions about this sort of thing that rather escape the eye. On a broader look, there's nothing more fun to hunt than submarines. They're the biggest fish there are, and they can shoot back. But some guy down here is hunting – fishing for some perfectly good marlin. I have a little bit better than a fourth dynamic attitude toward these things, you see. And somebody's fishing for marlin, and they take this perfectly good marlin and they yank him around in the sea, and sink pieces of steel into his mouth and they drag him up and knock him over the head so they can mount him on a wall to show how big and tough they were. Well, he was being a good marlin. Well, what the hell? What more can you ask of him? He's being a good marlin, so they punish him. That's silly, you know? It's a deeper significance than you would first glimpse.

Well, what's all this? What's all this about? Well, that seems to be all right, but it's apparently – it's only all right because the marlin can't shoot back. I think it's much more fun to hunt submarines. You can get in real trouble hunting them. You've put up as big a stake as they have, don't you see?

Aircraft, too. I like ducks. I have absolutely just gotten more disgust from duck hunters, you know. My father still tells a wild tale about me being in a duck blind when I was about twelve, and they said "You have the first shot," you know, and I was supposed to put up this big double-barreled shotgun with smokeless powder and projectiles made by Remington under vast scientific process. And a couple of teal were coming in and one came in and suddenly saw me in the blind.

I was just standing there with a gun; I was supposed to be holding it. And this teal was a very pretty teal, and he turned around and… He misinterprets the whole thing. I merely said, "That's a pretty teal," you see.

And he said, "Well," he said, "why don't you shoot?" (The way he tells the story.) "Why didn't you shoot?"

And I said, "Well, he's too pretty."
That isn't what I said at all. I just said he was a pretty teal, you know, meaning "What am I supposed to be doing shooting teal," you know? In the first place, I don't like duck to eat, and that's it. They raise plenty in Long Island that are dedicated to dying for humanity. [laughter]

I admit, this is a little bit too broad a view, don't you see? But airplanes, that's different. The guy's out there to kill you. Well, if you can kill him first, well, fine, that's a game. That's a game of comparable odds. And if you're going in for sports, you notice you always have to have comparable odds and that's it. He loses a body, you lose a body, you know, and the government loses some property. [laughter]

I'm not holding any brief for war, but you notice that war has been just stamped on as being a most terrible activity, you see, and it's been not-ised and not as-ised to such a point now that the little baby in his crib up in London is going to fight the next one. It's not going to be troops any more.

All right. This all comes out from the basis of withholds and individuation. And people get individuated, and they back up further and further and further, and they become more and more individuated, and they become more and more and more individuated. Well, how do they get this way? They get so individuated they're eventually not even themselves. How do they get this way? Just withholds and overts. Overts and they withhold, and overts and they withhold, and overts and they withhold, and eventually you get a guy who can't be a duck. See? He shoots ducks so he can't be a duck. So therefore, that's the reason he should shoot ducks. Proves itself, doesn't it? Self-proving proposition. If you have enough overts on something, you can't be it, then you should shoot it. Silly, isn't it?

So you get this superindividuation. And the more individuation that occurs, the less likely a person is ever to be able to walk out of anywhere. It's just like he's backing up down a long corridor. And the corridor has – is actually not so much a corridor but an endless succession of isolation rooms. And it's further and further and further from communication, and it's further and further and further from being anyplace. And the way he gets there is a very simple route. He has overts which he then withholds. That puts him in room one. Now, while in room one he commits another overt which he then withholds, he goes to room two. You get the idea? Now, while in room two he commits more overts, because now it's the best reason in the world he should commit overts, you see – because he's in room two. And he commits another overt, withholds that, and moves to room three.

And he's just going on, not necessarily apart from the human race, but apart from life. A person to be in some kind of shape must be able to be almost anything. He must be able to be almost anything. And the degree that you can't be things is the degree that you have overts on them that you are withholding. And that is the whole equation. There isn't anything more significant about it than that.

Now, you find out that if you've wrecked enough cars that you find it damn near impossible to be a car. You can drive one and run it off the road and run it into the bus, but you can't be a car. It's as simple as that. Therefore cars seem to go to pieces around you. You get this mysterious thing.
Motorcycles, which are much more touchy, are noted for this. In the motorcycle world, rather, this fact is very well known, terribly well known. You get certain guys [laughter] and the sequence and how they got that way, is overt against a motorcycle, then they can be the motorcycle less, and then more overts against the motorcycle, and they can less be the motorcycle, and they're totally individuated from the motorcycle and they've withdrawn. It gets to a point of where to touch a motorcycle is to have an overt against the motorcycle, and then you – you do that by dumping it in the nearest ditch or something of that sort. [laughter]

All the automobile accidents that are the subject of the diffident interest of road safety committees – all automobile accidents occur just through this mechanism. Because you can stop a person from having automobile accidents by making them run Reach and Withdraw from a car. It proves itself backwards, you see. You just make him run Reach and Withdraw, Reach and Withdraw and Reach and Withdraw and Reach and Withdraw from various parts of a car, and the next thing you know he not only can drive the car but he won't have accidents with the car and the car will run. It's quite interesting.

Person want to cure this sort of thing up – he might feel like he looked like a silly ass doing it, but he ought to just stand alongside of a motorcycle and run Reach and Withdraw on the motorcycle, and then take and drive the motorcycle and actually consciously run SCS on the motorcycle. While riding the motorcycle, you run SCS on the motorcycle. It's a very interesting activity. Do it very slowly, and so on, and the next thing you know you get horrible feelings like you don't want to ride a motorcycle anymore, and you get somatics and you get all kinds of things. Well, what you've actually done is put a motorcycle back under control and the mechanism by which it goes back under control is the overts start blowing. You start blowing overts.

Well, there are many ways to blow overts, but the best way to blow overts is the Security Check. Because the overt only remains bad if it is withheld.

All right. It's an overt to go to war in this society, so-called, that we have today. It's an overt to go to war. So therefore, one must withhold going to war. All kinds of nasty words: "jingoist," "warmonger." Oh, there's a whole dictionary of these things, you see, of anybody who thinks of going to war.

Do you see what's happening? Commit an overt called war, and then they withhold another one. You see, so therefore they commit another one, so therefore they withhold that, and so forth. And they're more and more individuated so therefore they can less and less control war, until you get leaders that get up and bleat from over the radio and microphones to the nation, "I hate war." [laughter] And he's building up a war situation. Year by year, he's just building up a worse and worse war situation. He's not doing anything at all that'd avert war. He's just telling people how much he hates it.

I remember the marines on Guadalcanal had that down, boy, they had that down to a very fine point. They could give that speech from one end to the other. "Eleanor hates war, James hates war," they had it all down, taped. See some guy – all you had to do for a laugh is just start giving this speech; it was the standard humor. The US was involved in one of the nastiest wars it had ever fought under the leadership of somebody who hated war.
Now, it's quite interesting, isn't it? International peace and the destruction of this particular playing field is at stake against this exact mechanism. You see, war is so terrible it cannot be fought. Yeah, what's that make? What's the next immediate step? Fight it! Because it's on automatic. Nobody can stop a war.

You know, you sit back, and after a while you don't know whether to laugh or cry, you know? This Berlin thing, Berlin. All right, so the Russians wanted to fight about Berlin. Of course they'd want the city, and so forth, because somebody's free in it and they can't stand that. And so there's this pawn sitting out there. Well, it was set up by somebody who hated war, so he set Berlin up there so that it would create a war. That was the way they divided Germany, you see. Start another war, inevitably.

And has anybody all through the years that Berlin has been sitting there as a crisis – potential crisis, has he ever gotten a counterpawn? All you'd have to do is say, well, Budapest, actually, or Vienna, or something like that. Start agitating for the Russians to give up Vienna, you see, or – after the Hungarian thing, and so forth. Just start treaty talks at once with them: How far they withdrew beyond the Hungarian border, not how much Hungary they could have, you see, but just a reverse, you see.

"How much of Russia are you going to give up beyond Hungary? Now, that is the point." Well, it's a counterplay, don't you see?

And the Russian says, "Berlin."

And you say, "Well, we're not too interested in Berlin. How about this Hungarian border? This Hungarian border? You see, there's an old treaty, the treaty of Budapest, that was made by the early Huns, which were your people." [laughter] You get the idea? And everybody's just all built up on this idea, and the Russians start worrying, and they say, "Well, better talk about Berlin, you know. Dangerous thing to talk about. What the hell will these people think up next?" [laughter] Just counterplays.

Has anybody bothered to pick up a pawn? No. So we must decide then that they are heading for war. They're not playing the game, so the game is going to occur. And it won't be a game. Interesting viewpoint.

But that's individuation from a subject which then no longer becomes controlled.

And that is true in all life. That is true in all life. When a person totally individuates, he can no longer control anything. A good garbageman sure has to be able to be garbage, let me tell you, man. But the idea of being able to be garbage immediately wipes out any possibility of his ever becoming garbage. Isn't that interesting?

Now, way to make little kids have accidents is just keep telling them they mustn't have accidents. Simple. Simple mechanism. Just say, don't touch this, don't touch that, don't touch something else. What would happen to a pc if you stood around saying, "All right now, we're going to run a little process on you. Now, stand in the middle of the room. Good enough. Now, don't touch that wall, and don't touch the ceiling, and don't touch the floor..." What's going to happen? Well, yet parents run this on little kids all the time and they fall down, bark their shins and that sort of thing.
What's very interesting is our kids around here don't get much of this run on them, and, well, they haven't to date had very many accidents. They don't have the usual childhood accidents, and so forth. But I see people worrying about them every once in a while. Little Arthur or something will be walking along a high wall, you see, with disaster on both sides of him, and I've seen somebody go "Ughhh," you know, like that. Why suggest it to him? He doesn't think he's going to fall off. He won't. He doesn't either.

So there's the basis of individuation. The basis of individuation. If you're going to make beer, you've got to be able to be beer, you know? All right, you've got overt's on beer and withholds on the subject of beer, why, you of course aren't going to make any good beer. Now, another mechanism takes place – to give you a broad view of this; although this sounds very chatty, Security Checks are a very vital thing to understand in their full panoply – and that is, that after you have gotten to the end of the corridor, room one, room two, room three, room four, room five – what do you know? You can't stay out of the place you left. It is impossible. Having backed up to the end of the corridor, you now find yourself at the entrance to the corridor but unable to leave.

In other words, you snap terminals and obsessively become the thing of which you have overt's against. And that is what is a valence closure. And as a result, the individual gets stuck in various things, obsessed with various things, you know?

Now, you take one of these dear old ladies that's protecting cats. Brother, man, I've seen them around, and after they've talked to me about... Well, you got to realize the reality of a cat. In the first place, to have much to do with cats you've got to know cats. And cats are a package of a certain I'm – series of I-am-supposed-to's. And these are neither bad nor good, they're just the I'm-supposed-to's of a cat. And cats have a whale of a time playing with half-dead mice, and half-dead birds, and they kill certain things (they're supposed to), and they have certain habits which are not necessarily very endearing habits at all.

And on the other hand, they have certain admirable qualities, and so on. And this is a cat. And it isn't a "Poor dear little pussy." [laughter]

Well, how does a cat's I'm-supposed-to's suddenly become this poor abused little thing which must be superprotected from life. How does it get that way? Well, the person who did this must have been hanging cats, shooting cats, beating cats, and then not telling anybody about cats. And then as a child in some life, you see, he strangled cats as a pastime and then kept saying that it was done by the boy next door, don't you see? Had to be withholds on this thing every time. And we just keep going like this, and after a while, why, "De poor dear little pussy," you know. And you look at this lady who's telling you that, you notice the way she's wearing her hair, and you look her over. She won't buy a fur coat made of anything but cat fur. But it mustn't be of cat fur, you see, so therefore it's even synthetic cat fur, but it's very con – involved.

But what she has done is back up the whole corridor, don't you see, and then found herself in nothing but a cat. See, she – you can only get only so far, and then it snaps back. That is the mechanism which actually takes place, and that is a very general mechanism of life.
The police officer who is an honest cop and resists criminals and then gets withholds – the withhold is an absolute necessity to individuation. And he gets overts on criminals and then withholds and then goes a little bit wrong and withholds that. And life after life, why, this thing goes, and next thing you know you've got a criminal police officer. And in the next life or two you'll find him being a thoroughgoing criminal. See? He – overts on criminals and he becomes a criminal. That's the mechanism.

You look at some fellow who is a criminal, trace it back to a time he was a police officer and you won't always be wrong. You won't always be right, but you won't always be wrong either. But it's a cop who went crooked by starting to withhold. He's been withholding. And of course that's one of the best things police forces do.

I've been very hard on cops in this particular lecture and I could be accused then of having something against cops. But I don't have what I – people usually have against cops. I am just running a supposed-to-be, a bit of an ought-to-be, on a cop. I think in a society that has any order to it, this kind of a situation should exist: that the people who are being what they are being should be what they are being, you know? That's an awfully innocently crudely look at things, you know? If the fellow's the mayor of the town, he ought to be the mayor of the town and he ought to be a mayor of a town, see. You shouldn't have police who are criminals, you see? All kinds of weird mishmashes. I believe in the simplicity and purity of it all. All I'm saying is I'm against pretense.

But anyway, where you have a pc who is loaded with withholds on a Security Check, you have a pc who is very individuated. Got the idea? So therefore you have somebody who can't be. And you're trying to find valences. And of course you can't find valences easily on somebody who can't be. But you can pick out and find the fixed valence the person is in. Because it's been this mechanism which has led up to his becoming that valence.

So you could find a person's terminal without completing his Security Check. But you will find that where a person's individuation – forced on him, or actual and so on, to such a great degree that he's loaded with withholds – you'll find he's very hard to get into session. He ARC breaks, he gets very upset in sessions, and so forth. Well, he can't be a preclear.

Well, now there are two routes by which he could approach this point of beingness. You find it in that he's critical of the auditor. This means he has withholds. It also – that also means then that he is having beingness trouble. And he can't be this thing called a preclear. And you have your first rudiments process on that, which I choose – I believe you have by now, which is the Shakespearian approach: "To be or not to be. That is the question." What's he willing to be and what he'd rather not be.

Now, you'll find out that will walk forward but if you run much of that, two things will occur. One of them beneficial and one of them harmful. The first of them is that it will soften him up on a Security Check. You'll find out all of a sudden he'll be able to do a Security Check better if you run that process, see. Because beingness and withholds, these things are counteropposed and one tends to solve the other, see. All right.

And the not-so-beneficial part of it is, is of course it walks him into his valence chain without the valence chain being identified. You don't know that this fellow is being a beer-maker. You don't know that he's – that is his terminal. But because you've run an awful lot of
this process, you have walked him into the engrams on that chain. And that process walks people into engrams. So don't make any mistake about it and be alert. That isn't any reason why you shouldn't use it. But you can get to a point of running where the person is not ready to run an engram. He's not ready to run the engram. You haven't got his terminal; you haven't done any Prehav runs; it's not sorted out at all. Yet there's your pc sitting in an engram.

Well, at the moment, call it one of the risks of the business. Because man, you're going to turn on some fancy somatics if you don't watch it. Thing to remember is, the somatic that the pc has, is where he is on the track, and it is only at that place on the track, and won't release from any other place. So you can walk him away from that place on the track, which keys it out, or you can walk him into that place on the track and as-is it. And these are the two things, the only two things, that processes do with regard to somatics. They either walk him away from it by getting him closer to PT and in other channels, or they walk him into it, where he as-ises it. And of course of the two there's no choice. The second one is easily the best solution.

Now, withholds will very often soften up and knock out present time somatics by walking the person away from the area, and maybe that's a good thing, see? The person could be tightly into an engram – in life, you see. The engram is just keyed in a hundred percent and there he is in life, in an engram. So that means he has very harsh somatics. He's got arthritis. He's got what you commonly call psychosomatic illness of some kind or another. Well, he's right in an engram.

All right, well you can walk him out of that engram, by moving him off so that you can then, when you've found his terminal, move him back into the engram. You got the idea? You might say the fellow's so close to it he can't see it. Well, you couldn't see it either and the possibilities of getting him there – of course, you find his goal and find his terminal and then run him for a while on the Prehav Scale, you'll find him landed in that section of the track, that's for sure.

But he might be so tightly in that section of the track that he couldn't even put his attention on the auditing session. See, that would be an interesting state, wouldn't it? I mean you'd find a pc then who's unauditable. Well, let me tell you the best approach to this, until others are found, the best approach to this is simply a Security Check.

Now, you can even run a Security Check on the basis of the chronic somatic that is making the person unauditable. Person's got so much eye trouble that you can't possibly – well, you just, see, all he does is talk about these eyes. And it's just a chronic present time problem. He talks about eyes and he talks about eyes and – his eyes. And you run into it, and you try to run a session and you run into eyes, and so on.

Well, that's boring. Because the truth of the matter is you've got to have his goal, and you've got to have his terminal, and you've got to run him on the Prehav Scale and then the engram will eventually turn up where his eyes are loused up. See, it's one, two, three. That's the way the thing stacks. And there he is sitting with bad eyes with a present time problem. And it's a present time problem so his case is not going to make any progress, and you can't find anything because he's got a present time problem. You see the knotty mess that this makes, see. You can't get it because he's got it.
And a very excellent way of getting at this and making him auditable, is to security check him. And you give him Security Checks and then he walks off from all this because you've knocked out this obsessive individuation, see. And he can walk off from the track then to where his eyes are being butchered and he'll tell you. Don't be taken in by this. He'll say, "Oh, my eyes are cured. They're well. I mean I've never been so well before in my life. Everything is fine, and so forth." Well, take it with a grain of salt. Pat yourself on the back for having temporarily relieved it.

Don't bother to tell him that he's not going to experience permanent this and that. Maybe it never will get that good or that bad again. Nobody – who knows? But for sure, when you get his goal, and you get his terminal, and you run him on the Prehav Scale, and you're running him on the track, why, one fine day you're going to do an assessment of the engrams he's run into, and there he is with those red-hot pokers in both eyes. And the somatics come off right there in that exact incident and that is the end of it. You see?

So up to that time you've done an assist, an alleviation. Which means you've walked him away from the valence in which he was obsessively stuck. But don't kid yourself that you cured him, because you haven't. And that would be the history of all chronic somatics we've run into in Dianetics and Scientology. They key out, they key in, they key out, they key in. And we sweat ourselves to death keying them out. And then after a while they key in. And then sometimes we're lucky and we key them out and they stay out. Marvelous. Now, somebody's going to get ahold of that person one fine day, is going to find his goal and his terminal. And even before he has a chance to do a Prehav run or anything else, bang! All the somatics around again in a thud. Disheartening, huh?

Well, the thing to do if that kind of thing happens, Security Check. Knock out the individuation and you'll knock out the chronic stuck in the engram. Why? Because he's backed up to the end of the corridor until he is at the front of the corridor, you see? Well, if you can at least get him to the back of the corridor and up – halfway up the corridor again, toward it again, see, you can do it with a Security Check. And he can be audited halfway back up the corridor again. You got the idea?

Of course, he's always got the chronic somatic on the chain of the valence which will be his terminal. That's why you must always have it correct. That's why you must always have a correct goal and correct terminal. Because there's only one valence chain in which he's stuck. And that is the way the cookie crumbles.

So the use of a Security Check is what it is, and don't be bemused into thinking a Security Check is more so. By rendering tremendous numbers of Security Checks, of course, you put the person into better communication; of course, you put the person into feeling better about life; yes, he isn't going to get that bad again; he's going to feel good about a lot of other things, and that sort of thing, but basically you've made him auditable. Because after you've gone all the way around, give him the Security Check, straightened him all out; you find his goal; you find his terminal; run it on the Prehav Scale; assess the engrams that he has run into where he was in valence; you run one of those engrams; and bang, you run right back into the chronic somatic he was running from. Only now it's on full and will run out.
So you get the circuitous routes here by which you can take to alleviate chronic somatics or banish chronic somatics. And you sometimes have to alleviate chronic somatics in order to get the case into auditing condition so that you can banish a chronic somatic. Now, does that make more sense?

We have all these years of experience behind us about all the various routes, and I'm talking to you now about a route, and throwing it into your lap and saying, "Well, you better be good at these things."

Now, I could have told you a great deal about how to do a Security Check. But there have been lectures on that sort of thing, you've got textbooks on it, you've got bulletins on it. What I'm trying to tell you today is simply why you should do a Security Check, what a Security Check will produce, what to expect of a Security Check, and, more or less, its general use in auditing.

I don't think you could do the type of auditing you're doing smoothly now without Security Checks. I think it'd be impossible. So the Security Check is very, very valuable. But don't overrate it, and don't underrate it. And don't, for heaven's sakes, go riding a hobbyhorse that if everybody in God's green earth confessed, it would be a paradise. I think it'd be a mess.

The end product of no withholds is good communication. The end product of no withholds is not Clear. It's just good communication.

So you use Security Check to set somebody up for auditing. Person's difficult to audit, think of Security Checks. That's one of your best ways out. Trying to resolve all the present time problems and all the rudiments of the pc and all of that sort of thing and going on over this is absolutely necessary. You've got to do this. But there's one positive tool that does do this. We have tested some other tools and they're nowhere near as positive as Security Checks. So that is its value.

A Security Check well done keeps rudiments in. A Security Check badly done and rudiments will be consistently out. The Security Check can be tailored to represent the area of the person's present time problem so as to key it out so that you can get him back down and actually get at the source of what his difficulty is.

Those are its uses, and I hope you will find what I've told you of some value.

Thank you.
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A lecture given on 14 September 1961

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The whole thing is flanked by Security Checks. Everything about it: Running engrams, general Prehav run, terminal checking, goals checking – just to run it backwards. That's all flanked by Security Checks.
What ratio of Security Check and so forth? Well, the more difficult it was to get a pc in-session, the more I'd concentrate on Security Check. See, the more – that's a proportionate amount. If the pc is difficult to get into session, or difficult to keep in-session, I would just come down on that Security Check with spiked boots, because that's where it lies. That's where you're going to get the fastest release of anything.

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

Now, let's look it over. What's made this – what's made this activity possible? We were steered widely out of course by auditors taking forever to assess, or auditors taking no time at all to assess. This is – lecture is on assessment, Goals Terminal Assessment. I'm just following the routine down. Yesterday I took up Security Checks. Today, why, I'll take up Goals and Terminal Assessments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Don't let me ever hear you say, now, any of you, "Well, if I were just Ron I could get this done in a hurry." You just say instead, "Well now, if I acted like I knew my business well enough, I would get this done in a hurry." Okay? Because look, I've got no altitude with some of the Pullman car porters I've audited. They don't know me from Adam. You know? Lots of the people I've audited -- they never heard of me, they never heard of Scientology, they never -- nothing. Yet they respond immediately and at once. Bang! Well, why? Why? Well, because I don't fumble. That's about the only thing you can say about it.

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

This R-factor is such a tremendous factor and is so little appreciated and so little understood, that a person's auditing will be incomprehensible to him in that it's apparently good with one pc -- or on one day and not good on another pc, or on another day with the same pc. You see, it's his auditing skill is -- goes over the roly coaster. Well, that's because his R goes over the roly coaster; his reality on the subject goes over the roly coaster. A pc can always tell. And so forth.
Well, I gave a session last night, if the pc doesn't mind my remarking on it. And the pc was at once struck with the fact that we were not going along as smoothly as we had the session before. Well, there's no question about the fact that the R was out. But it was out between me and the session. It wasn't out with – much with the pc, it was out between me and the session.

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

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

"Well I see blackness."

"What's going on?"

"Nothing."

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

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

Pc says, "What's happening?"

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

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

You say, "What are you looking at?"

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

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

"What do you see?"

"Nothing. Blackness."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Ah, well, put it that way, yes."
See, you'd never get around to doing a Goals Assessment. Hm-hm-hm-hm. Smart, huh?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Well, what's needle-flattened? Well, when you don't – when you ask the question again, do you get a needle reaction? You don't get a needle reaction, so you don't ask the question again. Now, that's fairly simple, isn't it? Nothing much to that.
So, let's take a look at this and realize that the first and foremost necessity is a competent auditor, who does know what he's doing and a pc who is in-session with that auditor, even though he might not be in-session with some other auditor. That's your second requirement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

"Well, I guess uh – most anybody would blow up a bank."

"Oh, anybody? Good, I'll write that one." [laughter] "Uh – uh – who – who'd be capable of blowing up a bank?"

"Well, my mother would be."

"Ah! Your mother. Good. That's it." [laughter]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Who would rob the bank?"

"The bank president."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Myself."

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

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

Now, you mustn't omit – you mustn't omit – things as terminals. Because to a pc here and there, you're going to find a spacecraft is more real than a spaceman. And although we have always so far broken the what over to a who – you know, found spacecraft and it wound up to be a spaceman – I imagine from just that indicator that sooner or later there's going to be a what that doesn't break down to a who. It's going to be the First National Bank and that is it. It isn't any who robbing anything, it's the First National Bank, see. That's it. That's the goal – terminal. It's a what. We've found enough of them.
Well, here's a common sort of occurrence on the track. Fellow is riding around, minding his own business in a spaceship – only blowing up planets and doing other minor things – and hardly troubling anybody, you see, hardly at all. And terrific numbers of overts, you see? And he smashes up a spacecraft 1, spacecraft 2, spacecraft 3, spacecraft 4, spacecraft 5, then starts putting spacecraft 6 in danger, sort of impulsively and it starts getting chipped up. And the next thing you know, this fellow will not assess as a who. This fellow will assess as a spacecraft. Good enough. If you can't make it come out to a who, well it's obviously – that's it.

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

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

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

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

"Uh – I can't think of any."

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

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

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

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

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

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

But I've had four or five auditors sitting behind me while I was doing a Goals Assessment on somebody, passing me notes. "It's his wife," you know. "It's his – it's his wife." [laughter] This isn't distractive at all to the pc, you see. [whispers] "It's his wife." [laughter] They don't realize that it's just because I'm trying to hold the pc in-session that I don't turn around to them and say very impolitely, "Why don't you shut up! If it's his wife, it's his wife. And if it isn't his wife, it isn't his wife. And that is all there is to it!"
Now, the auditor's phrasing – the auditor's phrasing of the goal won't run, much less assess. It won't run. It's got to be the pc's phrasing of the goal. So you start feeding him leads – oh, wow! See, you've just opened up the doors to all sorts of errors. He's got to reject the auditor. He can't rephrase it himself, you see. So just knock off the prompting and you will be a very much happier auditor. You know what's wrong with the pc. The pc is always looking like this, you know? Always looking like this. And he says, "Mmmmmmmm. Mmmmmm. Mmmm. "You know, he always does. You say, "He must be a robot." It's very obvious he's a robot. Very, very, very obvious.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, there is no routine designed that does solely a Goals Assessment. I thought of designing one time – and I said, "Oh God, that's too" ...something or other – a special Model Session, you see, for a Goals Assessment. I thought afterwards, "Oh, that's going too far, man. Another Model Session?" and that sort of thing. You don't have to have one. But you certainly have to keep up a professional demeanor and you have to be very crisp and you mustn't let it down and you must carry it forward competently or the goal will disappear. And later on when you get the terminal, it'll disappear. Anything is liable to happen in this line.
So, you take your E-Meter and you put the pc on it. And you read things off in a very businesslike fashion. You acknowledge every time, whether the pc speaks or not. It is not necessary to have the pc say one single word while you're reading a Goals or Terminals list back to them, but always acknowledge as though the pc has spoken. Always acknowledge. You say, "To rob the First National Bank," he says absolutely nothing. You say, "Thank you."

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

Now, for a pc to be required to speak or answer up, or say very much while you're reading a list like this, is quite distractive. And you think the pc may not be in-session. So you may be trying much too eagerly to get the pc to look like a pc while you're reading this list. And it's not necessary at all. All he does is sit there on total irresponsibility, holding the cans. That's enough.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Bank pres – " read.

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

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

Now, if you've gone all the way through a terminals list and you suspect there may be some more terminals, why, by all means get some more terminals onto the list. But this itself can be a defeated activity. When you start getting up to a hundred or two terminals, this just starts getting to be nonsense. Somebody has missed. I'd go back and I would take the whole group that I had gotten, before I noticed the pc was having trouble giving them to me – I'd take the earlier group – and then I would cover that one with the rudiments in. I would get the rudiments thoroughly in and then I would go over it. And I would pick the terminal out of it.
Now, a person's terminal will only bury if the rudiments on the sessions in which it
was found were out. That's the only thing that will bury it. You clean up the sessions, it'll re-
appear. And therefore, you're interested in getting the thing checked, basically to find out if it
still reads elsewhere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And he'll come back with a large sheaf of paper and he sometimes has a hundred goals
on it. And then you yourself look at the meter and ask if he's got any more on this subject, that
subject or the next subject, you see? And you've made sure that he doesn't have any ARC
breaks on this, and you just drain down the needle reaction. And you get a few more that he
might not have mentioned or might have been too reticent to tell somebody about, or some-
thing like this. And then that's about it. Just consider, well, you've got the list. All right. That's
fine.
Now, your reading of that list can be done by repeater technique, going over and over and over, which is the common, most accepted way of doing it but which can wind up some pcs in difficulty. Or just reading the list over and over and every time you get an instant reaction from a goal you mark that it's still in. And you no longer get an instant reaction on another goal and you consider it's out. And you just scratch goals and check goals and scratch goals and check goals. And that's all you do.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fellow says, "I did."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If you want to get a good auditor reality on this sometime, pick a terminal at random on a pc. You know, you pick a terminal. You know? You make up your mind now that this person looks like a robot. So you say, "That's fine. Now, we're going to run 'a robot' on the Prehav Scale. All right. Now we're going to do an assessment on a robot. "Would a robot be serene?" and here we go, see – whichever way you assessed it. "Would a robot have faith?" [laughs, laughter] Go up the list very nicely, do a proper assessment; you will find that the robot will assess by elimination. Yes, the robot does have a level. That's fine. Now we're going to run this level.

Note carefully, however, how many levels a robot was alive on the Prehav Scale. Note that carefully and mark it down, an arithmetical number. There were 5 levels live on the Prehav Scale when we assessed a robot. There are the pencil dots that say which levels were alive. There were 5.
Now we're going to run it. And we give it a 2½-hour enthusiastic run with all the rudiments in and everything going along just perfect, you see, and the auditing command perfect – five-leg bracket; everything is fine.

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

Robot. Good. And we're going to run it for 2½, 3, 4 hours. Oh, the preclear will be getting gains. Pc will be feeling much better. Odd somatics, but very much better. Not quite sure, but probably all right. (Confidence in the auditor, you see.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And the fellow finally says, "Well, yeah. Yeah. There's – yeah. Oh yes! I had a goal once. It was back in Arslycus and that was to bash the foreman in the head."

"All right." And you check it and it stays in and you say, "All right. Now, let's find a terminal for it."

"Foreman." You didn't make it. Disappeared.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.
Thank you. How you doing today, huh?

_Audience:_ Good.

Okay. Now, the state of affairs today is that you have now decided that there was something you needed to know about Scientology, and questions are in order. The date is what? The 19th, or....

_Audience member:_ The 19th of September.

19 September AD 11. All right. And I am in the way of questions. Questions. One, two... Yes.

_Audience member:_ How much of an Assessment by Elimination do you do on the Prehav Scale?

How much of an Assessment by Elimination do you do on a Prehav Scale? This became a burning question back in July. So burning that there is at least one person who has scars. You do a repeater technique on the Prehav Scale and you have a pc in more trouble than could ordinarily be gotten into by the Income Tax Bureau. Now, that's a lot of trouble.

Now, he's all messed up. You know, all of the data we have actually answers these questions from away back. If you knew the progress of data, and your subjective reality and your validity of the data's good, you can work these things out, normally. But there's an old rule from about 1950 that you can ask an auditing question two or three times. You can ask it two or three times and then skip it. You can do it. Three, well, that's borderline. Two, sometimes you wish you hadn't. One, certainly. One, always.

Now, when you're asking these questions on an assessment on the Prehav Scale, you're running straight up against this old rule. How often can you repeat a level _without running a process_? Now, that is the question which leaps up there. How often can you read a level to the pc without _then_ being guilty of auditing him? Do you understand?

Now, if you do a repeater technique or you do too many readings of levels, you of course have audited the whole Prehav Scale on the preclear and of course he's in a mess. So, the governing factor is a simple one: is how do you get an accurate assessment on the Prehav Scale without actually auditing the Prehav Scale on the preclear? Now, that is the question.
And the way you do it is a very precise way. And this is the way I do it, and I have always
gotten away with it and – auditing, you know, is what you get away with – and I've never had
any difficulty with this. But other approaches have brought about difficulty, uniformly and
routinely, have brought about difficulty, and therefore, this is the one I recommend which is
probably the first one and the earliest one of these things. I have great confidence in this
method of assessment.

You take the whole Prehav Scale, the Primary Scale, and you start at the bottom of the
scale, the original one. I – by the way, I will give you the very, very original one just to start
off with. This is not the one, but this is the way I used to do it. And I never got in trouble with
this one either. I'll give you the earliest, shall I? I just remembered there was another one.

You started at the bottom of the scale and you read up scale to the pc until you got a
rising needle, and then you quit, and went back down the scale again. And you just took the
one which reacted the most going up and reacted the most coming back, and if it was the
same level, why, you had it made. And if that wasn't it, then you separated out with just a
brief read of the one, read of the other one, found out which was the most, and that's the one
you took. That is the original, by the way. I remember that. That was Johannesburg.

All right. Now, auditors had trouble with that one, and when the Prehav Scale became
very expanded, we ran into the first method of assessment for the new, expanded Prehav
Scale – Primary Levels. And that's – this is the proper one. And this is the one I'm going to
give you now, and this is the way you do it. Now, you won't get into any trouble if you master
this particular method of doing it.

You start at the bottom, and you just read the levels up the scale all the way to the top.
And wherever you get a needle reaction, an instant reaction of the E-Meter needle, you make
a dot at that level.

Now, in view of the fact that you're going to use the mimeographed sheet several
times, sometimes you make crosses, sometimes you make circles, sometimes you make dots,
you know. But use one symbol for one assessment so you'll be able to differentiate it. And
every time you get a reaction just on one read, you put down your symbol. And when you've
gotten all the way to the top, you will find that you have gotten several levels reacting. Sev-
eral levels reacted.

Now, this has an added advantage and at this time you could count and find out how
many levels were active on this preclear the last time you assessed him for a level. And if you
now have more, you know that you're in trouble. And you had better assess the goal and as-
sess the terminal and check these things out. And particularly the terminal because you may
not have a proper Terminal Assessment. You may not have a proper Goals Assessment. So
that is a very close watch you have to keep, the first three or four assessments on the Prehav
Scale, because that tells you whether or not your Goals or Terminals Assessment was right.
That's the way you check it out. That's aside from exactly how you do it routinely, assuming
you had the proper one.

You have now reached the top. Now, you go back down and you don't hit every level
of the Prehav Scale. You don't read it all the way back down from the top. You simply read
those levels that you made a mark on. And you read those on down to the bottom.
And now you go back up, and now you only read those that have two marks after them. And at that time, unless your rudiments are out, and everything is nutty and going wrong, you've got your level. There's only one reacting. There will only be one that accumulates three. There'd be something quite wrong if you got three or four accumulating three. But it sometimes happens that on the last read up, you will get two levels that have three marks after them.

Now, what you do is read – do the same system. You read the one, you read the other one. And you'll notice one dropped out. And it'll drop out right now. And when I say read it, I mean just repeat it once to the pc. Now, there is a complete assessment on a Prehav Scale. The length of time which this takes is very, very short. There is practically no time involved in it at all. This actually is a totality of about six or seven minutes at the absolute outside. And somebody that tells me they are taking fifteen minutes to assess on the Prehav Scale, I know they are doing something wrong.

And if somebody that takes a session to assess on the Prehav Scale, boy, I know they're wrong. I have no doubt about that.

But let me now tell you the numerous errors which auditors make in doing this. Number one, they expect the preclear to answer, so they wait after every read, see? And they say this, "Would a king have faith?" Now, they wait for the preclear to answer and the preclear has nothing to do with the assessment. We care not for the preclear's opinions of assessments. We care not for the preclear's opinions of the rightness and wrongness of anything. Assessments, whether they're goals, terminals or level, are totally between the auditor and the E-Meter. They are not anything to do – the preclear had nothing to do with this. He might as well be on a long distance lead and in the next county. That's just if you just figure it just to that degree. You do not have to be in good communication with him. Nothing has to be there. You just read them. And you get an instant reaction. He does not have to say anything. You don't tell him to say anything. You don't ask him for his opinion. Nothing These are all methods of wasting time. How fast can you read these things? You can read these things almost as fast as you can talk.

How fast can you read the scale from the bottom to the top? Without any pauses. The funny part of it is that you would get the same reading because it's only going to require a tenth of a second for that level to react. If it's going to react, it's going to react and that is it. And if you were very, very sharp and you were very close, you could actually catch the reaction while catching your breath to say the next word. See, that's how close together that thing could be. But that's an extremity, and that looks like it's too much strain, and it isn't a good auditor presence to do that, so you rather easily read them, you see.

That's the first and foremost. They expect the pc to say something, and the pc shouldn't say anything. To hell with it. I mean that's nonsense.

Now, the next error which they make is to get a one-way flow started, you see? "Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)? Would a king (blank)?"

Now, what are they doing They got a one-way flow, and halfway up the scale they're going to get a stuck. A very tricky way of doing this, and by the way this is just trickiness and
this is not a pat method of doing it – this is not a fixed method, this little thing I'm about to give you here which is just a way to do it – is you read "Would a king (blank)? Would you – a king?" "Would a king (blank)? Would you – a king?" You got the idea? "Would you have faith in a king?" You see, for one level. So it's back and forth, back and forth, so you got a two-way flow established as you go up the thing. You got the idea? So you don't get him on a stuck flow anywhere.

In other words, pc to the terminal, terminal to the pc, pc to the terminal, terminal to the pc. You see, you just – you get how that is?

Somebody got a Prehav Scale? I'll show you what I mean. There will be no slightest doubt. I felt a little doubt, a little dark cloud of doubt went up over your heads at that moment.

All right. "Would a king have faith in you?" You see, that's one flow. King to you. "What would you cause a king?" Bum auditing command. "Would a king prevent you from knowing? How would you have no effect on a king?" See? "How could a king affect you? Would you run an obsessive can't-have on a king? Would a king make something of you? How would you create a king?" Get the flip-flop, back and forth? All right, that prevents a stuck flow from happening as you assess this thing. Using "how," you will find uniformly as you do this, is much more easily done.

Now, I'll give you how I would actually ask the pc these things. I would ask a pc these things. I would have him on the meter. Let me give you the next error. The next error is to be looking at the pc or the list when you're saying the word. Because an instant reaction occurs before you can shift your eyes from the list or the pc back to the meter. So you have a little drill which you should develop in yourselves that runs like this.

You look at the list to get the level. You look at the meter and you say the list. You speak while looking at the meter. Got that? Now, actually that's just a little bit tricky. You'll find – some of you will find that's just a little bit tricky to do at the first few trials, and you'll find it sort of seems odd to you. See? You're not reading the paper. You're apparently reading the meter and you've actually had to put the list over here on the meter. You know? It's like this.

All right. I'll give you an example of it. We've got to form this up in our minds, you see. "Would you have faith in a king?" See? But actually you don't do it that way. You look at the list. You say, "Would you have faith in a king?" "Thank you." ... "What would a king cause?" "Thank you." ... "How would you prevent a king knowing?" "Thank you." Got the idea? Paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Got the idea?

Now, reading it at about that speed permits the pc to keep up with you – so he analytically can keep up with you. His reactive mind is keeping up with you the whole way. You see that? That's just about that speed. You just go paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Paper, meter, pc. Read it off the paper mentally, say it while looking at the meter, and then look at and acknowledge the pc, and then come back with your pencil and make the dot. So you've made a little circle each time you do this. A little circle. And you keep doing that, and all of a sudden it gets very natural. There's nothing much to it.
Now, I punch these things. All right. "Would you have faith in a king" "Thank you." "What would a king cause?" "Thank you." Got the idea? Cause. Well, we don't care about kings. When you're assessing something, hit it with your voice.

Now, that's a little circular trick on how to do an assessment. When you get that thing down, grooved totally, you find out your assessments become much more positive and reliable. Why? Well, you're doing it on a positive, reliable basis.

Of course, we don't expect anybody in this course to look at the meter fixedly for quite some time. Be sure you look at the meter for some time first. It makes the meter calmer. [laughter] And if you look at the meter – you look at the meter, and then you look at the list and you'd say, "Well, have you got faith?" ... [laughter]

"Well, wasn't any reaction on that, was there?"

Just avoid the E-Meter. Never confront the E-Meter and you'll have messy auditing the whole way.

Now, it's very easy for a human being to confront a human being. They're fixated on bodies anyhow, so they all too often will be fixated on a body. And they all too often get their TR 0 about half flat and it leads them into a fix, you see? And there they are auditing TR 0, you see, while they're doing an assessment. And actually, any Scientologist can be knocked totally out of session by suddenly noticing that at no time has the auditor ever looked at the meter while he was asking the question. And he immediately – his own training gets in his road. He doesn't like to duplicate a bad auditing activity, so he's liable to call the auditor's attention to the fact. "You didn't look at the meter. How do you know whether that is right or wrong?" Now, of course, this has never happened in this unit. [laughter] But you see how that would go.

All right. Now, that's about all there is to know about one of these assessments. Anything else about one of these assessments is pure "additity." And some people do have an addectivity – an addictivity to additity. [laughter] Additity, that's right. So don't do it. Don't put a lot of other things on this assessment because that is the way you do one, and your assessment will always be right.

By the way, on general assessments of goals and terminals, do you realize that Mary Sue catches you out something on the order of 50 percent of the time? Wrong goal. Wrong terminal. Did you realize that was happening? That's something to be worried about because there's only one way you can louse up a pc and that's to have the wrong goal and the wrong terminal.

Everything is a negative gain. Not only is all auditing from that point wasted, but it actually worsens the pc to audit the wrong terminal. Okay?

So you got to be sharp on this. You've got to be very good on this. And you've got to be very good. You've got to know how to get the right goal. You've got to know how to get the right terminal. You've got to know whether or not they're right. And you've got to know what to do when you find out they're wrong.
Now, those things are paramount in importance. They're paramount. I just couldn't emphasize them enough. This you must learn how to do here if you learn nothing else. For heaven's sake, learn how to assess. And as I say, Mary Sue is finding you out about 50 percent of the time. That's too many, man, that's too much. And has never found a perfect set of rudiments, I don't think, to date. And never found all rudiments in on the pc to date when checking and doing a cross-check on a terminal. That's a commentary. It's not a good one.

So get all of your rudiments in, keep them in. And after you have found the person's goal, run your end rudiments, check the person's goal before you get somebody else to check it. Same way with terminals. Do identically the same thing with terminals. And you won't be making so many misses.

It's quite ordinary for somebody's (quote) "goal to be found" (unquote) or "terminal to be found" (unquote), and then come down to get it checked, and for two or one rudiment to be out; the goal or the terminal, whatever's being found, not just slightly incorrect but totally incorrect. And for the goal or terminal to be found which had already been null – (quote) (unquote) "null" – that was just liver than a pistol. But there is something else that is happening which is of considerable interest and that is you are not inquisitive enough. You are not inquisitive enough. You must be more inquisitive. You are afraid of ARC breaking the pc by asking the pc enough questions. That tendency is everywhere manifest. You must ask the pc more questions. Now, I'll give you an example.

A student's goal and terminal had caused a week or so of auditing, fruitless auditing – search, search, search, search, search, search – and Mary Sue checked it out only to find that a previous auditor had ARC broke the goal so that it was not now registering. And the second that the ARC break was taken off, that goal went liver than a pistol, and it took her only in a matter of maybe an hour or an hour and a quarter to do the whole job. Now, that meant that the auditor, who just found that goal and terminal, that meant that that person was not at all inquisitive. Had spent a whole week grinding on a goals list without ever asking the pc, "How did your last Goals Assessment go? Did anything peculiar happen in your last Goals Assessment? How do you feel on your last auditor's attempt to find your goal?" No question of that sort was asked. But a whole week an auditor could sit there and try to find a goal and terminal, knowing from the auditor reports which were all in the folder that the pc had been assessed previously for goal and terminal unsuccessfully.

Ah, but the auditor before that had found the goal, and the pc had blown session instantly saying, "No, no, I don't want that goal. I want nothing to do with it at all," or some paraphrase thereof. And apparently this auditor must have said, "Well, she doesn't want anything to do with that so it must not be her goal," and went on with the remaining list. And then another auditor came along and assessed for a week without ever discovering this other incident. All you have to do is ask questions and your E-Meters react.

Now, there's another thing about assessment that you must know – all of this is slightly a prelude to it – and that is that when a pc has been badly audited on levels but the right terminal, you have to take off the auditing in order to get any assessment at all. It's part of getting the rudiments in.
So before you do an assessment, you must get the rudiments in. And particularly you must ask – if the pc has had a previous auditor auditing on the Prehav Scale or has had any auditing on the Prehav Scale whatsoever – find out if there's ever been anything wrong or anything ARC broke or anything upset about any former assessment, and clean that up, slick as a bunny, and you'll always have a bang, bang, bang assessment.

You can always do easy auditing if you set the pc up to be audited. And you can always do hard, impossible auditing by not setting the pc up to be audited. So the first rule, in answer to your question, is get all of your rudiments in by which we also mean get inquisitive about any earlier or former assessment or what the pc has felt about assessments of the type we are about to do. And get the ARC breaks off of that. And whether you're doing a Goals, Terminal or Prehav Assessment, you will always get a reliable assessment 100 percent of the time. You see? All right. That answer it?

Male voice: That answers it.

All right. Okay. Is there another question? Yes?

Male voice: Yeah. Does this three-way cycle of paper, meter, pc prevent the establishment of the one-way flow that you mentioned?

Does this cycle here of paper, meter, pc prevent a one-way flow from occurring? No. No, no. You've got one-ways and two-way flows mixed up there. I'm sorry, but you've got a wrong idea of a two-way flow. I would recommend that you read Scientology 8-80. You go ahead and get that book. I think that's the one that covers it, isn't it?

Female voice: Yes, it is.

Scientology 8-80. And it tells you all about flows. There are flows, and they are bank flows. And this flow has nothing whatsoever to do with anything but the terminal that you are assessing and the pc, and the interrelationship between the terminal and the pc. And that is the stuck flow we are talking about. Has nothing to do with the auditor's relationship to the pc. Has only to do with the terminal's relationship to the pc. And that is the flow that can get stuck.

You cannot run on a terminal "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." "Would a king cause anything? Thank you." Now, all of a sudden, this odd phenomenon will suddenly disclose itself. The needle will stick. And it'll just get stickier and stickier and stickier and stickier. And all of a sudden go stuck. And your tone arm will get stickier and stickier and stickier and stick. And you'll say that's it. That's it. The level is flat.

No, it isn't flat. That is a stuck flow. And somebody else comes along and say, "Well, what could you cause a king? What could you cause a king? What could you cause a king? What could you cause a king?"

All of a sudden, the thing gets loose, the needle gets loose, the tone arm gets loose, everything is loose, everything is flying around beautifully, and you'd say, "All right. What could you cause a king? Thank you. What could you cause a king. Thank you. What could you cause a king?" And it'll start to get stick, and "What could you cause a thing – king?"
Thank you." And all of a sudden it gets stuck, stuck, sticker, sticker, frozen-y, and the tone arm will freeze. Now, that's a one-way flow, don't you see?

You've got to think of commands in terms of flows from the person to the terminal, from the terminal to others, you see? And you've got to get what a pattern of flows is, because if you stick any leg of that flow, you don't flatten the command, but you simply freeze the meter. And this is not the same as flattening a level, you see, that's a different one. So you can run an unbalanced command and make a level look like it's flat, but it isn't. You understand what I mean?

Male voice: All right. I do.

Yeah.

Male voice: Come back to establishment of a one-way flow while assessing. I got the impression just now that you didn't tell us to flip-flop on this, saying "Would a king cause... Would you cause a king? Would you run an obsessive can't-have on a king?" I got the impression that you didn't tell us to do it that way. You only told us that as something fancy in auditing.

No, no.

Male voice: Oh, you didn't? A-ha. Well, do you want us to do it that way?

I think you ought to listen to that tape played back. I said that is not a vital necessity ...

Male voice: Ah!

... to do this kind of a thing. But you will cause a stuck flow if you don't do something like that. [laughter]

Male voice: Okay.

See, there are other ways you could prevent a stuck flow. You could read a whole five-way bracket. But now we are getting above the auditor's ability to keep track. You see, you could read a whole five-way bracket. You could say, "Would you have faith in a king?" "Would a king cause anything to happen to you?" "Would a king prevent another from knowing?" "Would another prevent – would another have no effect on a king?" And "Would a king have an effect on himself?" You see, now there's a five-way bracket, isn't there? All right. You try to audit a pc and keep track of a five-way bracket and five different commands. Now, do I make that clear? Do I understand what you are asking now? That's the main point.

Male voice: Yeah. I've got it now.

All right.

Male voice: That we do have to do something on the line of changing it back and forth.

That's right. You can also assess this way. That's why I say this isn't vital. I just say you have to do something about it. This is a point you have to take up.

You can also do this. Now, "What do you think of faith in regard to a king?" You see. "How does cause relate to a king?" That's not a particularly good one. Not a particularly good
one, but it does get around this because it can flip-flop. You see, cause-king. But you're not saying king causing anything. It's just cause in relationship to a king, and he will turn the command around one way or the other or some type of permissive command like that might get over the whole problem. That's why I say that that exact method, which I gave you, is not the only method by which this is done. But the fact of a stuck flow is always present during a PreHAV Assessment. It can always happen on an assessment.

And all of a sudden, you haven't got an assessment, have you? You see, here would be the way you would cause a stuck flow. "Would you have faith in a king? Would you cause something to happen to a king? Would you prevent a king from knowing? Would you have no effect on a king? Would you have an effect on a king?" See, you-king, you-king, you-king, you-king, and you've done this sixty-five auditing commands. Although there it's an assessment, they still operate as auditing commands, and you've done it sixty-five times; you're going to get a stuck flow. See? That's for sure. See, that's an awful lot of times to say you-king, you-king, you-king, you-king. Outflow from you to the king.

I think you really ought to look over flows. I think you ought to look over flows. I think all of you should pay some attention to this, because otherwise why you put a five-way bracket together would be complete mystery to you. You can do this, you know. Just draw little arrows. You see, you're trying to break the valence, which you have already found in the pc, off of the pc. You're trying to individu – to knock off the individuations and other phenomena with relationship to the pc and this valence.

Well, that is done by flows because the pc is already stuck on the valence by some type of stuck flow. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Sergeant orders troops. Nobody ever orders the sergeant. Get the idea?

Eventually, he either gets stuck into being a private, you see, or he snaps terminals in some way with troops, or he can't leave camp, and nobody can figure out why is that sergeant never leave camp? You got the idea? He's just on a flow from sergeant to troops. Sergeant to troops. Sergeant to troops. Sergeant to troops. See? And he'll eventually snap on that flow. You cannot continue something flowing that long in one way. If you do, you get into all kinds of weird troubles.

Now, you eventually would find this sergeant had an officer, and the officer would come along, and he would say – well, let's take it the way officers would normally handle a sergeant – they'd say, "Well, sergeant, what do you think? Sergeant, don't you think it's a good idea? Don't you think it's a good idea? Don't you think we shouldn't uh ..."

And we get a different kind of officer one day. And he said, "Sergeant, stand there. Hand me that. Write up the orders. Drill the men."

Right away the sergeant can't take a single order, see? He'd said, "Blublublublubala. No. I just –." Actually can't even hear this officer. See? Positive orders, a stuck flow. So anything that flows the other way runs into a jammed stuck flow coming in, and he can't actually accept an order from an officer. And he goes around nattering about it. He goes around being very upset about it, and so forth. We would-say, "Well, there's something very wrong here." Yeah. The only thing very wrong is we have – we've connected with the phenomena of stuck
flows in life. Now, oddly enough, with this officer around long enough doing that, he would remedy the flow.

Three years – after three years of service, you would have this sergeant saying something like this: "Well, I certainly hated Captain Jinks when he first reported to this post. But there's one thing you can say about him. He knows what he's doing." Something like a year and a half ago, Captain Jinks finally ran out the stuck flow, you see?

All right. Five years later we find the sergeant wearing his hat. See, we now don't have any troops. The government has interfered and decided that in view of the fact that we're getting rid of all the territories and turn the country over to the Ban the Bombers or something like this – in view of that, we don't have any troops anymore, you see? We just have a skeletal force and the sergeant doesn't have any troops, but he's still got Captain Jinks. And this has been going on for about two years. And Captain Jinks says, "Sergeant, stand there," and the sergeant goes off and wears his hat exactly in the same position and carries his stick in exactly the same position as Captain Jinks. He's got a stuck flow in exactly the opposite direction. He's snapped terminals in now to Captain Jinks. You got the idea?

Just like you had these troops, who themselves never gave any orders, eventually all looking like the sergeant. So now you'd get the sergeant looking like Captain Jinks.

Now, we're talking about the valence closure mechanisms when we're talking about flows. These are the mechanisms by which a person becomes somebody else. There isn't anything odd about it. It's this stuck flow mechanism. You run a body. You run a body. You run a body. You run a body. You run a body. You run a body. Body never runs you. So you're in a body.

And then one day you get a reaction from a body. So you succumb. Because the stuck flow has now snapped. It is looking for some excuse for the body to run you in some particular way because you've run the body too long, don't you see?

Now, you have most of the drivers out here on the road being driven by their cars. If you ran a questionnaire, they would answer it quite broadly. "Where should a car take you?" They would all answer that. They wouldn't even think twice about it. And yet the essence of all excellent driving is taking the car somewhere.

I taught somebody to drive a Jaguar by taking the Jaguar down the road, and it almost killed the person. I made the person take the Jaguar down the road, turn the Jaguar around all corners. You see, do everything, think everything, and do everything to the Jaguar that they were supposed to do. Very interesting. Almost killed the person for a while, but I made him do it consciously and so made him discharge this stuck flow by running it consciously.

In other words, 8-C on a Jaguar. If you in driving start doing this, watch out, because you're liable to have almost anything happen. You all of a sudden lose your ability to drive right in the middle of a long straightaway or something, you know. You say, what's going on? What you've run into is a stuck flow. What you've done is take over analytically the stuck flow mechanism. If you start consciously driving a car that you've been so carefully driving unconsciously. Because in driving a car unconsciously, you have already succumbed to a stuck flow.
We have at this particular time the idea that all skills must become unconscious. Well, isn't that a fascinating idea, a skill is unconscious! See, a footballer, for instance – all of his actions with a football must be into some kind of a reactive groove so that he never even has to think. He just always makes the perfect goal, you see. He never has to think. He – that's the modus operandi of the day. If you wanted to improve his football, you would go out there and bring it all up to the surface. Now all of a sudden, he never would miss. But before, it was all unconscious but he missed occasionally. But that was just the fortunes of the day, you see. The automaticity doesn't always work. Leaves us all on the subject of stuck flows. And this is a very, very, important mechanism. Because it is the mechanism which you're trying to cure with Routine 3.

You're finding out what thing it is that the person has total stuck flows on in all directions and has been submerged into and has become. And then you are separating this thing out, and you are separating it out usually running with a five-way bracket, which runs all flows and all conditions with regard to this terminal. And when you have flattened all flows and all these conditions of the Primary Scale, and whatever else you had to do, and incidents, you will find out that you have discharged the compulsion to be interiorized into it or to run it or to command it or to be unconscious about it. When you've discharged these things, you, of course, have gotten rid of most of the person's case. You follow that? Did you know all that?

Female voice: Ron, how does this affect you? Always instructing students.

What's the question? Huh?

Female voice: The stuck flow. You're an Instructor, always instructing the student.

How does this affect me?

Female voice: Yes.

A stuck flow? Oooh. [laughs, laughter] I got a long way – I got a long way to go before this gets to be a stuck flow. I remember one space academy, I think the curriculum was two thousand years, I was a student there. [laughs, laughter]

Female voice: All right.

Remember something about Scientology. Scientology is the only thing which undoes its own spells. Scientology is actually the only science on Earth today which undoes all of its own rules. It's a very peculiar thing. That is the only reason we have any business doing anything with it. Anything we do in Scientology can be run out.

Do you know the only overt that you can pull with Scientology lies in the field of instruction. To fail to pass along the materials accurately becomes an overt. Bad auditing isn't much of an overt. Not on the long run, on the long run. But bad dissemination is an overt because this makes it impossible for Mr. Jinks that was badly audited to get it run out a couple of lifetimes later. See, there's always some hope for Mr. Jinks as long as there was good dissemination.

No, but that's a – it's a joke with regard to me. Actually, I've had a great deal of trouble with schools. Schools are always teaching me, oh, things like my own subjects, and so forth.
And I've had to learn my own speeches. And they're – the difficulty is they're wrong. And there's one whole series of speeches that are commonly taught in schools and they're all wrong. They've got now the wrong place names and the wrong people, and they don't make sense, but they're good oratory. And this is crazy, you know.

But you get a goofiness on the subject after a while. And about the only thing that you find difficult about instruction is being taught principles that are contrary to truth. And when somebody's pushing principles which are contrary to truth or contrary to fact, or which are just made up out of thin air or something like this, then you have – will encounter a great deal of difficulty. Both the Instructor and the student will eventually get in trouble because of this. And as Suzie will attest, I've been laughing, and you, of course, have heard me in lectures laughing about certain subject matter that is taught on Earth today as incorrect.

We didn't realize that every physics textbook in England at the elementary level has rule after rule and law after law incorrectly stated or that is totally incorrect.

There was a scientist, who has made a hobby of this, has been checking up all of the English textbooks and was on "Tonight" last night, and he had wondered how much we had held back British science by teaching Newton's laws backwards and things like this, and they were all in the textbooks, and the textbooks keep on getting reprinted and issued, and so forth.

Well, now, that's an overt. And an Instructor would suffer from that. But now you, for instance, start teaching a student correctly somewhere; because, well, there isn't one of you who won't teach somebody sometime or another something about Scientology, you see, whether in a broad mass or single individuals. You couldn't escape it. But let's say you were pushing a bunch of misconcepts. That would then add up to an overt, wouldn't it?

All right. Now, the overt act-motivator phenomena has to be part and parcel to this stuck flow phenomena. See, you have to get an individuation, there has to be an unease, there'd have to be an unconscious reaction, there has to be something unknown, there has to be something hidden. All of these things have to occur in order to make the stuck flow phenomena come about.

For instance, the sergeant is telling the troops that they're actually going to go on a picnic, and they get out there and they find out that the picnic baskets happen to be baskets for dirt. And they're actually supposed to build a fortification in the burning sun, you see. There's always this kind of thing going on in the army.

So you've always got people snapping into people and valence closures, and so forth. But they must all be accompanied by lies or prevarications.

And right on that subject, there's only one thing that becomes an overt with regard to the instruction done here: is when I tell you clearly, with exclamation points and underline it and underscore it, that you must read an E-Meter, and then you proceed to read the pc's shoes – well, I get some overt thoughts. And in the field and region of those overt thoughts, I suppose I could get into a stuck flow situation.

But every now and then, I run out my overts and unkind thoughts about you, so you're safe. [laughs] Okay. Right. Any other questions? Yes?
Male voice: On this withhold, on the new rudiments commands, you have "To whom wasn't that known" and "To whom shouldn't that be known?" How does that apply if you ask the pc "Are you withholding anything?"

Give me that – give me that bulletin right there. Instead of answering that question, why don't I give you a brief rundown on the new rudiments. On what you can get away with and what you can't get away with, with regard to it, huh?

Male voice: Good.

And that'd answer it in the process. Ask your question once more though, however.

Male voice: When you ask a pc "Are you withholding anything?" and you get a tick, how do you apply that question there "To whom wasn't that known?" How does – this doesn't even make sense to me.

All right. All right. Let's take up the whole thing. Number one, Room: that is very, very easy. These are the new rudiments. Room: TR 10 or pc's havingness process. If you have found the pc's havingness process in the list of thirty-six Presessions, you naturally use that to orient him with regard to the room, and he will be able to find out and differentiate why he doesn't like to be audited in that room. He will pick it up. Now, you've – the safest thing is to have the pc's Havingness Process. That is the safest thing. That's the best thing.

But to break down at that point when you're clearing rudiments to find the pc's Havingness Process would be a very clumsy way to go about it. So just sooner or later when auditing a pc, you should find the pc's Havingness and Confront Processes. It doesn't take very long to do, and all the materials and how it is done have all been made available this long time. It's a rather simple action.

Now, I have something to say about this, this is why I wanted to go over all of the rudiments. I have something to say about this auditor process.

You realize, of course, that a beingness is in the middle of a confusion. And that a beingness is pinned into a confusion, so this is one of these limited processes. "What are you willing to be? What are you unwilling to be," of course, is picking the stable datum out of the confusion which is reverse auditing. And it's very good, run on a very limited basis. But if you wanted to run a case with this, you would have to run much more broadly, and you would have to run your 1A processes as part of the auditing command – you'd have to introduce 1A. You'd have to bring it right in on the heels of this thing.

This one for a long run now, not just for two dozen commands to settle the pc into session. You see, you can get rid of – you can get away with it, you know, for just a rudiments process for a little while. You can get away with it, usually. But remember, to run it broadly, you would have to introduce the whole idea of 1A and get the problems out of the road. Because he obviously has problems, and the beingnesses are the middle of confusions about problems.

So you'd say – have to say, "What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be?" "What would another be willing to be? What would another rather not be?" "What confusion could you confront? What confusion could another confront?"
Now, the best way to sort that out would be to sort out problem, motion and confusion. And use the word that reacted the most on the pc for those two confronts. Now, that is quite legitimate and is one of these dynamite processes.

Now, if you wanted to run a whole case with this, you would have to add two more commands. "What confusion – ," you've sorted it out whether it's confusion, problem or motion – "would you rather not confront? What (confusion, problem, motion) would another rather not confront?" You'd have to have the plus and the minus confusion. Now, I suppose a whole case would run with that. I suppose a whole case would run Clear with that without an assessment. Well, after all, you've picked up the beingness which is the stable datum. And you're handling the ability to confront a confusion. And you're handling these various elements that create a reactive bank anyhow. And maybe if you ran a case with that for a thousand hours, the case would go Clear. You got the idea? But it's one of these looong, arduous propositions without much differentiation.

But running it just "What would you be willing to be? What would you rather not be?" All right. Now, let's just sit down and run that for two hours. Well, all right. Well, all right.

And then next session, let's sit down and run it for – start to run it for two hours. I don't think you'll make it. The pc's going to be right splang in the middle of an engram. Because that runs pcs into engrams if run very long. Otherwise, it's a very limited process, and you must know that about it. But it's a nice one to settle the pc into auditing session. Oh, you'd run it a couple of dozen times, you know. You say, "Well, what would you be willing to be?"

"I wouldn't – wouldn't ..." And all of a sudden he'd "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. I'm not willing to be a pc."

"Oh, all right. So you're not willing to be a pc. All right. Now, what would you be willing to be?"

"So-and-so."

"What would you rather not be?"

"So-and-so."

"What would you be willing to be?"

"Oh, I'm willing to be a pc."

"All right. I'm going to audit this – ask you this question two more times and end this process if that's all right with you. Thank you." And you're out.

In other words, it will do that job. But going much further than that, you're going to get into trouble with the process, so you might as well know that. I wouldn't give you a process that you could get into trouble with, without that.

Now, if you do get into trouble with it, add "another" and "beingness," "another" and "not beingness." Just in the commands I just gave you. And if you're going to sit down and clean this thing up till A to Izzard, you're going to have to run "confusion-confront," "confusion-rather not confront" for self and for the other, too, making this whole number of package
of commands. It's going to be one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight commands. It's an eight command process to run the thing all the way out.

But the way to get yourself out of trouble on it, you would only have to add the two confusion commands, see. "What confusion can you confront? What confusion could another confront?" That would get you out of trouble without getting elaborate. You get how this would be done? Pc says, "Oh, I'm going into an engram," and so forth. Well, you haven't got his terminal. You haven't – you're not running him on the Prehav Scale. You just made a boo-boo. So on. Just add the command "confusion-confront," and he will come right on out of it just as nice as you please, okay?

So you've got the command; you've got the remedy. All right.

Let's take up the next level which is the one you're asking about. "What is unknown about that problem with Joe?"

This is perfectly all right. It's perfectly all right. Now, what did you find wrong with that?

*Male voice: No. It's the withhold. The next one. I must be confused a bit.*

Oh, you got – that was what's marked with a question mark. Oh, I guess, I guess what you're talking about.

All right. "What is unknown about that problem with (blank)?" Now, that is good enough to clean a present time problem because you've located the fact that he had a problem with (blank) – his boss.

Well, you ask him, "Do you have a present time problem," and the meter goes clang! And the blue smoke starts coming out of the corner. We going to put a little smoke hole there. And oh, he says, "I don't want anything to do with the problem, because I want to get on with the session," and so forth. Well, that's not a good enough question. I mean – you'd better audit it. And the best way to get rid of it, and the fastest way to get rid of it is just ask him the plainest version of it all, which is "What is unknown about that problem with your boss? What is unknown about the problem with your boss? What is unknown about that problem with your boss?" Just repetitive command. Nothing fancy. Nothing further about it. That makes it. That makes it. All of a sudden, the guy go abloom! And you only run that, you see, long enough so that you get no reaction on the meter. And you say, "How do you feel with the problem of your boss?"

"Well, I think I ought to do something about it!" That isn't long enough. The test of a PT problem, if it's flat, the pc doesn't have to do anything about it. That's the primary test of a PT problem. That's an old saw in auditing – pc feels he still has to do something about it, it's not flat. I've had an auditor tell me, "Well, I've got the PT problem flat because she said right after the session she would go out and phone up her husband and make peace with him."

And you say, "Yes, but you didn't get any gain in this intensive."

"Oh, well, it couldn't have had anything to do with that!"

Yes, it had everything to do with that. He didn't apply the basic test of a present time problem. She still wanted to do something about this problem with her husband. Therefore,
the present time problem was not flat and didn't answer the required rudiments. The pc has to take care of something in present time. The pc has to move in present time toward a certain target. Well, if the pc has to move in present time toward a certain target that has nothing to do with session targets, the pc is out of session. Simple as that. So if the pc has to do something about this, you still have not flattened it. And you just run this until the meter goes flat on that present time problem. And then you ask him if he has a present time problem about anything else, being very specific about \textit{anything else}, meaning we're through with that one.

And if he's got one on that, then you clean that one up. And then you ask him, "Do you have – now have a present time problem?" You get no reaction on the meter, carry on and go to your next rudiment.

And we run to withholds. "To whom wasn't that known? To whom shouldn't that be known?"

Well, that is about the nastiest withhold process anybody ever dreamed up.

Now, the question – I don't know quite how the question comes up now. How – repeat the question again.

\textit{Male voice:} Well, the question is when you ask the pc, "Are you withholding anything?"

Yeah.

\textit{Male voice:} And you get a tick, and you ask him, "What was that?" – "I don't know." \textit{Then how do you apply that uh ...?}

I get you.

\textit{Male voice:} ... end?

I get you. I see. And the pc doesn't know?

\textit{Male voice:} That's right.

Ah, this is a special case. This is a special case. Well, let me see, I have to kind of pick it up here somehow or another, because I can't imagine a pc saying that to me without my following straight on through... You know, these – the Germans developed dachshunds, you know, to go down small holes.

Well, I don't know. Let's see, you're asking me to clear this up with a command. I would clear this up differently. If I ran into that and I said, "Well, what isn't – are you withholding anything?" and the pc got a tick. And you say, "All right, what was that?"

And he says, "Well, I don't know. I haven't got a clue."

I wouldn't run a process. I would say, "Well, before session ..." or just any kind of thing, you know, the who, when, what type of questioning.

"Well, before session was there something that came up that you thought you ought to tell me?" Don't accuse him of withholding, you see?

He'd say, "Oh, yes. Oh, yes, yes, I did want to tell you that actually last night I had quite a headache after that session."
And you say, "Well, all right. Thank you. Now, are you withholding anything?" And you very often will find the tick disappears. That's as easy as it is to clean them, see? So that's a two-way comm clean. Any question about what, when, where. That classifies as two-way comm. You're supposed to try to clear a withhold with two-way comm. "What was it? When was it? Was there any time when you thought of withholding anything from me? What sort of thing would it be that you would find it very difficult to tell me?" That's a very nice one. Run it into classes.

"What would I be most likely to get angry about?" You see? Never confronted that one before, you see. "You get angry about, let's see. Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho, yes. Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho." Of course, he's got you, the auditor, mixed up with somebody who's censuring him. So he'll get a whole type of class of withhold from you as an auditor. Got the trickiness with which this can be done?

Cleverness is speed when getting a withhold off of the pc. Cleverness is speed. Now, that doesn't mean there aren't other ways of doing it. And that doesn't mean you can't do it with a repetitive process.

The earliest repetitive process for a withhold was "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Is there anything you'd care to tell me about that? Oh?"

"No."

"Well, all right. Thank you."

"Well, think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've withheld.

Now, is there anything you would care to tell me?"

I was down in the Melbourne ACC, and I was giving a whole bunch of lectures on O/W and advising the auditor to run this sort of thing, so he went covert on the whole deal, you see. And he started running the pc, saying, "Think of something you've known. Think of something you've withheld. Now, is there anything you would care to tell me?"

See, well, the pc's already loosened it up and it's rattling around in his skull and it's about to come out through his eyeballs if he doesn't get rid of the thing.

Now, that's the earliest repetitive process which was directly leveled at getting withhold off of a pc, or beyond just the idea of getting withhold off of a pc.

Now, that's usable. That's a rudiments process. See. It's quite usable.

You say, "Well, are you withholding anything" Tick. "Well, what is that?" "I don't know."

And you say, "Well, is there anything that you thought you should tell me? Is there anything that you haven't told me in earlier sessions? Is there anything you think I would ob-
ject to being told?" Any type of questioning. And it's still going tick, see? He hasn't given you the gen.

Of course, you can go off into repetitive processes. And the earliest one of them is, "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld." "Think of something you've done. Think of something you've withheld."

Now, a much more modern version or a much more modern process would be to search it out along some line and say, "What is unknown about my reactions? Thank you. What is unknown about my reactions? Thank you. What is unknown about my reactions? Thank you."

Uh-uh-uh-all of a sudden he, of course, uhhhhhh! He suddenly realizes you're going to get ragingly angry if he suddenly tells you something. See that? But that's sort of clearing the auditor so the auditor can be talked to by the pc. You get the indirect method? So there is a direct application of Unknown to that exact situation, which is a special situation.

This is a highly general situation. Now, this withhold in the rudiments – it's up to you to get the rudiment off of him. Now, what you use to do that, we're not particular about. You can get the old "do, withhold" process. You can stir it up one way or the other, and so on. You're not trying to run a Security Check on this pc, however.

And if the pc is adamantly holding up the whole progress of the thing, yes, that's a special case and you can go in and run any process which you think will eventually get him to get loose and turn loose of that withhold.

He obviously has got a withhold from you because he's afraid of your reactions to the things, you might say, and as long as he's afraid of your reactions to the things he might say, he is not in two-way communication with you and so is not in-session. So this is an in-session type of withhold, not a Security Check type of withhold, that we are more interested in. So that makes it a little bit different, doesn't it?

_Audience voice: Hmm._

Huh?

All right. Now, this is directed at this. Remember these are a list of processes to be run on something found which can't be cleared by two-way communication. That's what these Rudiments Processes are. So we say, "Are you withholding anything?"

And the pc says, "No," and we get a tick and we say, "What was that?" And the pc said, "Ooooh, well, oooooh, yes, oooooh, well."

And you, "Well, what was it?"

And the pc, "Ooooh."

"Well, what – what – what's this all about?"

"Well, last night down in the restaurant, three other students and I were discussing your auditing, and I don't want to have to tell you this, but we decided and so forth and so on, and I said, and that was an unkind thought."
You're not interested in what they thought. You're only interested in what he thought. And then you say, "Well, come on now, what did you say? And what did you think?" That's always the keynote of withholds. You can waste eighteen thousand years of auditing on running off other people's statements, and so forth, with regard to the withhold.

"Yes, I had an aunt once who drowned a puppy."

"Oh, Christ... all right. So you had an aunt that drowned a puppy. That has nothing to do with our auditing session. Did you help her drown the puppy?"

"No, I just heard about it."

"All right. What did you do and where did you drown a puppy?"

"Oh, do you suppose I could've?"

"Well, it says here something about it." Got the idea?

"Did you ever drown a puppy?"

"Well, no. Clang!"

"Where did you drown the puppy?" Clang!

"Oh, I had forgotten all about it."

You see, that's a Security Check type of situation. Now, you saw into this Security Check situation. You clean this up and get this drowning of puppies so that it doesn't react. And this thing works the same way. If you were to run that on a Security Check withhold, you see, you would clean up the whole withhold. You wouldn't leave the guy stuck in some kind of a withhold.

Now, let's supposing that this was just an auditing session situation, see? And you said, "Well, what's this withhold?"

And he eventually said, "And I was down at the café and we were talking to three other auditors, and I said, and I thought, and so forth ..."

And you say, "All right. Are you withholding anything?" You still get a clang You say, "Was it – is it about that, that you are withholding?" And you still get another clang.

Well, there's no sense of sitting there for the next two and a half hours trying to beat to pieces something which is apparently an almost traumatic incident. See?

The thing for you to do is not to run responsibility on it or something like that. The thing for you to do is to run this one. "To whom wasn't that known?"

"Well, you, of course." You see?

"To whom shouldn't that be known?"

"You, of course."

"All right. To whom wasn't that known?"

"Well, it wasn't known to the other students."

"Well, to whom shouldn't that be known?"
"Well, it shouldn't be known to your preclears."

You get how this would be answered? And so it eventually cleans up that traumatic situation.

And all too often this is being run into by auditors. You say, "Are you withholding anything?"

And the pc says, "No," clank!

Then you say, "What was that?"

And "Well, I guess that was the ... oh, yes."

And you say, "Are you withholding anything?", you see. And you still get a reaction. You try to chase it out as an ARC break or something of this sort. Actually, it's the same withhold, but it didn't release.

Now, this is how you release a withhold and that is why it is a process. Does that make sense now?

Male voice: Yes, very much so.

Otherwise, the weapons by which you get the pc to give you the withhold, this is another story. All right? Does that answer it?

Male voice: Yes. Perfect.

All right. Now, this becomes – next one is ARC break, and this is one of the most important developments that we have had for a long time. And this is a honey, this process.

"What didn't an auditor do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?" And that is a bitch kitty because that cleans up basic-basic on the ARC break chain, and that will smooth a pc into session faster than scat. There are variations of this command.

There is no variation of, "What weren't you able to tell an auditor?" That is nonvariable.

If you're cleaning it up for the session only, you, of course, say, "What weren't you able to tell me in this session?" That is not as good as, "What weren't you able to tell an auditor?" but would still keep him within the finite ranges of the session rather than run it all up and down the line and would clean him up for you. Just now.

Let's say you run into the end-of-session ARC break. Well, you're not going to sit there till midnight, for heaven's sakes, running this other process because this is going to be a longer process. You can clean it up for the immediate session in which you are involved. And the immediate session in which you are involved is simply me, not an auditor. "What didn't I do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell me? When?"

That's a specialized use of it, and the specialized use of it is limited to trying to get on with the session, trying to get the pc out of session, and something ended; this gives you a very short run. But if you had to do something like this to keep the thing squared around – of course, the pc is hot on the subject of an auditor.
But this is quite a remarkable development. And let me go into the background and the network of the development itself.

You're seeing here the final, great-great-great-grandson of the discovery that communication is the most important corner of the ARC triangle. See? Communication is the most important corner. And what do you know? As long as you run a recall, it is perfectly safe to say, "Weren't able to say?" That's perfectly safe as long as it's a recall. "What wouldn't you be able to say?" will wind the pc up in more soup. Why? Because it's saying, "What weren't you able to – what aren't you able to go out of ARC with?" See, same thing. So it is quite a delicate thing and you should know this about this process, that that is very, very solidly and completely and only a Recall Process. It only works as a Recall Process and then does lots of good. And if used as a conditional process, you know, "What aren't you able to tell me?" I'm not so sure, see? You've got to run that as a Recall.

Now, psychotics have gone sane on this single auditing command, in spite of the fact that it was a stuck flow command and everything else. "Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you. Think of communicating with somebody. Thank you." Run for twenty-five hours. And it's made some people go sane, see? I mean it's that powerful a process.

It could be refined. You could have said, "Think of somebody communicating with you. Think of you communicating with somebody." See? Something like that, and you would have had a considerable resurge on the part of a case. But it wasn't communication that aberrated anybody. It was the not-communication that aberrated them. So a recall on the not-communications operates as a very powerful process, and it is extremely powerful just as a process itself.

We don't need it at the present moment. We don't have any real use for it at the present moment. It would have made a considerable splash four or five years ago, you see? Everybody would have thought this was marvelous. And you would have run it something on this order.

Fellow has trouble with his mama. Fellow always had trouble with his mama. All right.

"What weren't you able to tell your mother? When?"

Now, to round it out as a total valence process, you would have had to have said, "What wasn't your mother able to tell you? When?" Got the idea?

Now, that run, both ways would be a very rapid-fire valence splitter. And it'd split up valences like crazy. That's a real, real wild valence splitter. A marvelous one. So Prehav 13 you can lay aside and forget. If you're trying to clean up ARC breaks with a present time environment, just use this, and you've got a better, faster run than Prehav 13.

Only you do it like this. You'd write down everybody the person knew in present time and then you would assess the list and find out that Harry was real hot. So you'd say, "Well, what weren't you able to tell Harry?" and "What wasn't Harry able to tell you?" Now, that would be one version, see?
You could run it as a pure ARC break process and keep the flow going. And now we get a booster. A pc is in a position where he is expecting somebody to do something because he is dependent on somebody doing something. And if somebody doesn't do something at the right moments, he is left in the soup, so he is in a dependency situation.

So for a pc in auditing sessions, for the auditor not to have done anything, and for not to have been able to tell an auditor, picks up and runs out all the times the pc was audited when not in-session. And, of course, that blows the sessions. So what you're really doing is blowing the sessions. You're just cleaning up auditors and sessions here just like mad, when you're running this process. I don't know, I suppose you've used it in the last day or so, and you might have found it extremely valuable. Have you, any of you, used it? Worked good? Work fine?

_Female voice: oh, yes._

All right.

Now, I'll tell you the additional steps which you would have to take to make a long run out of this. You would have to, to get this long, arduous line, you'd say, "What didn't an auditor do? When?" "What didn't you do? When?" Of course, this now broadens it out of session, doesn't it? "What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?" "What didn't an auditor tell you? When?" Get the idea? And that would make a well-balanced process. So your process would become quite well balanced and you would just be cleaning up sessions in all directions.

But this is enough to actually knock out auditing sessions because there isn't very much auditing track, so you don't need too complete a process to fix it up. And you'll find out that's quite workable just the way it is. "What didn't an auditor do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell an auditor? When?" And you pick up the basic-basics on the ARC breaks which the pc is having with you right now.

Now, for short-term use, "What didn't I do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell me? When?" That would be a workable form unless you had had a long, personal acquaintance with the pc. If you'd had a long, personal acquaintance with the pc, like well, auditing your husband or something like that, you'd have to add in "In this session." See, to clean up the ARC break and get the session off you'd have to say, "What didn't I do in this session? When?" "What weren't you able to tell me in this session? When?" See? Now, that pinpoints it right on down the line, and you've run the session out. See, that's good enough. That's good enough. You'll find out that's broadly workable.

If you wanted the full dress parade of the process, you would run Doingness – you would run Not-Doingness and Not-Communicatingness, both sides, in general or on a specific Prehav 13 type terminal.

Remember how we used to run Failed Help sometimes? Well, you could use this same thing with Failed Help. You could separate the guy's whole family off of him. Everybody in the family is certain he shouldn't have come into the HGC to be audited. And it's all we hear about, see? And we know that there's lots of stress and strain with regard to this.
Do you know it was an early discovery that a person who had a non-Scientologist on the other side of him raising hell with him because he was in Scientology, would ordinarily be expected to not quite be aboard the bandwagon and sort of squirrel. Well, he's listening all the time to a bunch of overts.

That is the source of a squirrel.

A fellow like, oh, let's take some real championship peanut-whistle squirrels, Van Vogt. Now, he never actually would have been a squirrel, Van never would have been a squirrel, if it hadn't have been for – what the hell was her name? Mayne. Mayne. I think she's got connected up with an electric circuit someplace. But Mayne's also over there curling her moustache. And saying, "Natter, natter, natter, how bad it all is, how bad it all is," and actually, apparently aboard the bandwagon but actually just cutting everything to ribbons. You get that? I mean that, therefore, keeps the guy from not really being with us and not really being against us and being sort of in the center and not really knowing what he's doing. And he's going around in small circles all the time.

All right. That kind of a condition comes in. Or the whole family had decided that if he went to that place or went to see that person again, they were going to be through with him, and they mean through. See? And what's really very interesting, he usually is the one in the family who controls the money and would be through with them. But he never does, see? Through, you see?

All right. You run into that kind of a situation, that's a whole series of developing ARC breaks and their incipient PT problems. So you just get rid of all your PT problems by assessing all of these people, finding the one that drops the most immediately, running this needle action out of this particular process on that person, see? You'd have to take Van Vogt. You'd have to take Mayne. You see, just substitute her for "auditor", see?

All right. "What didn't Mayne do? When?" "What weren't you able to tell Mayne? When?" See? Obviously, the individual is in some sort of a subjective state with regard to the person, so the person has some sort of a supercontrol over them, and you'll just move the valence out that much so you'll let auditing happen.

Now, that's a sort of an interesting approach and an interesting use of this particular process. Fellow comes to you for auditing, and you are doing all this. See, you're making out his assessment sheet there at the beginning. You're getting his preclear assessment data, and, "You married?"

"Yes." And so on.

"How does your wife feel about Scientology?"

"Oh, well, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. As a matter of fact, I was going to have to ask you not to tell her I was being processed."

Oh, man! He's just set himself up for two hundred hours to no gain, you see? Because he's got a consistent withhold in present time. He's got a continuous present time problem. All of these sort of things. So you make it your business to find these things out.
Now, you assume then that there will be ARC breaks. So you assume then, if he's had that much trouble with this person, there have been ARC breaks with this person. All right. Your smart approach to this as you're starting him out as an HGC pc or a personal preclear, your smartest approach is to clean up all the people in his environment, just before you assess him or do anything with him at all. And it's perfectly safe to do it with this process, because you're not going to run very long on these people.

And you understand that it is a liability and that you are liable to run into danger by running anything but the pc's terminal, Routine 3 type terminal. You realize that's a dangerous thing to do. So don't run it very long. You should be able to clean up his wife or something like this. It takes a very fast process.

And there is a very fast process. And you're in and off of it in maybe twenty minutes, half an hour, something like this. And you've gotten a grief charge or you've got the traumatic situation, it's all gone, it's all smoothed out, and so forth. That's the – you're through with that person. You stack – unstack these persons off of the pc, spend a couple of sessions doing this, and then assess him, and you'll never have any trouble with the rest of your rudiments. But that is only, of course, for a preclear. That is only for a preclear, entirely, who is having this kind of trouble – people who object to Scientology.

Not necessarily object to him, what the hell, there isn't a human being on Earth that isn't objected to one way or the other, see? But he's going to have trouble with this person about Scientology, you certainly should move over into that bracket. A D of P doing this as a system would get minimal blows, minimal upsets, minimal PT problems and maximal profile gains. You just clean up the pc's environment. And that's the process he would use or just any version thereof.

But remember that Not-Communicate has to be a recall version. It can't be a conditional present time version. That I can't stress too hard because if you ran it as a conditional present time ...

All right. Like, "What don't you have to communicate with? What aren't you able to communicate with now?" Oh, man, you've had it. Of course, you immediately say to somebody, "What aren't you able to communicate with?" Well, you've just asked him, "What part of your whole track is unknown to you? How many populations, temples, airports, companies, regiments, families, parents have you had for the last two hundred trillion years? Thank you. Now, get the idea of not knowing anything about any of them. Thank you very much. Now, stay out of communication with them. Good."

Has to be a recall. Has to be a straight and direct recall. This discovery is basically hardly won, and it amounts to this: this is what the pc is actually objecting to on the subject of auditing; whatever else the pc says, those are the things which the pc objects to: The auditor didn't do something, and the pc was not able to tell the auditor. And these are all that the pc really is objecting to, whatever else he says.

Pc says, "Yap, yap, yap, and you should've, and I feel terrible, and I am all upset, and I don't want any auditing or anything else."
Immediate rejoinder is not, "Well, if it is all right with you I will now run a process on you." That is no time to be taking this up, let me assure you, you see?

That is the time that a pc says, "I don't want to be audited, nothing else, and so forth, and I've just had it, and you're going to run any more engrams on me today? And I – ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. No thank you."

And you say, "Well, what weren't you able to tell me?" See, you haven't even started the session. "What weren't you able to tell me?"

"What wasn't I able to tell you? What was I able to tell you?"

"Well, what weren't you able to tell me?"

"Well – oh, I see. You're auditing me."

"Well, yes, if you want to put it that way."

"Well, you haven't started the session yet."

"All right. Well, what weren't you able to tell me?"

"Well, that you haven't started the session yet."

"Well, what else weren't you able to tell me?"

"Well, you remember yesterday, I was right down there in the middle of this dang thing and this spaceship had just crashed, you know? And actually, I was hardly able to talk, and you keep on running the same flubbing, flipping process on and on and on, and there were no answers to it. And all I could do was palely nod my head, but I actually didn't feel like nodding my head at all! Now, that's what I wasn't able to tell you! There!"

"What didn't I do?"

"What didn't you do? Oh, God, you ... That's easy," see? "You didn't ask the right auditing command, that's what you didn't do." And back and forth, flip-flop, and all of a sudden the pc's in-session.

Now, you should get back and put him on the E-Meter and actually say, "Now, if it is all right with you, I will begin this session ..." That's what you should do, isn't it? Because the whole end of your last session must have been invalid. He's still in-session. What are you doing starting another one? You didn't end the last one.

Right? So what the hell, you don't monkey around with a bunch of forms. You know, "If you just swing that incense pot, you know, you swing that incense pot, and if the people down there in the choir box all say, 'Ohm, mani padme hum, mea culpa' at the right time, you know, you'll get Clears." Well, let me tell you, they've been swinging incense pots and saying "mea culpa" for two thousand years and we got – haven't got Clears. We got something else. Right?

So you go putting ritual ahead of getting auditing done and you will always be wrong! Now, there are times to use good form, and that's when everything is sailing along fine. Anybody can use right form. But I will say something about my ancient familial lineage and my dear cousins, the British. They very often continue to use form when they ought to be doing
something else. And this has been a failure, hasn't it? You look down the line. That's just a failure. They're going to do it this way when they ought to be doing something, right now, desperately. You got the idea?

Form can get in your road. Form gets – got in the road of Roman administration. It's gotten so much in the road of American administration today that if the form of asking their wife that night isn't obeyed by the American diplomat attending the conference, of course – he, of course, can't have anything to say in the next day's conference. You know, the dirty crack about Versailles that set up the Second World War to fire, was that all the wives were consulted every night by the diplomats and so they had a changed treaty state every day. Nobody else brought his wife but the Americans. And they blame that on the American woman. [laughs]

Now, that's form. That's ritual. Ritual of some kind or another. It's not whether or not we do something now about Berlin. It's whether or not we have a ruddy, flipping conference about Berlin. You got the idea?

_Audience voice: Yeah._

Now, what the hell is this conference? Well, the foreign ministers all have to get together, and then you have to set up dates, and you have to do this and that. You don't do anything like that!

If you're going to do something about a situation that is all flying off at all angles, and so forth, well, you do something about the situation. You don't do it by form.

The whole world of diplomacy, not just British diplomacy, but the whole world of diplomacy is just a bunch of form in lieu of doing something, You see?

The safe thing to do is to adhere to ritual because then you are not responsible. And that is the whole basis of diplomacy. If you adhere to ritual, you can never be hanged.

It is brought up as a point of the late – well, he's at least late – Dag Hammarskjold that the man never made a statement because then he would have to be responsible for some of his commitments. If he had stated something, then he would be responsible for having to execute something, so Dag Hammarskjold made a business of never saying anything positive. And according to one of his best friends, would always take fifty minutes to tell you what he could have told you in five minutes in the first place because he was afraid of making a definite commitment.

Well, what did we see of all this? We saw a perfectly good idea go further and further adrift and more and more astray, and then we saw the Congo, and then we see this, and then all of a sudden we've got sabotage and everything going to hell in a balloon.

You know that the United Nations permitted its first soldier – its first soldier – to be killed? Did you know that? The Israel war. That's an interesting thing, isn't it? The first United Nations soldier that wore the white belt of the United Nations was killed in the Middle East without protest by the United Nations. And he was a few days later followed by the United Nations Chief Administrator in the Middle East. Do you remember that? After that do
you think they could ever make anything stick? Well, they're just catching up with their own overt, which is not to back up their own authority.

Now, that's simply beside the point. I'm giving you a little bit of a roasting. And the roasting is this: That if you go around thinking form is going to get you out of trouble, but you should be getting out of trouble by wit, you're going to be wrong. Always put getting the job done ahead of doing it according to the rules. Because the rules will only fit the majority of cases. But remember the majority of cases leave a minority that the rules don't handle. Always the case.

You've always got to remember that no matter how much you know about auditing, how many rules you have learned about auditing, how disciplined you get, how you can finally get to a point of where you put the key in the chest and wind yourself up, and then run for two hours, that you're going to run into situations which will not get you out of because you are disciplined, because you are well trained, because you do know what you're doing, you can keep your wits about you when anybody else would have gone to hell in a balloon. But that you can do that, does not excuse you from using your noggin. It doesn't excuse you for a moment for not being clever, for not realizing and reading the handwriting on the wall.

There are many ways to handle human beings. Many, many, many ways to handle human beings. There are some right ways and there are some wrong ways. By the way, any trick that you use can always be done within the realm of the Auditor's Code. You don't have to go outside that. The pc is ARC broke. The pc does not want a session. The pc has to have a session. The pc is in trouble. The pc does not want to have you start the session. The pc is in a confusion.

Well, your job is to get a session going. Your job isn't to sit there and do it by the rules.

Oh, well, two hours later, the pc suddenly wakes up and realizes you never started the session. But if you've straightened it all out in those two hours it'd be "Ha-ha. That's one on me! You never started the session, did you?"

And you say, "Well, that's right, but not having started it, I'm now going to have to end it. Is that all right with you?" [laughter]

Now, the pc's nattering around and saying this and that, and they walk out in the hall, and they won't even come into the auditing room or something like that, that is your time to blow in here with ARC breaks! Got the idea? That's your time to start sailing, not your time to say, "Well, do you want a session? How about my giving you a session?" That's all part of ritual.

This guy has just been struck down by a truck and he's lying there and he's half-conscious and he's bleeding. Now, do you say to this person, "Is it all right with you if I give you a little auditing with Scientology?" See, it doesn't make sense when you put it in that category, does it?

All right.
SEMINAR, QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: WHAT IS KNOWABLE TO THE PC

A lecture given on 20 September 1961

Well, your day today is – what day are you in?

Audience: 20th.

You're in the 20th. Well, hello, I'm glad to see you're in the 20th.

Now, those that have been in engrams, in either session today, this is the 20th of September. [laughter] So come up to present time. Come on, come up to present time. Come on, present time, 20th September 1961. Okay? Did anybody come up to present time? [laughter]

All right. Well, it's your turn to tell me what you don't know, and ask questions about what you want to know. Don't ask questions so somebody else can find out. That is a common trick in Academies. Students are always asking questions in order that the others can be informed. I'm not interested in that; I'm interested in the direct communication. Okay. Anything? Yes?

Male voice: we know in Security Checking we're not using "forget" or "not-know." Equally we're not saying "in this life." Therefore, if a pc has a certain amount of not-isness on his case and we ask a question, get a reaction on it, but the pc doesn't know what it is, and it probably is a past life, what are we to do?

Pull it. If it reacts, he can know about it. You've asked whether or not, when we're doing a Security Check and not using a "not-know" version and not using "in this lifetime," we get a knock on the E-Meter, what are we to do about it. That's a very good question. Let us take up immediately the datum that most applies to this, which is, why do you get a reaction on an E-Meter at all? All right. That is a very simple thing.

That which is in the ken of reaction is in the knowledge of the pc. That which will react, is knowable. That's the first and foremost rule of an E-Meter's reaction. It doesn't mean that it is known at the moment the question is asked, but it means that it is knowable. Because an E-Meter can only react on those things which are instantly and immediately restimulated by the preclear himself. So therefore, on a circuit version, of course, it is reactive, but it is knowable.

The reason why you assess for an engram is not to find the hottest charge. The reason you assess is to find out what is real to the pc. This would be the realest goal to the pc. Therefore it reacts. This would be the realest terminal to the pc, therefore it reacts. This is the real-
est level of the Prehav Scale, therefore it reacts. This is the realest incident to the pc, therefore it reacts.

It isn't really even what the pc is in. It isn't what is wrong with the pc. It's what the pc can connect with. And I would say offhand that with a great deal of clever interrogation – E-Meters always require to be backed up by the clever interrogation. And a Security Check must always be done by variant questions. You must never use a Security Check with a repetitive-question approach. If I find anybody in this unit saying, "Have you ever raped anyone? Thank you. Have you ever raped anyone? Thank you. Have you ever raped anyone? Thank you," I will let the floor disintegrate under you! [laughter] That's what I will do. I will not-is the floor. [laughter] So if you feel yourself falling in the middle of a session, you know what you've done.

Now, there is the score on anything of this character: if it reacts, it is knowable. Reaction means reality. And you can just put those two together. They're easy to remember because it's so alliterative. Reaction is reality.

Now, although you know what's wrong with the pc, although you know what incident it should be, although he's sitting there going glup, glup, glup, and every once in a while tightens up the space mechanism and it turns out to be a shepherdess. Well, that violates your reality. But remember that the pc was read by the E-Meter's reality. That's why we use an E-Meter. It's reality-reaction. If it reacts, it is real.

Sure, you have to get the shepherdess off before you get to this space mechanic. You get the idea. So therefore you, at no time, must be guilty of enforcing a reality on the pc which is contrary to what the meter says. Pc's reality is what the meter says. Always what the meter says. And it is never what you say or what the pc says.

But in interrogation – a clever interrogation on any given question – "Have you ever raped anyone? Have you ever thought of raping anyone? Have you ever remembered having raped somebody? Have you ever had consistent dreams of having raped somebody?" And this needle keeps falling, you see. And all of a sudden he says, "Well, I had a dream about it once."

"Oh, you did? All right. Let's go in for Freudian dream analysis. And give me what it is."

And "But it's not in this lifetime."

"Well, all right. So, it's not in this lifetime. Who did you rape?"

"Oh, well, you're being direct about it. That's not fair."

And he all of a sudden will have some foggy recollection of something or other, and the pc says, "It isn't real, but I sort of remember, but it's somehow or another, and I've got a picture of..." and you go – he goes on like this.

And you say, "Good. Who did you rape?"

And he finally says, "Well, I guess that's the right answer." And it clears on the meter. Well, you don't care if his reality is any greater than that.
And you can clear those that do that. But I'm glad you asked the question for two or three reasons – we haven't covered this subject of why does an E-Meter react, for some time.

And an E-Meter would only react on a past track thing that was sitting right there ready to be triggered. You know that you can have a pc sometimes, half out of their chair – leaving. You know? They just suddenly say, "Ahhhhh! Buuu." And they want to blow. They want to run. They want to get out of there, and so forth. And you say, "What's ...?" And they've hit something, you see.

Well, the space police have been looking for them for two and a half billion years, and it'll come through with that much charge. It really will. They know – they're being looked for right now. If somebody found that out, that would be that. And they've been consciously alert. You know, they haven't known why they've been alert, but just that you asked the question, triggered it. And when you can get one of those off the case, you've done the case an awful lot of good. Because it was right there. If it reacts, it is real. It is attainable.

Now, you compare this to your ordinary experience as an auditor that past track is almost out of sight where any ordinary person off the street is concerned. You say, "What were you doing in your last life?" You can't ask that as a casual social question. All right, you're not going to get an answer to that. So you compare it with that experience, and this other experience then seems frightening. But every so often you're going to get one off the street, and you're going to say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" And it's going to go bang! And you're going to say, "Well, when was that?"

And "I don't know."

And you're going to say, "Good." It falls again. You say, "When did you rob this bank?"

"Oh, well, umm. That's another story. Uh ... I don't know. When I was a little boy, I used to have dreams about this sort of thing. Used to have nightmares about this sort of thing." And he's liable to get a sudden terrific reality on having robbed a bank and been in prison for eighteen years in Cook County prison, or something like this, in his last life, you see. And he's been scared ever since. But he may get a direct recall. And when you get one of those, you've actually freed up a considerable amount of track. So it's very valuable to do that.

Don't limit your question on a Security Check to this lifetime. Those directions do not apply on a processing Security Check. And don't bother to run a "not-know" version. Why? Because you've moved the whole thing up. You're upgraded now to where you're going to find a goal in an HGC. Straightaway, you're going to find his goal, you're going to find his terminal. Simultaneously going to be doing his Security Check. And what's this going to amount to? This is going to find the guy on the backtrack, straightaway. And it'll only be, maybe, the first couple, three sessions with the Security Check that you might have much trouble with. And next thing you know he'll be running engrams. Within the twenty-five hours he might very well be running engrams.

When an HGC auditor gets real hot; first day, he gets the Assessment Sheet and he gets the person's goal. Next day, why, he gets the person's terminal. That's by noon. Two o'clock, the fellow's on the first run. That's the way it ought to be. I won't settle for anything
less as expertly done. The amount of floundering which is being done with goals is technical floundering. It is not anything to do with the pc. It is technical floundering.

Similarly, the Security Checks – the length of time it takes to do a Security Check or clear a question is just technical floundering. It's just not looking at the needle, not getting a reaction, not asking the question, not pressing it home. You're sitting there security checking a sheet, you're not security checking a pc. You get the idea? All these various conditions are present. It's technical that slows it down. I hope that answers your questions.

Male voice: Yes, it does. The only doubt I have now is how to help the pc to have this as more knowable when it does react, when I know there's something now that is potentially knowable to him.

I wouldn't do a thing for him.

Male voice: Just sort of keep on questioning around him?

I wouldn't do a thing for him beyond clever questioning. On a straight Security Check, that is it. You start auditing a Security Check, and hard and running repetitive-command processes while doing a Security Check, and that sort of thing, and it's never paid off here. We've just never had it pay off. It sounds like it might be a good idea.

But the way you'd help him is to point up your questioning. And that is by compartmentation of the question. "Have you ever robbed?" "Have you?" "Have?" "a bank?" Bank doesn't fall. "Have you ever robbed?" falls. "Have you?" that doesn't fall. "Robbed?" "Well, what have you robbed?"

"Oh, well, you get down to that. It was never banks, you see. It was just clothing stores." And the locks will blow off. He might have robbed a bank on the whole track, but you'll actually blow the question on compartmentation. It won't bother him then. That is how you help him out. Is that more of a specific aid to you?

Male voice: Yes, I've got it now. Thank you.

All right, good enough. What other question do we have? Yes, Virginia?

Female voice: You might have no reactions on a question, but what happens when you do a Prehav assessment, and you don't get very much reaction? What error has been ...

What happens to a Prehav assessment when you don't get very much reaction?

Female voice: Hm-hm.

Go on.

Female voice: That's all.

Just that?

Female voice: What error has been made, or what can we do to get it ...

What error has been made?

Female voice: ... so that it will ...

Well, the error could be that you've cleared him! [laughter]
Female voice: ... back up a ways.

Just back up a ways. All right, all right.

You don't get much reaction. Well, there's several things that can happen. And that is that during the entirety of the last run of the last level that you were running, your rudiments were out. That is the most common suppressor of a Prehav assessment. The rudiments have been out during, maybe, hours and hours and hours of the past run. And this has made that level submerge. And now, it is the only level that's alive, and the other levels are not going to react. It's not flat, it's submerged. You see what I mean?

If you run a level with the rudiments out, it's just like doing an assessment with the rudiments out. The level submerges. It drops out of sight. It doesn't go flat. It invalidates.

So you get, number one, your goal can disappear because rudiments are out. Now, we know what to do about that. You put the rudiments in and reassess on the goals list.

Terminal disappears because the rudiments are out. We know what to do about that. All you do is get the rudiments in and reassess on the existing terminals list. You've already got his terminals. Get the rudiments in, go over those, and you'll find the terminal lives up again.

Now, it's just the same with a Prehav level run. You're getting no tone arm action on running the level. And you think it is flat. And you think you had better reassess. And you try to reassess. And you can't get any reaction on the Prehav Scale. Hmmm!  

Female voice: Can you be more specific?

Now, what you've got there is rudiments out. And now the rudiments have not been out just before the assessment. The rudiments have been out all during the run.

Female voice: Mm-hm.

Aha! So, what do you do? You take up every session the person has had on that run, and you put all of the rudiments in – the whole lot. And now you do a reassessment. And either that level will now be alive again, at which time you keep on running it, or you'll have a new level that will pop up, ready for running. Does that answer your question? It's the same in each case.

Female voice: Mm-hm.

It's exactly the same action. Except what you might overlook, is the fact that the rudiments have been out ever since you've started the run.

Female voice: But I got one reaction. And the other times I had had more reaction. Though I'd had four or five levels reacting, well, I got just a tiny tick on one and nothing on anything else. And this was one that had dropped before.

This was one that had dropped before?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

I don't understand the question too tightly here.
Second female voice: Well, what she's worried about is that she says she went through, and she had five levels reacting before.

She had five.

Second female voice: And she found the level, and she ran the level, and she flattened the level. And now she did an assessment again, and she found one level only reacting this time on the E-Meter, and that level stayed in and stayed reacting, didn't it?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

Second female voice: It stayed in.

But that's what's supposed to happen.

Second female voice: I know.

Female voice: No, back up a little bit more. On the last time when I made an assessment and ran the Prehav, well, there were several that dropped. Well, so then I made another assessment. And on this assessment only one level dropped at all.

Well! What is wrong with this?

Female voice: Well, it seems to me like there ought to have been ...

Has the sky been blue all day?

Second female voice: It's all right that way?

I mean, that's the same order of magnitude. You're complaining because the sky's been blue all day.

Female voice: Okay.

That's what you should get.

Female voice: Good.

You shouldn't get anything else, Virginia.

Female voice: I should be so lucky! [laughter]

Yeah. You should be so lucky! There's nothing to sort out. However, if something like that did happen – and I'll tell you something to keep you from worrying. She needs a magnetic compass!

Female voice: I've got problems.

She's got problems. I'll give you something to keep you from worrying. You've assessed the Prehav Scale, and found only one level dropping. You should be so lucky. That's what's supposed to happen. Very often you find four or five levels dropping, you have to sort out the one. But you go into a Prehav Assessment and find just one level dropping. Great! All right. Your work's been done for you. So everything is dandy.

But, I'll give you a stable datum. When in doubt, check rudiments. And that's a good stable datum for anybody to have. You say, "Well, there must be something real wrong with what I have just done. There must be something wrong here, because I've only found the per-
son's goal, and they eventually had just one goal. And then I found their terminal, and they only could have one terminal. And then I found their level, and they only could have one level. There must be something wrong here." Check rudiments for every session you've given the pc.

*Female voice: I could do that.*

Check rudiments for every session you have given the pc, from beginning to end. Just check rudiments all to pieces, in all directions, consistently. And then just find out if those rudiments have been in all the time. And you still only have one goal. And you still only have one terminal. And you still only have ... You've got no choice but to go on clearing the person. All right? All right.

Yes, Bob?

*Male voice: Ron, what are the mechanics involved when a preclear flattens a level? What's happening?*

What are the mechanics involved when a preclear flattens a level?

*Male voice: Yeah.*

It is, everything pertinent to that level has been pulled out of that chain. It doesn't mean you have discharged the whole engram chain or the bank on a terminal, but it means that that – that the significance of that level has now been nulled out of every incident that the pc has contacted while doing a five-way bracket. And it simply means – no more, no less – (let us say, "failed leave") let's say there is no more impulse on the subject of "failed leave." This, however, may leave the whole bulk of an incident. See, a whole incident may be there, and the only thing taken out of it now is "failed leave." You got the idea?

*Male voice: Yes.*

All right. So what we've done, in running Prehav levels, if you get an idea – get a mental image picture here of a whole bunch of picket fences. And here's a picket fence, and then on top of that we'll put another picket fence, and then on top of that we'll put another picket fence, and we call each one of these picket fences an engram.

All right. Each one is the whole Prehav Scale. And each picket there is a level of the Prehav Scale. So we run "failed leave." Well, eventually when the level is flat, in these three picket fences we're not going to find any "failed leave." That's going to be gone. So this many pickets is going to be missing. One picket out of each engram. Got the idea?

*Male voice: Yes.*

All right. Now the way you clear, eventually, is that you just pull all the pickets off all these fences. And, of course, you have run all of the engrams. Now, there's a shortcut way to do it. That's a shortcut, is after you've got these things stirred up and the pc is doing an escape mechanism on these things and really isn't pulling up many pickets, you put the pc wherever the pc was in valence and run that particular fence. And run all the pickets off of the fence but not with all of the levels of the Prehav Scale. "Not-know" runs the whole lot.

Now, don't be amazed if later on when you're running the Prehav Scale, there was one picket left in that engram. He says, "What's this? I thought we ran that." This would be quite
common. "We thought we ran that, and here I am parked at this crossroads." Well, it's gone now.

And you say, "Well, how about parked at the crossroads?"

Well, there's nothing to it now, but there was that part of that engram left of being parked at the crossroad. What you've done is left one picket on the fence. And that is the whole thing. So there would be two systems of running a bank. They're both successful. But independently, taken one from the other, they are not adequate. Neither one is totally adequate for all cases. So you can run both systems.

Now, both systems in combination, are totally adequate for all cases. So you've got the system by which you remove a picket from engram one, a picket from engram two, a picket from engram three and then a picket from – oh, eighteen hundred pickets from the remaining locks, and so forth, that have to do with these things. All right. And that is the end of a level. There's no more postulate of that character left in those pictures.

Next, you take your new level, and you pull all of those pickets out. And then you take a new level, and you pull all those pickets out. And theoretically, at the end of all of this you've pulled all the pickets. And the pc is capable now of blowing pickets faster. So any new bank that shows up, he as-ises it.

All right. Now, that system is one system. And the other system is, you find the person's goal terminal and now find all incidents relating to the terminal. Assess the engrams – this is no level running, you see – assess the engrams necessary to resolve the case and run those as engrams, one after the other. No Prehav levels, see? Run them one after the other, after the other, after the other, and get rid of engram after engram, and lock chain after lock chain. All having to do with that. Well, the odd part of it is, if you did a very good job with that, you would wind up with a Clear.

All the pickets gone, with Prehav levels, you wind up with a Clear. All the engrams gone, with this other type of engram running, you run – you wind up with a Clear. You're addressing the same thing, only there are two different ways to handle them.

The best system is to take both systems and mix them. Use a mixed system. Why?

Well, you use the Prehav runs and that throws the engrams into very plain relief and gets rid of a tremendous amount of locks, and then finds the pc sitting in places that aren't easy for the pc to blow. So we pick up an engram – or two or three – and we run them. Differently or indifferently, it doesn't matter much as long as we get them relatively flat.

Now, we go ahead and go back to Prehav level running and when he hits these pins again, of course, the only thing that's left is something like a card house. And all that's left in there is "faith." See, we didn't hit any "faith" while we were doing an engram run. And we hit "faith" on a general Prehav run, and bang! That is the end of that engram, and he gets the delayed reaction on the benefit you think he should have gotten from having run the engram.

You will very often find yourself sitting around having just run an engram that explains the whole pc's life condition, everything else. We know everything now about the pc.
The pc has run it fully. And they say, "Oh, that's fine." And they don't change very much, they think, and it never really lifted, and so on, and you get kind of disappointed.

All right, you go back to a Prehav level run. And you'll be running along very happily and all of a sudden you've assessed him at "faith" on this terminal, see. And "faith."

The pc will say, "Well, I could have faith in ..." It was an engram with a polar bear, you see. He and the polar bear were fighting over a fish or something. And he has faith in his ability to get this fish away from the polar bear. That's the answer, see. And he'll go ...

You say, "What's happened?"

"It blew up."

"What blew up?"

"Well, that – that whole – you know the engram we were running last week? Well, you know, I hadn't really ever noticed, but I never really did get the fish away from the polar bear, you know? And there's nothing left of this thing. You know, here we are, out on the ice. And you know, ice isn't bad. You know, I'd always figured before it was bad. And fish tastes pretty good, you know? What do you know!"

And you'll get the relief on the Prehav run, after the fact of running the engram, see. Delayed reaction.

So these two systems work to do the same thing. Which is what? Get the pc to confront, as-is and handle his reactive bank.

What actually does happen, is the reactive bank gets confronted and handled, understood and within the realm of control of the pc. As soon as this occurs, he no longer has one. You have a Clear. Okay?

Male voice: Right.

All right. We won't go into the technicality of he's got these things and standing ridges of electronic waves, and they have flow systems connected with them. And that we're really running an electric eel in the first place. There's too – we have too great a stress these days on the scientific balderdash. You know, the ergs and the ohmiwhums go whoom-pa-poom, and now we know something. We don't know anything. Okay?

Yes?

Male voice: Are the Change Processes still being used in auditing – straight auditing – and what is their importance in auditing today?

Well, the Change Processes ... You're asking if they're still being used in auditing and what their status is right now?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Tell you that very briefly.

Simply been relegated to the Prehav Scale. On assessment, you run into Change, you can still move over into the Secondary Scale, and you run it. But you will find that general runs on the Prehav are nowhere near as beneficial as specific runs on the exact terminal of the
pc. In view of this fact, it is actually practically a waste of time, in comparative times of running, to run anything but the pc's terminal.

So the whole idea of Change, Change Processes and everything is still in, but it operates only against the preclear's terminal only at that time when the preclear, in being assessed on the Prehav Scale, gets a reaction on Change. Change is the level, so you run Change. And everything you know about Change is applied to running Change at that level that you find the pc at. Okay? Right.

Yes, ma'am.

Female voice: Ron, can you give me some more data on how to unravel the grouper?
Can we get some more data on how to unravel the grouper? Have you got a grouper? Did you yourself get whammoed into a grouper?

Female voice: I have, but also I've had pcs who have, too.
Has your grouper unraveled?

Female voice: No.
It hasn't?

Female voice: At least I can hope on tonight! [laughter]
Hmm?

Female voice: I hope to have it unraveled tonight.
You hope to have it unraveled tonight. Well, I won't tell you that grouper is one of the most insidious, one of the most horrible, one of the most fantastic ... [laughter]

But I actually will tell you that a grouper can be a thoroughgoing bitch. It is mean. And when you run a pc into a grouper, his apparency is that all time jams. In actuality, he has come up against the whole time jam. He is confronting something.

What is a grouper? A grouper is a number of incidents becoming located, apparently, in one time instant. A number of instances have apparently all occurred in one time instance. So we have a number of incidents located at one point on the track.

Now, I have had pcs say that they felt them all pull in. Or that it all collapsed on them. No, no, no, no and no, no. They ran to that point of the track where it all collapsed on them. But the collapse occurred at another time than it occurred. They think it happened in the session. It actually happened a few million years ago. You get the slight difference here? All right, now that time misnomer, all by itself, would throw a red herring at the pc, and he would be thinking about his grouper having occurred in auditing. When it – as a matter of fact, it didn't occur in auditing.

Now, I'll give you a number of ways of taking apart a grouper. There is no doubt about the fact that groupers are fairly serious breeds of cat. First place, let us look at the anatomy of the grouper before we worry about how to take it apart. Let's find out what we're taking apart. Let's not do the Egyptian stunt of repairing radios before we know that they receive broadcasts. Civilize... I mean, the psychiatrist, the ancient physician, all alike, were guilty of this.
The grouper most commonly is a vacuum. It is a cold installed vacuum. And a grouper is normally found associated with implants. And the person who has a grouper has implanted people.

*Female voice: Oh-ho-ho-ho, ho-ho.*

There you are. Now, that is what that is all about.

Now, I didn't mean to make you ashamed. I see you blushed. Because ...

*Female voice: I ran an incident doing that Saturday.*

You what?

*Female voice: I said I ran an incident doing that. Of implanting people.*

That's what it is. All right.

Now, you have to know what you were doing. What were you doing? Now, that is the main thing. Because, of course, a grouper cannot hang up on a pc unless the pc has done it. A grouper – anything that can mash electricity – the only thing which can mash electricity with a crunch like that or cause an individual to slam pictures into his bank like that is a cold vacuum.

There are many systems of doing this. For instance, the Russians – ha! – talk about brainwashing! Ha! If you wanted to go ... After running into a grouper, it'd be very, very hard to convince the pc that he ought to engage professionally in brainwashing. I think it'd be very difficult to convince somebody that had hit a grouper, that he ought to go ahead and fix himself up for new groupers.

But the way it is done is this way: is all you'd have to do is take a handful of dry ice and throw it – and smash it into the fellow's face and hold it there and that would be that. That's a twenty-second brainwash. He'd have very little memory of what he was doing, his whole bank would collapse and that would be it. Just get a handful of carbon dioxide and smash it into the person's face. That is the way a grouper is done. Now you know.

Now you can – it takes the Russian seventy days and it should take you something on the order of seven seconds. Cold. Cold is an extreme stillness. Time is a temperature. Therefore, you must not run no-motions, in the vicinity of a grouper. You must not run no-motion anyhow, but don't run it particularly in a grouper. Don't start asking somebody who's in a grouper, "Who is that standing there?" Because the only thing in a grouper is supreme no-motion. It is no-motion fringed entirely with motion.

Now of course, the tiniest temperature, such as forty degrees below zero, is hot compared to the vacuum in which a grouper is sitting. Think it over. That's a hot – that'd be a hot day. Because most of these groupers are at the temperature of about minus two hundred centigrade. So you see, forty degrees below zero, Fahrenheit, would be a warm spring day. But that is motion. There is enough motion in that temperature to cause motion and a stable datum. Follow that? That's an unhappy fact.

Look, you look at extreme cold as extreme motionlessness. All temperature is based on the phenomena of motion. If you have motion you have temperature. If you don't have
motion, you don't have temperature. Time is a temperature. If you don't have motion, if you
don't have temperature, you don't have time. This is the way a thetan has got it all figured out.
Now, you understand that?

So if you say extreme coldness equals no motion equals no time, then you will see that
the only thing that you can run in the vicinity of a grouper is motion and time. So a grouper
can be taken apart, laboriously, by motion and time. Do you see how that would be?

All right. This fellow's sitting there in a whole bunch of plastered up pictures and he
can't make any sense out of it whatsoever. Now, the way to get him into it very solidly would
be to say, "When have you been cold? Thank you. When have you been cold? Thank you.
When have you been cold? Thank you. When have you been cold?" It would group and group
and group and it'd be tighter and tighter. And then to vary the agony, say, "All right. What in
that grouper isn't moving? Thank you very much. Is there anything else in the grouper there
that isn't moving? Thank you very much." And he'd really be in the grouper tight. See, you
could actually take somebody and audit him this way, and he'd get tighter and tighter and
tighter into the grouper. You understand that?

Well, understanding that, then the road out of a grouper should be very plain. All you
have to do is ask him about motion, or ask her about motion, and ask them about time. So
questions about motion and time will free any pc from a grouper. But don't consider that it's
necessarily a fast action. It does not necessarily take place in two minutes.

All right. Motion and time will free up a grouper. Now, if we put unknownness in
connection with that, now we really have something interesting in the way of processes, see.
We got time and motion as our basics. Now we're going to add the ingredient of unknowing-
ness. So these three, now, would be a double-barreled whirl devil as far as a grouper was con-
cerned. And we could ask somebody a question of this character about a grouper: we could
say, "When was the time unknown to you?" Yeah, "When was the time unknown to you?"
"What time was unknown? What haven't you known about time? To what person has time
been unknown?" You generally get the most delinquent and procrastinating member of the
family, you see.

It doesn't matter how you phrase these. I'm just giving you the skeletal structure of
commands.

All right. Now, we take motion. And we'll say, "What motion wouldn't you care to un-
dertake?" Now, that will lead in the direction of a grouper. "What motion ..." I mean if you're
processing somebody who has a grouper. "What motion wouldn't you care to undertake?"
Which is the idea of motion and restraint at the same time. Motion and restraint. Motion and
restraint.

All right. That has some workability. Give you another nice one, is, "What motion was
unknown?" And you'll run every surprise the person's ever had. Now, people who are in
grouper are very allergic to surprises. They don't like to be startled. Their hair stands up
straight. When they have long blond hair it reaches the ceiling, practically. They don't like to
be startled.
So, "What motion was unknown?" will produce some of the bitchier, meaner somatics that you have ever had anybody run into. "What motion was unknown?" "What motion was unknown to you?" "What motion was unknown to another?" This kind of thing. And you'll get all sorts of bank phenomena of various kinds. And you'll get a grouper – looks like the grouper's stacking up. And it isn't. All you're doing is running off the instant when it stacked up.

Now, this is what makes a grouper hard to run. Because no matter what you do to it, it looks like it's stacking up. Do you see why? Because you're running a moment when it stacked up. So that every instant that you're running in the grouper looks like an instant – looks like it is stacking up now. There is no time in it. So therefore, the stack-up then is what the pc sees and conceives it to be a stack-up now. So it always looks like the grouper is getting worse. And pcs become very disheartened when they start seeing one of these groupers start going to work. All you have to do is keep running the stack-up.

If you had an idea – I'll give you an idea of what a grouper looks like to a pc. But this is a rather poor view of it. We've got an art gallery. We've got an art gallery. The Corcoran, the Metropolitan, some such art gallery, and you got pictures all over the walls, everywhere. And there's a fountain in the middle of the art gallery. And suddenly and mysteriously, every picture flies off the walls and hits the fountain and sticks. And you have nothing on the fountain but a mound of pictures.

Now, having hands and a truck, it would be very easy to pick up these pictures. So to get a little more sense into this grouper idea, we have to go just a little bit further. If, after they all flew off the walls and hit the fountain and laid there in a pile, the fountain then began to spurt permanent glue and was left to do so for some years; we now go back to the fountain to pick up the pictures and put them back on the wall. And that's about the way the pc looks – to it – it looks to him, you know. And he says, "This would be the grimmest thing that ever happened to me. This is terrible."

The horror of it is, is he thinks it happened in the session. See? It looks to him like it happened in the session. Why, he triggered the incident, didn't he? In the session, didn't he? It's obvious. Didn't he? Only, of course, he didn't trigger the incident in the session, he ran into an incident where all the pictures were flying into the fountain. And he ran into this in session, and because it's got timelessness, he gets fooled at once.

Now, if you wanted to relieve the pc of having run the grouper, you would run the auditor that ran into the grouper, and you'd run the session out. And the grouper would disappear. And then the pc would get audited, very carefully, by somebody else, and the grouper would appear. And the person would think that this collapse again occurred in this next session. And of course, it never occurred in the session at all. You see where we're going now?

Now, if you wanted to free up a grouper, all you have to do is find the picture the pc isn't grouped in. And run it. Don't keep running the pc through the grouper. Find another picture. Because although you will find there's a grouper, there are other pictures north and south of the grouper in which the pc is in valence and which will run. So you rehabilitate the pc's confidence in the ability to run a picture. And eventually the grouper itself will work out.
What does a grouper look like? Well, I've just told you. In action, that is the way it looks. But how is the engram – what is the actual engram which contains a grouper? The actual engram – well, I have personal acquaintance with one of them. A rocket jockey lying on a bed being hit by electronic rays. He's strapped down to this bed, and he's being hit by electronic rays so as to disabuse any further idea of him exteriorizing and going out and running one of those confounded planes that's been strafing the capital so regularly. Get the idea? They want him pinned, and they want him there, and that's it. And they do an implant.

Well, he thinks he is being hit by moving rays. Where, as a matter of fact, they move in a cold vacuum on him and plow it straight into his body. And of course a thetan doesn't move out of that very easily. Particularly, if he's done it. See that?

All right. So you'd have an incident where the person was actually – the incident, really, is a person lying on a bed with pictures flying at him. All you got to do is keep the pc's attention on the bed, not the pictures.

If you're going to run the grouper, find out where the pc is located in the grouper – whether as a person who was administering groupers (the overt), which is the better one to run, or the motivator (lying on a bed) – and then keep his attention on that.

All right. "What don't you know about that patient?" See? Not "What don't you know about his pictures?" or "... your pictures?" or something like that. "What don't you know about that patient?" or something of the sort. Now, all this is very interesting. Not very serious. You can unbale – I have seen this done; I have subjective reality on this – you can unbale a grouper by running ARC Straightwire. "Recall an ARC break. Thank you. Recall an ARC break. Thank you. Recall an ARC break. Thank you. Recall an ARC break. Thank you." And the person will unstack right down to the actual incident in which the grouper occurs. That is an old process that happens to do this exact trick. "Recall an ARC break." Doesn't matter what time or place they're recalling the ARC break, they will eventually wind up in the grouper because that is an ARC break to end all ARC breaks.

All right. So you could unstack the case and find the case lying there.

And now your auditing must be very careful. And you must go on running, "Recall an ARC break." Don't go switching it off just because you've found the incident. Flatten "Recall an ARC break," while having spotted where the grouper is. Don't go Q-and-Aing. Just because you run into an incident, don't ever stop the auditing session and run the incident and then run a little more Prehav, and then he runs into another incident, so you decide you'd better run that incident. Aww! That is – that is for the birds.

Run what you're running according to your plan. And when you have flattened it, now take up what has happened, perhaps in the next session. Got the idea? That's the way you audit.

You always assess engrams. You never at any time run an engram just because it seems hot, or the pc seems to be in it, or something like this. You assess them. If the E-Meter says so, they can be run. If the E-Meter reacts, the engram can be run. If the E-Meter doesn't react, the E-Meter is right, the engram can't be run. No reaction, no run. So you always assess engrams. You never switch off in the middle of a Prehav run to do this.
Now, you're in a rather deep and complicated subject when you're into the subject of groupers, because it has to do with the fact that somebody's collapsed a bank on somebody with a thud. It has happened to everybody. And there's practically everybody who has got a grouper at one time or another. And it needn't become fashionable. The truth of the matter though, it requires good, well-skilled auditing to handle this kind of thing.

Just in the common course of human events, a grouper would come apart anyplace. But the first rule I would lay down on it is, don't run the grouper. You can uncover it, that's all right, and so forth. Don't bother with it. Find an engram that the pc can run and get the pc to run it. Because the pc can be moved out of that grouper area as easily as out of any other engram. But a pc is so fixated on it, and a pc believes so implicitly it happened right in the session when they were being audited, that they say that the session should cure it. And that, of course, is what is intended when you're implanting people: that if they ever run into it, they're not going to get out of it.

Now, what kind of person applies groupers? Almost anybody in space opera is liable to one fine day take his finger off his number and decide that the enemy's habit of exteriorizing from bodies shot down, and going back and picking up a doggone Woolworth second-hand body, and picking up another scout craft and coming over and attacking again with all of his information must cease.

So space opera very commonly develops practices by which the enemy is made to forget. Forget what? Well, that's very essential because after you've captured somebody or shot him down in your operational area, of course, he knows it. And if he simply flies out of his ruddy 'ead and goes back to base and picks up another body, he'll bomb you out of existence. This kind of thing was quite common on the track. All right. Sounds pretty wild, but it nevertheless was very common. Far commoner than being a streetcar conductor.

Now, the answer was specialized implanting. And it became very, very specialized. Now, what is the most antipathetic thing about space? It is cold. And the next most antipathetic thing about space? Female voice: Black.

Hm? What?

Female voice: It's black as tar.

You see? You get what it is. So you just take the elements that the – space opera doesn't like, and you put all those things together, and you've got a grouper, a very nice one. Naturally, somebody's sitting in a scout craft all by himself, and it's only two and a half years to the next system, you see, and he's being sent over there, and he sits there for two and a half years. He'll start to self-audit whether he likes it or not. Yeah! The only memories he's got, the only thing he can see, you see, is his own pictures. And he'll pull his own pictures around, and so forth.

And then space itself does a lot of brainwashing You're hoppity-guppitting along at umpteen light-years per whump, and there's a meteorite shower.
Well, the manufacturers were very good. They were very good, reliable people, but remember it was war when this craft was built, so there is no shock absorbers for meteorites in the nose. And the windscreens, and so forth, have nothing like a double panel. And you're traveling at such fantastic rates of speed that when you hit the meteorite shower, all you know about it is that you are in space someplace, probably falling quietly into a sun. One moment you were traveling at three light-years per *oomph*, and the next moment, why, you were falling into the sun. And you hardly know what the hell happened.

Well, what the hell happened is that the meteorites came through the ship with a *whoosh*, you see, and even though they missed you, they took all the air out of the ship. They took everything out of the ship. And having done so, they let in this tremendous cold.

Now, what becomes very interesting is, is the meteorite is very often hot when it does this. It was cold a moment ago, but it has just hit, remember, a very fast traveling object. And the disintegration of the meteorite and the disintegration of the object, alike, have heat. So it's nothing to be standing on a ship and be hit with a red-hot object, after which you're instantly very cold because space is cold. Red-hot, ice-cold. Boom-boom. And they're not a split second apart. You couldn't even measure the microseconds, you see, of difference between them. All right, that makes a nice, hefty engram. It makes a nice one. It makes a lovely one.

Well, of course, when they start really implanting the boys, they naturally will ARC break it as much as they can, because that really makes it stick. They make it betrayal. And they tell this fellow, "Now, you have a good rest, because we're going to exchange you tomorrow. And you can go home, only we're having a hard time putting your ship together, you see, because it was so badly shattered by our ack-ack. And you have a good rest, and so forth. And here's a book to read on our ideology, and so on. And when you get back home..." They build him all up, you see. "And here's some nice electronic soup to eat, and you're a nice boy and a whale of a fellow." And the chaplain usually comes in and talks to him about his soul. And it's all wonderful, you see. And he's just in this beautiful mood, where these fellows are the princes, they're just the princes of space. He really – they've almost won, if they only knew it, you see. And so he stretches out on his bed with a deep, relaxed yawn, and a panel drops on the other side of the wall, and red-hot soup hits him. Which then turns ice-cold, and there goes his bank.

Now, what he never knows is whether or not he is hit by pictures created by them or created by him. That's what he doesn't know. Are they his pictures or their pictures? Well, he thinks he's being hit with an assortment of pictures. Why is he being hit with an assortment of pictures? Well, they're all of the same class. Well, he's in that kind of a circumstance, isn't he. So the pictures he's mocking up actually are all of a class. They'll be something like 180 pictures of deaths stacked up on 180 pictures of wrecked ships stacked up on something else, and he's sure that somebody shot these pictures at him.

Well, this is a nice trick, because he disowns them. He says, "They're not my pictures." Well, who the hell else was around there making pictures? Just him! So another characteristic of the grouper is that it's totally disowned, and the preclear is totally irresponsible for it.
Now, he dramatizes this irresponsibility by saying it happened in the session. He dramatized the irresponsibility by saying he can do nothing about it. Don't you see, all these things add up together. Because these things, when they are vicious, always go in as an ARC break, the ARC break — "Recall an ARC break" process unstacks one, and so on.

If you worry about them too much, you're at fault, because the pc who is in a grouper can be run, I assure you, in many other incidents which will react on the E-Meter, and you needn't pay any attention to the grouper at all. A grouper is a grouper. And sooner or later the pc will fall wise to the fact that while being a space jockey, or something of the sort, he was one fine day recruited as part of the propaganda corps. And he was supposed to take the little people they were fighting and lure them in by some kind of statements or another, so that they walk straight into a red-hot electronic cauldron which goes ice-cold, and then they don't go back and pick up new bodies and keep the war going. And sooner or later, you'll run into some kind of an implant like this.

I see I have certain people present who don't like this idea at all. [laughter] Well, why get emotional about it, I always say. It's just a space opera. It's not real. There's really nothing to it. Of course man has never lived before. We know that. He's never been up in space before. These, by the way, are just the common defenses of people stuck in space opera.

You get some fellow telling me that he never under God's green earth would read that trash called science fiction. I'll say, "Okay, get the idea of implanting somebody," and leave him in a grouper. I mean, it's easy. [laughs] Scientologists should not be antagonized. [laughs, laughter] You have too many weapons.

Anyway, I repeat, the best advice is to find an incident the pc can run, and run it very nicely. And all of a sudden, light will dawn and bells will ring, and so on. Of course, the keynote of any grouper is not-knowingness.

Now, a grouper that turns on with a hell of a somatic accompanying it, is another horse of a different hue. So this grouper turns on and it's — the pc finds it uncomfortable. All right, so it's uncomfortable. But the grouper turns on and starts ripping a hole in his stomach — I don't mean this literally, but it sure feels like it, something of this sort — and it is hot and it is heavy, and he does not like any part of it — Ohhhhh! — I can give you a process, fortunately, which happens to handle this exact circumstance that applies only to a grouper and applies only to one that is running hot and heavy, with a heavy somatic. A special case. And that is, "What was unknown about that pain?" Interesting target, isn't it? "What was unknown about that pain?"

And before I give a — get off this subject — you'll find out that's good anyhow. That's an awfully good assist. All by itself. It's that pain. It's the one he's got right now; that's the only one you're interested in. You're not interested in what was unknown about pain, because you've got the whole track flying now. It's just that pain.

And on this same subject, allied to it: A pc who is suffering a tremendously fixed attention, as he is in a grouper, becomes very hard to audit. And if the pc has gone into an incident, which is a grouper, and then you are trying to audit the pc, you may have a time on your hands. You may have a bit of trouble on your hands keeping the person in-session and not
recognize that you have a pc in a grouper. And the pc has a horrendous somatic of some kind
or another.

    Well, it's time to investigate what the pc is in. And if it is this action of there's pictures,
pictures, pictures all over the doggone place. They're all plastered up a la art gallery, and it's
all gone black, and that's what happened and God knows, it's all terrible, and so forth. Then
you use these same mechanisms that you use to take the grouper apart. Okay? Use the same
mechanisms I've just given you. If he is in a serious somatic condition this other one handles
it. "What about that pain was unknown?" or "What is unknown about that pain?"

    Now, you must have this datum with regard to running engrams: How did the engram
chain come up? How did it come up? Why are you handling this particular engram?

    Well, let's not try to look it up in the encyclopedia. You were running a terminal,
weren't you? So a continuous mistake that could be made in running engrams is to forget that
they are on a terminal chain and to run them as "you," "you," "you," "you," "you." "What
don't you know about that picture?" You get the idea? Because remember, you're running a
terminal chain, here. The only reason the thing came up is because of terminal. Well, you are
now trying to get the pc, as "you," to run something which is a package called a valence. And
I've already told you the reason you're running valences is because the pc has disowned the
somatics and so forth, of the valence.

    So if you remember this when you are running engrams, you will get into much less
trouble: that the engram is actually the engram of the valence in which the pc is. And there-
fore, therefore and thereby and thereunto, you should mention the valence while you're run-
ing engrams.

    Well, all right, we get fifteen engrams. The pc's been in and out of fifteen engrams;
we're running Prehav Scale on "a looper". And now we sort these engrams out very carefully,
and we find out which one falls the most, and now we run it all as "you." Does that seem odd
to you? Now that you look at it, does it seem odd to you? He – you found it by running a
looper. You were running a looper, "faith in a looper." "How could you have faith in a
looper?" you know, and so on. And now you've got fifteen engrams sorted out. Well, of
course, they are the engrams of what? They're not the engrams of the pc, except secondarily.
They're the engrams, primarily, of a looper.

    So we would have to remember this if we wanted an engram to free up. And although
we can of course use "you" copiously, in running the engram – "What don't you know?" or
"What wasn't known to you? What wasn't known to others?" and so forth – for heaven's sakes,
let's mention a looper. "What wasn't known to a looper in that engram?" See? Saying that was
the terminal – just so I won't restimulate you, because I'm sure none of your terminals are a
looper.

    So you get the idea? Now, this also applies to running one of these groupers. Not
"How would you get such a grouper?" but "How would a looper get into one?" Got the idea?
"Now, just how would a looper go about getting himself in that kind of a fix? All right. What
wouldn't a looper know about it?" See? "How would a looper get somebody into that kind of a
fix?" "What would a looper make unknown about such a thing?" Got the idea? So use that
terminal when you is running engrams and you will get a faster run and you won't have quite so much trouble.

Now, I'll give you a much more serious situation with regard to a grouper. Somebody is run into a grouper that you do not have the goal or terminal of. Aah! Or you pick up a pc off the street and he is in one and you don't know his goal or terminal. Now, what are you going to do about that? That's pretty grim. Isn't that terrible? He's obviously in a grouper. It's all black and the pictures are plastered all over, and you don't know his goal and you don't know his terminal, and what can you do about that? ...Come on, tell me.

Huh?

Female voice: ARC Straightwire?

Huh?

Male voice: You find his goal and terminal first?

Yeah, that's right, you find his goal and terminal, of course. You're not in the business of running groupers. And a grouper has nothing whatsoever to do with finding a pc's goal and terminal. You can find them in people with groupers and snoopers. It doesn't matter.

Almost on a dare, I'd – if insane asylums were open to human beings and other – and people and so forth, if I could – I used to have a collar that was on backwards. Used to put a collar on backwards and had a card printed, "Reverend Witherspoon," and used to go in to console the dear, dead benighted, and so on. I should exhume this celluloid collar. I suppose it's still in good condition. Because I think you could probably find the goal and terminal on every person in that institution, just whimity-bam. I imagine they'd just audit like a well-oiled dream. Because you can run engrams on them, why couldn't you find a goal and terminal? Ought to be very easy.

No, if you find somebody whose case is all jammed up and has been jammed up this way in former auditing, they tell you – in other words, they've run into a grouper on the track – what should you do? Q-and-A with a pc, or go about your job of auditing? That's right, always.

So, it works out similarly. Similarly, if you've got somebody's goal and terminal, don't neglect the fact that you have the person's terminal in trying to undo a grouper, see. And you would say, "Where would a looper go to get warm?" Be almost a lead-pipe question on a grouper, because of course its basis is cold. And he gets cold, all over. He has this – chilled!

You in England are very lucky. You don't have restimulative weather. [laughter] All the same, all the same. We have very nice, mild weather. No snowstorms in the summer, none in the winter to amount to anything. No sunshine in the winter, none in the summer to amount to anything. [laughs, laughter]

Actually, we did very well this last past summer, I was very proud of the climate. We did very, very well. Only gone through a couple of hurricanes lately, and Carla is still to come. Carla will be here about the 2nd of October, I think. I was calculating her speed. But I – that was many days ago, and she may have changed course since then. And it wouldn't be so
bad if it was still carrying some of the furniture, and so forth, from the gulf coast, but uh ...

[laughter]

All right. Now, I've given you a very long and arduous dissertation on this, and actually there's quite a great deal to know about it. I hope you don't treat this information lightly because a grouper is an interesting phenomenon. It is one of the many phenomena of the track, and it is an interesting thing. But it is cold! It's cold in there! And you say to somebody, "Now, how cold have you ever been? Recall another time you've been cold. Good, good." If you ran that long enough, they'd almost certainly wind up in a grouper.

Okay. Time for one more question. I guess I've overwhumped you. [laughter] People are looking rather sick. People are looking rather sick and ill and pale. One more question.

*Female voice: How would you go about cleaning up every session a guy's ever had?*

How would you go about cleaning up every session a person has ever had? Well, in view of the fact the auditing track is not a very long track, that's a very easy thing to do. If you simply ran the ARC break process which you now have in the present rudiments, you'd clean the lot. Okay?

It's interesting sometime to take off the auditing by whatever means or process. We had a student one time, in Washington, in the Academy, that was auditing somebody, and came down with measles. And he was promptly and immediately rushed to the nearest sawbones, and the sawbones couldn't find any measles. He looked around but the pc was not "measing" very much. And it finally came down to my desk, and I said, "Hey, hey, hey, hey!" I just said "Let's see, what was he doing two or three days ago?" And they said, "So and so," and I said, "Well, run the session off." And so they got hold of him, and ran him running the session, I think, or something like that, and the measles disappeared within the hour.

Measles seem to be something that goes into very easy restim. I notice in old Dianetics – I've had a letter from somebody that picked up the book, read, I think, half of the first chapter and then audited his wife. Ran her into measles, and she was instantly taken to the hospital with measles. Only the doctor couldn't find any measles. And she was all broken out, and three to ten days later why it all ceased and she didn't have measles anymore.

It's of interest to get off an auditing session where something like that has occurred. Now it sounds like auditing is dangerous, doesn't it? Well, actually, it usually passes out. If – what's restimulated by auditing is much more easily restimulated by life. And let me point this out, that there isn't any auditor presence as he's walking through life. That's the only reason that you should be good auditors is because it's very easy to do things that life will restimulate.

Okay? Anybody particularly worried about these groupers? Well, I'll tell you, you should be worried about these groupers. The idea of going on down there... In the first place the whole war started in fun. There was nothing much to it. They were just blasting a few cities and – you know, it – as fellows will – and there was no sense in getting serious like this about it. And then picking those poor prisoners of war and sticking them in that room.

*Female voice: Well, what happened to them after that? [laughter] That's what I want to know.*
Well, they just kind of threw them out on the trash heap. I had an instance of that character. Not a fellow who was given an implant, but a fascinating instance. It's the funniest engram I think I'd ever run into.

Fellow was in a spaceship, and it had hit something or other. He'd gotten shot up and the cold air had gotten in or something of the sort, or the cold lack of air. The air had been let out and the cold had come in. And anyway he'd been orbiting around as commonly happens in a space wagon. And he'd been orbiting around, not minding his own business but with nothing to think of, nothing to do, and plastered up against the side of the spaceship.

So finally a rescue team – you know, like one of these Air Rescue Squadrons they have up in Alaska or something – spotted this ship orbiting around before it ran into a sun and warmed him up for good. And they picked him up, and he was still in his body, you see – doll body. And, of course, the rescue team didn't pay any attention to this and didn't test for this or anything else, [laughs] but salvaged his shoes, you see, which were these magnetic, walk-on-the-hull-and-don't-drift-off, put-out-by-the-Little-Bide-a-Wee Space Jockey Society authority stamp. A good spacing seal of approval, you know. And they took off his shoes, and the rest of it was just so much scrap tin can, and threw it over the side. He was still in it. And this pc just went on and on and on about his shoes. [laughter] And by George, we just couldn't get him unfixed from those shoes. And it seems like ever since he'd had trouble with shoes, you see. He had trouble buying shoes; he had trouble in getting shoes fitted, he had – shoes, shoes, shoes, shoes. That's how serious it all was. Left a terrible trauma about shoes.

You say what happens to them afterwards. Well, they throw them on the garbage dump, or they do something like this, and don't very often suspect the guy is exteriorized.

Very often when a guy's been hit like this, if the intentions were right, he wanders away from his basic team. Or he doesn't go back to his base. He feels very degraded, so he shoves off and gets on another planet someplace and becomes a juvenile delinquent.

You'll find after a severe battle you'll find people in space activities feeling very degraded and so forth. And they can't explain why, and they'll tell you that space is very degrading, and so forth. Well, yeah, they just blew up a planet or fortifications and cities and fields, and they've just chewed up Lord knows how many people, and then they wonder why they feel degraded, you know? Silly things.

But you should cheer up about a grouper of that character. [laughter] You should cheer up on it. Because if anything is calculated to release a lot of memory, it's one of these things taken apart.

Now, that's no invitation to get into one; that's no invitation to run one or otherwise, but they just are what they are.

You'll also find out that all the other phenomena mentioned in Dianetics are present in engrams. There are bouncers, there are call-backs. You get a guy to the end of the incident, and he's at the beginning of the incident, and you say how the hell did he get there? Well, he's got a call-back at the beginning of the incident. Usually, however, serious engrams have these
There'll be somebody at the beginning of the engram who's making this sort of a motion, see. And he gets to the end of the track, and all of a sudden he remembers that, and he goes back to the beginning of the thing. And he gets to the end, and he goes back to the beginning. Finally you see this guy waving, you know, tell him to come on. Or he thinks he ought to leave, and it's nothing more than an open door in front of him. You're running him on down the line, all of a sudden he isn't in the incident. And you say, "What happened?" and, "What happened?"

And he'd say, "Well, nothing."

"Well, what happened just a moment ago?"

"Well, I was running down this thing, and – oh, there's that door!" You see? [laughter]

It's an invitation to leave. So he bounces. Bouncers, groupers, call-back, denyers. This idea of "there's nothing here" can be expressed in various ways. And the guy will run through something, and part of it's blank. And he'll go on through to the end of the thing. And then he'll finally recover a piece of it. And it's some symbol to the effect "there is nothing here," you know. Or somebody has disappeared at that point and he Qs-and-As with it. And so that part of the engram is, of course, missing.

There's all kinds of oddities in running these things – phenomena, phenomena. You can get phenomena-happy about the whole thing. You follow the rules, you'll get out of it.

I am happy to be able to say a word or two about groupers. I have very intimate acquaintance with groupers. And they're a little bit hard to run, occasionally, but the main reason they are, is just those reasons: The person thinks it turned on in the session. It didn't. He thinks it's some other kind of engram. It isn't. It's just an engram. But pictures accumulate to it, so it's in a confusion as to what picture do you run. See, if there's five thousand pictures flying around in the air, well, which picture do you run to run it? Well, instead of worrying about it, why, go find another picture.

And the basis of them are cold. The only thing that can hold anything together like that is motionlessness with an exclamation point.

You know the trick, don't you, of directing the pc's attention to the motion beyond something he is stuck at. Now, I heard a remark here the other day by an auditor that demonstrated they didn't know this, that this was not known. Said all we could find there was a picture of somebody standing still. And I don't think they ran it, because that wasn't adequate. Well, there was a picture of somebody standing still. Well, all the auditor would have had to have done when he found this still picture is just say, "What motion is going on behind the picture?" and all hell would have broken loose. Because the only reason you get a severe "still" is because there is a tremendous motion. And the pc will always look at the "still" and ignore the motion. So if you just put the pc's attention on the motion in that zone or area, the "still" will disintegrate.
People who have still pictures are not "stuck on the track" but withdrawing from motion. And the "still" is a remedy for the motion. So the pc will always take refuge in something that is motionless when the pc believes that the motion is too much for them. And remember, all pain is motion.

All pain is motion. So in painful incidents, you find the plethora of motionless pictures. And you'll find them stuck, stuck, stuck, stuck, stuck. You run him two feet and he's got another stuck picture, and so forth – some holdup. Well, what's the holdup? Well, you've got to direct the pc's attention to the zones and areas of motion. That's all. Just direct his attention to it.

I'll give you a subjective example of this. The Egyptian area is one of the worst for anybody to get anywhere near because it's confusing and violates their beliefs. Why? Because Egypt was space opera from one end to the other. And you'll have somebody standing there on a pyramid, and he's very worried about his cloak blowing open because it exposes – might expose the butt of his ray gun. And he says, "Well, uh – cloak – ray – ray gun. Well, that has nothing to do – I must have a collapsed series of pictures here, or I must be in some kind of a state, because this doesn't agree with any reality that I've been taught in the history books."

Actually, Egypt was a battleground between two space groups, and they set up all this nonsense one way or the other, and all the supermagic, and all that kind of thing. So every once in a while you even find a – you'll even find a science fiction writer trying to run back the coming of Christ to space opera or something. He's just talking straight out of his bank, you see? Marvelous what these fellows will actually pick up.

But the sum and total of this is, it's such a disagreement. It disagrees with the history books. It disagrees with everything and it's sort of got the guy – every – he's – reality is being violated, violated, violated, violated.

So it's these areas of violated reality which give you all kinds of trouble, because the pc doesn't feel that this is very good. And he doesn't feel that he's playing it straight. And he feels the pictures must be dub-in, and he invalidates himself, and all kinds of wild things go on. Where, as a matter of fact, if he just sat there and ran the picture that's turned up, and so on, that would be that. He would come through it on the other end, and then you'd know what the whole thing was all about.

Well, anyway, with that little preamble, I was being run one day on books. And all of a sudden encountered the fact that the Greeks had books. Well, this is not generally known, of course, they've disintegrated these many years, and nobody has anything to do with a Greek book. They don't exist anymore. But actually they were books. They had little wooden covers, and a wooden spine, and they had a printing system. And the printing system consisted of having a bunch of slaves with the alphabets, and the fellow would read these things out, and they'd hand another guy the letter and he'd stamp it, and they'd read out another word and they'd stamp it, and finally they'd get a block print set up. It'd be a block in a frame, and they'd crowd the thing together, and then they would take a piece of papyrus, and so on, which was quite available to them at the time, and they'd spread it over the top of this, inked, and they'd roll it down with a roller and that was a page of the book, and they would then put it in the
book. They're kind of hand-made books. They're making a thousand copies of this thing, "Manual for How to Get Along with Alexander," or something. [laughter]

They would put them one after the other, make them up, and then they'd break this form apart, you see, because these were carved letters. Well, they were all out of wood, the books were out of papyrus, nobody ever preserved one, they've never come forward to present time.

So it's quite startling to find yourself sitting in a Greek garden reading a book, don't you see? This must be dead wrong, you know?

So anyhow, that – I got that all cleared up, and said now, "What do you know, there are books in Egypt. Only the Egyptian system of printing went this way." And you know, the Egyptian system of printing suddenly turned up, and I remembered what that was.

And, of course, that was all pictograph, and so it was a very complicated printing system. Fantastic printing system. You had to have a whole bunch of slaves. And they all stood around great trays of various kinds, so classes of pictographs were arranged according to tray. And a reader would sit up on a platform and he would read a word, and the slave – you see there were thousands of these pictographs – and a slave that had that type of pictograph in charge, see, he would pick it up, and he'd join the circle. And he'd just stand in line, and actually your words were all in line in a number of slaves. But they'd bring them in and they'd put them in the form. And as the slaves would come by they'd keep putting them in the form. And then when you had the frame, you made it up just the way the Greeks did. And you'd ink the face of these pictographs, and you'd run it off on a piece of – so on, and so on.

And I got looking this over and I said, "This is very funny, because you'd think they'd have more light." And what started worrying me, the picture wasn't moving. I'd got into a stuck picture, which was quite unusual for me. And I'd go on, about the printing. Yeah, but printing what? And for this thing to be this stuck, must have been a lot of not-knowingness there. Well, they were printing the orders of the day. For who? Well, for the invader force. The orders of the day. And this was a printing shop that was publishing space orders for issue to space agents operating in Egypt.

Of course, the second that I started realizing something like that, I said, "Space opera. Well, hell, back of this picture there must be the wildest motions that anybody ever heard of." So I just put my attention on the other side of the picture and, of course, that was the end of the print shop, that was the end of everything else, and here we were out there in a good, solid, lovely battle.

The pharaoh had just died, you see, so the boys from the other side wanted to get their candidate in quick, you know. And we wanted to get our candidate in quick, and everything was going off in the usual bombastic fashion, and right there out in the Valley of the Dead, why, you had some boys in khaki uniforms blowing the living pants off of everybody else they could see and anything that moved. And then the funeral procession was coming, so everybody in the battle by common agreement had to pack it up and get the hell out of there, because you didn't dare let the public in on it. You talk about secrecy, man, that was secrecy!
Well, there's a nice, calm subject – books. Pc feels very scholarly about it all, you see. And there is a stuck picture. And then, of course, somewhere in the vicinity of that stuck picture there must be action. And the second he spots the action, all is explained. And, of course, this type of action is a very deep level of don't-know. Nobody must know about it, and as a matter of fact, except Scientology, I don't think anybody ever does, right up to present time.

But they're now flooding the palace of Thebes.

Female voice: Yeah.

And the location of this particular print shop was on the – in back of the lowest dungeons of the print shop. And anybody coming in would, of course, go through all of the prisoners, all of the cells, they'd pass through the lot (and a smelly lot it was), and then they'd get to the back end of the thing and they would run into the telecommunication system to the space command – and the print shop. And I'm sure it is still there. I'm sure it's still there.

But they're flooding it, and I don't know whether that's bad or good. Because think of the horrible shock historians would get. Think of the histories that would have to be rewritten if historians started to tell the truth.

So you see, the picture is held in place by an avoidance of motion or a not-knownness on the subject of motion, and that is what holds a picture in place, and that is all that holds a picture in place. And if you want to look for stickers, or somebody says, "Stay there," in a picture, that isn't really good enough. You don't audit that. You audit the motion which made the picture stick. You got the idea?

You always audit the motion, never audit the "still," and that is one of the basic rules of auditing today: *Always audit the motion, never audit the "still."* As an auditor then, always call for the motion. Always call for the heat. Never call for the "still" and never call for the cold. And your pc will be kept very nicely out of groupers.

Okay? Well, I said I'd give you a short one today, and almost kept my word. That's it. Thank you.
SMOOTHNESS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on 21 September 1961

Thank you.

Well, this is 21 September, 1961 and you, I trust, are a little closer to Clear – I trust. This is not grading a great probability about it because, after all, something that's been going on for the last – I don't know, when were you Clear last? About two hundred trillion years ago? Something like that? Well, it's been going on for this long, I suppose you can suffer with it a while longer. I suppose.

But unfortunately you won't have to and if your auditing would just improve, why, you would find that it would be of mutual assistance for your auditing to get better. So this is a – not a demand, you understand, but just a pathetic little plea for your auditing to get better. [laughter] I see Bob, here, is taking that bad. Your auditing isn't perfect either. Yeah. Nor is mine. Once in a blue moon, you find yourself taking your finger off your number.

But I will say this, I will say this, I take my finger off my number less often than you do. And there are some of you going in the direction of perfection to such a degree, however, that you find it difficult to achieve mediocrity. Now, those are bitter words, but if you keep going in the direction of perfection, absolute, never errored perfection, you're going to miss that interstate known as mediocrity or even passable. Do you get what I'm driving at?

The fellow who keeps hammering in there about perfection all the time – you know, they've got to have – the auditor who sits there saying, "Well, I'm – now I've got to get this acknowledgment across. Well, what am I going to do? Well, let's see now, I had better get this order across to him. Now, let's see, was that too Tone 40? No, I guess that wasn't too Tone 40. Figure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure-figure." See, he isn't auditing the pc. See?

And I would rather you did a personalized job on the pc first and a technical perfection second. You got the idea? And then all of a sudden you'll get some horrendous win or other, you'll find out you can do it and then you'll find out that it's very easy.

The wrong way to you can go at this, you know. You can say, "You have got to be perfect before you can do anything for the pc," and you sit there giving a session being too perfect and then nothing happens with the pc. But of course, you aren't auditing the pc, you're auditing your own auditing. You see how that can work?

No, audit the pc. The pc comes first. And all you want is a majority of rightness, that's all. Just be right more often than you're wrong and you'll get there. It's as simple as that. It's the percentages. Auditing – the percentages are rather cruelly high. You have to be about 92 percent right. Life you only have to be 51.
But what I tell you is true, that the pc forgives anything but no-auditing. A pc doesn't forgive no-auditing. And if he has a problem that is bugging him or bothering him or he's worried about something or other and the auditor is mainly worried about the ritual, you've got the source of the bulk of ARC breaks.

The auditor is so worried about the ritual; worried about, "Let's see, is it the sensitivity knob that's supposed to move? Or let's see, I guess you take the reading at the sens... you know, the sensitivity knob on my meter hasn't fallen ever since I started the Security Check." [laughter]

And the auditor is so, so, so concerned about what he is doing, that the pc never has an opportunity to impart the fact that he's worried as hell. The pc never forgives it, see? Because the pc is sort of talking to a bundle of technology, not a person. And with – the pc finds himself talking to a bundle of technology, he goes out of session.

So auditing comes first, you see, and technology comes second. And that's all very well for you to say, because it will be used here and there as an excuse to do very horrible auditing. You see, you get me both ways. I mean, I can't be right along all these lines, but the point is that the pc sits ... This kind of a situation is quite common in an auditing session: pc comes in, he's bubbling over with the fact that he's just been shot by a howitzer and the auditor sets up the E-Meter and adjusts the cans and adjusts the needle and tells him to sit there, and then starts in and asks him if it's all right to begin a session and so on, and all it looks to the pc like he's being denied auditing. That's all it looks to him, no matter what the auditor's doing.

Pc meets you in the hall and says, "I've just been shot with a howitzer." Well, don't say, "What do you know!" and then go through the technology of starting a session. The pc is already – by imparting this horrendous piece of information to you – has already announced the fact that he is already in-session. It's obvious, because he's considering you the auditor and that's all you're trying to achieve with your ritual – is to get him to recognize you as the auditor. Well, if he's already done so, what the hell, man? What the hell?

So he meets you in the hall and says, "I've just been shot by a howitzer." And you say, "Well, where?" and "How was that?" and so on. And steering him gently by the shoulders, steer him into the chair, and "Where was this howitzer? Where did it hit you? Oh, yeah. Well, have howitzers ever been a problem to you before? You may have a habit of being hit by howitzers in some fashion." "All right, well, what do you know about that! And this howitzer – how big was this howitzer?"

"Oh, 55 millimeter."

"Oh, well, that's a pretty big howitzer. All right. How do you feel about that now?"

"Oh, I don't know, I feel a little better about it."

"Well, all right. Now, let's recall the first time you were ever hit by one of these howitzers. Well, all right," and so forth. "All right, recall another time. Okay. Now, how does it seem to you?"

"Well, it's better."
"All right, now you think we can get on with the session? All right now?"

"Yeah, I think we can."

"All right, what goals would you like to set now?"

Your rudiment was reversed end to, wasn't it? Rudiments should have been in one place, but the pc was in-session. It's a delicate line between a Q and A and that sort of thing, but you're liable to go right on through to the end of the session and he never discovers that you've never started one. You obviously start one the moment that you steered him toward the auditing chair.

And the technical question comes up: When does the session start? Well, the session starts when the pc recognizes that he has an auditor — that's when a session starts. Pc recognizes that he has an auditor and goes into session, that is it. See, he's obviously willing to talk to you as the auditor, so he obviously is in-session. He's obviously interested in his own case, so he obviously is in-session.

Now we're going to make difficulties, see, now we're going to adjust the E-Meter cans and tighten up the leads and see whether or not the sensitivity knob is moving properly and read the maker's name plate. Have him get down on his knees — the way they'll be doing it a hundred years from now, unless you disseminate properly — get down on his knees along side of the chair and say a prayer to the — of the Auditor's Code before he begins the session. Unless I get some of your terminals run out, that's what'll happen. [laughs, laughter] I'm being mean today, you know?

But anyway, just look it over. Look it over. What's a session? Your point of view as a moment ago, why, your point of view of a session might have been two people sitting in chairs and the auditor going through a routine and a ritual called Model Session, see? Well, you just alter that point of view and you will be right. Some pcs practically don't get out of session; so the main problem is trying to get them out of session overnight. See? They are just in-session, bang, you see? Well the difficulty is ending the session.

Now, the difficulty in starting a session always comes because the auditor doesn't recognize the start of session. It always is in that category. Something wrong here.

Now, there's two ways this can happen. The pc is leery of going into session because he too often has been denied a session. All right, that's good. We start one anyway and just run out his auditing ARC break, that's all. Something like that and you've got him started and you've got him in-session. But in-sessionness is a technical condition. It has nothing to do with placement of bodies or a ritual. It's whether or not the pc has recognized his auditor and is willing to talk to the auditor. Of course, that's part of recognizing the auditor. And is inter-ested in his own case. And that's what a session is.

And if you recognize that as a session, the suddenness with which a pc will start talking to you in a streetcar or on a bus or something, is amazing. Now, you have certain rights as an auditor and that is not to run a session while traveling on the upper deck of a two-decker bus, you see, in areas where one can't be heard or where you're going to get off at the next stop. You see? You have certain rights about that sort of thing. But nevertheless, confidence
has been imposed on you – in you as an auditor. And therefore you should make an appointment for the session. That's the least thing you should do.

People start telling me their troubles and I haven't got time at that moment to listen to them, I never say, "Well, I can't listen to your troubles now." That'd be a silly thing to do, wouldn't it? "I'm sorry, I'm too busy to hear all this tale of woe that you're giving me." A week later we try to put the person in-session. Well, it has to start with an ARC break. You got it?

So, it's always a good thing to have a card handy, like an HGC card or a private practice card or something like that. And somebody starts telling you their troubles, say, "Well now, it's very interesting" – but you're going to get off at the next stop. And you say, "Right now, I've got to go. And I'm very sorry but I've got to go see this friend and so forth. Now, here is my card. And you make sure that you come and see me at two o'clock next Tuesday."

Well, that's fine, you're still interested, aren't you? That's the proper acknowledgment. You've acknowledged the person. You put him on wait, yes, and so forth. He hadn't even realized that he's in-session. But the mechanics of this will work. You'll find the mechanics of it will work. And then if you do start auditing that person as a pc you haven't got to start it with an ARC break.

The main problem is preventing sessions from happening in the wrong places. If you only knew it and if you were very smooth as an auditor this would be your main difficulty, is preventing sessions from occurring in the wrong places where you can't audit, like the second deck of a double-decker bus. So, you should give a little more thought to how you're going to get out of a situation like that, rather than worrying all the time about how to get a pc in-session. My difficulties is how do you get pcs out of session, not how do you get them into session.

Now, that's how far a look you can have on the subject of the technical practice of auditing. I mean, it can be totally the reverse to what you've been worried about.

Not that you have a sympathetic face or anything, but somebody says, "Oh, my," and you say – you knucklehead – you say, "What's wrong?" [laughter] That's it. You've had it, he goes into session. You're an auditor, you're a pro, you've said the right thing and there he is in-session. Now, how are you going to get him out of session without him running something, see?

It's a very natural thing for you to do – well go ahead and do it. But also have the panacea for correcting it, which is to say, at least a point of continuance of the session, or hand him to a substitute. Send him to the D of P or something like that.

You say, "What is wrong?" You've started a session. How easy is it to start a session? Well, it's much easier to start a session than you think. But if you were working hard to start a session, you almost never start one. You see how this would be?

Now, if you just work real hard and you fumble with the leads and you get it all set and you adjust his chair and you get it all set up and so on and the scenery is all okay and then – so on. You hang a sign on the door and you clatter around one way or the other and you come back and you sit down and you heave a long sigh and you say to him, "All right. Is it all
right with you if I begin this session now?" All right, that's fine. Now, that's perfectly all right, providing the pc is not in-session. And then, of course, that is totally wrong. There isn't a single thing you have done that is right. Not a single action you've undertaken is right from the pc's point of view, because you didn't handle the session as having started.

You probably didn't end your last session with this pc. Something like that is it what's in error. Pc still had a present time problem, pc still interested in case, pc still back on the track and so forth. He's been awake half the night thinking up the answers he's going to give you to the auditing question tomorrow. He sees you; his instant response is to give you twenty-five answers to the auditing question in rapid-fire order. Well, attribute that to your prowess as an auditor. It isn't something to be neglected. Pcs do this sort of thing – you're good, that's all. Either you're bad at ending sessions, or you're good at being an auditor, one way or the other. You have inspired confidence. Well, don't abuse the confidence once you've inspired it.

How do you handle a situation like that? Well, you hear the pc out – not all the way out. Now, there's a vast difference, in auditing, and letting a pc talk and auditing a pc. And some of you have never differentiated between these two things and you will waste a lot of auditing time. Letting a pc talk has nothing to do with auditing a pc.

And if you sit there and you find out, in thinking back over sessions, that pcs have been very verbose, they sure do talk, they run on and on and on – and if you have had that kind of experience, chalk it up as a slight miss on your part. Because you haven't audited him, you've let him talk.

I'll tell you a liability about letting a pc talk. They talk their havingness down. You can get a pc to tell you your troubles – his troubles and go on with an improper acknowledgment and just letting him run on and on and on, and you'll see him go down from antagonism to anger, to fear, to grief, to apathy. And you'll see him go right on down the Tone Scale. That's because you're not auditing him; you're acting as a camouflaged hole.

Now, auditing consists in directing the attention of the pc. And when a pc is just sitting there talking – gab, gab, gab, gab, "And it's so and so on. And I did this and I did that and so forth and it's so on." Well, then something is in error with your questions.

Do you realize that by the interjection of questions into what he is saying, you can direct his attention and throw him right back into session. And you must be in some kind of a mental paralysis where you don't think of a question to turn all this off. You're not trying to turn it off, you're trying to direct it. And if you just sit there and let a pc gab, gab, gab, gab, gab, talk, talk, talk, talk, and tell you all of his troubles and so on, you're just asking him to run his havingness out the bottom. The way to handle that situation is always interrogation. If the pc talks too much, interrogate.

How do you interrogate? Well, your knowledge of the human mind should be adequate now to the address of the situation. You can be far too abrupt with your knowledge of the human mind. He is saying, "And my Instructor did this and that and the other thing. And I was feeling so bad and then, by George, he came right in and dropped the bulletin right on my head," and so on and so on. You say abruptly, "What did you do to the Instructor?" That shuts it off effectively – creates a nice ARC break, too. But in essence, you've got to ask him what
he did to the Instructor. But how smoothly can you do this? And then that has to do with how smooth an auditor you are.

How smoothly can you ask him, "What'd you do to this Instructor that caused all this?" See, there are various gradients by which you approach this: "When was the first time you noticed there was some difficulty with this Instructor?" He's only been able to tell you by this time about two motivators – one motivator, two motivators, you see? But you can see by all the signs that he's going to go on for the rest of the auditing session telling you all the motivators. Well, that's not going to help him any. So by the time you wrap around this and figure out just about what he is talking about, you should be thinking of directing his attention. And when a pc is talking too much, direct his attention.

Now, every once in a while, a pc goes off in a high spate of interest of some kind or another and starts telling you about a gimmegahoojit or the interplanetary customs of the Z People. Well, very often also, you're interested. I had – some auditor here the other day said, "And he was telling me about this spaceship" – and the auditor is report – doing the reporting – "And he was telling me about this spaceship and how it really operates, and you know if I'd had money right at that moment, I would have bought one!" [laughter]

Now, there's a pc doing a high degree of salesmanship, the auditor quite interested. [laughter] We're not talking about that kind of a situation, you see, that's perfectly permissible. [laughter] If you shut that off, you've had it.

No, we're talking about a different kind of yap, yap, yap, yap, see? We're talking about a pc who's complaining and going on and on and on. The auditor that sits there and lets a pc go on and on and on and on and on just isn't auditing. It's the auditor who isn't in-session. The pc's willing to talk to the auditor but the auditor's not willing to direct the attention of the pc.

And the most obvious type of question that could occur to you is just "When did that trouble start?" He's saying, "And they shot me and they hanged me and then they dragged me across the field and then they brought all the cows over and made them stare at me." And he's going on and on on in this direction whamnity-wham. And if somewhere along this line about the time they shot him, you haven't asked, "When is the first time you had any trouble of this character?" you're remiss. And your pc's going to run his havingness down. See?

You should be in there directing the attention of the pc. All right, now, let's go back to this first situation I announced. The pc meets you in the hall and the pc's going gab, gab, gab, walla, walla, walla, telling you all about it, see? Now, you've got the problem of getting him into the auditing room, getting him into the chair, getting the E-Meter set up and getting it all fixed up and so forth. What are you going to do? There is no pat solution, except one – and that is direct the pc's attention. How do you direct the pc's attention? If you direct it too savagely, you have operated as a sudden shift of attention, have surprised the pc.

What are you going to say to the pc? Well, you're going to say to him something that directs his attention. Not necessarily onto the mechanics of the session – probably certainly not onto the mechanics of the session.
One of the tricks I use is put him in a comm lag and set him down. Ask him a question he can't answer right away. That gives you time. See, there's all kinds of things you can do. And they're all quite real and they're all quite convincing and they're all quite effective. He meets you in the hall and he says, "Gab, gab, gab, walla, walla, walla. And I thought up 365 answers to the auditing question which you were asking me last night. And as a matter of fact I've got them all ready to give you and so forth and we're all set and...

Well, what the hell? You're not even in the auditing room. Now, what are you going to do? Well you're going to do something to direct his attention. That's what you're going to do. Now, how are you going to direct his attention? Reprovingly? Surprisingly? Oh, no. Nothing like this. You're going to say to him something on this order: "Uhm, by the way, did you have a present time problem when we ended session yesterday?"

And he's going to say... And I'm going to get the E-Meter set up and going to give him the cans, sit him down in the chair, put a sign on the door and so forth. He's sitting there looking at it. "Yeah," he says, "Yes. It was how to answer that auditing command."

And I say, "Well, all right, was that much of a problem?"

"Well, as a matter of fact I sure struggled with it until about last night about nine o'clock or something like that," [laughter] "I happened to think that you were asking – you were asking me about a man. And you know I didn't realize before that you were asking me about a man."

"Well, what did you think I was asking – how did you define that?"

And he will say, "Well, I defined it, actually, as an island."

You say, "You did? Well now, how would you get those things to compare?" Finish it all up and so forth, say, "All right, now what goals would you like to set for this session? That's good. All right. Now, is it all right with you if I begin this process now? Thank you very much. Now, here's the auditing question," bang: "But, let's define it. Let's define it now. What do we mean by *blah, blah* and man?"

We actually have done a tiny shift of attention without distracting him too much. Now, we've asked him the pertinent question. You've always got to ask him the right question. You got the idea? You ask him the right question. Obviously he had a present time problem about the auditing or he wouldn't have been answering the auditing command all night. Obviously, you didn't end session. Obviously, there was some unconfidence involved in the thing, because he obviously, too, must have gone on self-auditing to some degree, so the session couldn't have been ended.

In other words, you've got to size up the situation. That's not a pat situation. The only thing pat about it is, is you've got to direct the pc's attention. You don't let a pc go on talking forever. It is a dirty trick. The pc will feel silly after a while. He will feel very out of session. Direct his attention and not crudely, suddenly or accusatively. You get the point?

Now, when is a pc in-session? Pc is in-session when he is *able* to talk to the auditor – change that over from "willing" to "able" – and is interested in his own case. Those are the only real requisites to being in-session. Given those things, you've got it. Now, if a pc is talk-
ing to the auditor, he obviously is able to talk to the auditor. If he's talking about his own case, he obviously is interested in his own case, so obviously there is a session. And you've got to handle it as a session. Because he's suddenly apparently elected you as the auditor. And maybe he's being audited by somebody else.

All right, this pc says to me, "You know, in that session yesterday – I was having a session yesterday – and all of a sudden we ran into a society where all they did was cook. And I got to thinking about cooking and I got more and more worried about cooking and so forth and I just realized in this lifetime I've never been able to cook," and about this time I suddenly realize that I have been elected the auditor, don't you see? He is not just talking about his case conversationally, but is actually talking a session, see?

So I say, "Well, what did your auditor do about that?" In other words, I give him right back to his auditor. Just mention his auditor and I've shifted his attention. Well, obviously his attention is stuck there.

Now, when you get very, very expert, and when you seem very smooth to pcs, it will be because by interrogation you can shift the pc's attention. And when you can shift a pc's attention smoothly, why, he will get an idea that you have terrific altitude. And it's all in the expertness with which you can shift the pc's attention. You use that with questions.

Now, every once in a while in giving a Security Check, you ask Instructors, "How do you give a Security Check?" Well, that's fine, you give a Security Check by reading the question, finding out if there's a drop on the meter. All right, there's a drop on the meter. That's where you fall down, if you're going to fall down on a security question. There's where you fall down. Right there at that point. You've asked the question which is on the printed form, you've gotten a fall on the meter and right there a large percentage of auditors lay an egg. They do not direct the pc's attention. They read the question again. They do some version of question-reading; they don't direct the pc's attention with a question.

Now, just look at this little tiny microscopic trick here. You say, "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" And you get a fall on the E-Meter. Now, instead of directing the pc's attention, you say, "Well, have you ever – " you know, substituting emphasis for brains, "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" And you get another fall on the E-Meter. And then you say, well, it requires a different emphasis, so you say, "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" [laughter]

Now, you see that hasn't anything whatsoever to do with shifting the pc's attention. You see what – why it's wrong?

Now, even a banal shift of the auditing thing tends to shift the pc's attention. "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" You get a fall. You could say, "Well, what was that?" Well, now if you point too emphatically to the meter, you'll get an out-of-sessionalness on the part of the pc, because his attention is being pulled out of the session, out of his bank, onto the meter.

I as often as not will assume that the pc is not interested in the meter, but at this moment is very interested in having had an odd phenomenon of some kind or another. If you get a fall, it's usually accompanied by some electronic shift of some kind. You know, the fellow's
going, "Tall buildings, I never thought of that before," you know. It's kind of a – maybe it's a lurch in his stomach or he gets a twitch in the end of his nose or his hands feel kind of sweaty suddenly. Well, I don't refer to this, I refer to that. I'm just as likely as not to say, "What happened just then?"

"Well, I had this lurch."

"All right. Does that have anything to do with tall buildings?"

"Oh, I can't stand tall buildings."

"Well, have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?"

You get the shift? You put his attention more on him, more on the bank and then reiterate the question that we want to know. And he says, "Well, it just seems like it might have happened. It seems – it seems possible. It's – it just seems like it's something I would do."

"Well now, why do you think you would do that?"

"Well, I have this fear of every time I see a tall building, that it'll fall over."

"Oh. Recall a time when that was that way."

"Yes, yes, definitely."

"All right. Now, have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?"

"Augh, it's an awful question you're asking me."

He gets the idea that his attention actually by this time is being actually ground right straight down on the bank. He'll get a sensation that he's really being shoved into it, but you have not changed your intonation, you haven't changed the starkness of the question, you haven't lightened it up, you haven't made it more accusative, anything else. But the pc gets the sensation of you have just taken his attention, and you have said, "Stop looking at me, stop looking at the E-Meter, stop looking at this beautiful bright day around here and look at that bank, damn you. Now, did you or didn't you?" He'll actually get this kind of a [makes a clapping sound with his hands] pressure – sensation.

What have you actually done? You've restimulated the channel. You've restimulated the whole chain. You've got the whole chain of tall buildings now in total restim both by your security question, by asking if there was some sensation that went along with it. By asking him if he ever has any difficulties with tall buildings. Is there anything he's ever noticed, recalling a time when he noticed that and so forth. And now the security question again, "Have you ever pushed over any tall buildings?" And boy, he'll feel by this time as though he has been run into by a Mack truck. And he's going to give!

"Well, all right, if you put it that way, I pushed over the Empire State Building. That's why it's in ruins. That's why New York's never been the same since," if he ever did. He'd give it to you right now. "Ohh!" You get why? Because your ability to fix attention has been horsepowered up to his inability to fix attention and you have made him able to fix his attention on the thing which his attention is dispersing off of And he gets the idea just as though you've backed up a Caterpillar tractor back of him and shoved. "Get in there and pitch. Let's you and him fight." This is what the thing sort of adds up to.
All right. I'll go over another instance of this. Now, "Have you ever whistled at a girl?" You get a reaction on the E-Meter. Don't say, "Ah, I have a reaction on the E-Meter here. Um, let's see, is there any other way I can pull your attention out of session? Do you have any present time problems?" [laughter] "Are you worried about your wife or anything like that? Don't you realize you've been far away from home? Your children might be trapped in a burning building." [laughter] Don't go on this particular course of action. That is the wrong course of action. That is the escapist approach. Letting the pc escape. You don't do that at all. You do it quite in reverse. You say, "Have you ever whistled at a girl? Did you have any sensations just then?"

"Yeah, as a matter of fact I had this sensation right across my head."
"Oh, well, what do you suppose that might have been?"
"Well, I don't know. I don't know."
"Well, what would it have to do with whistling or pretty girls or something like that?"
"Well, I don't know. Why, how could it poss – ah, there it is again!"
"Well now, did you have a picture just as you did that?"
"Oh, yeah, well."
"Well, all right. Well, have you ever whistled at any pretty girls?"
"Well, no, not – ow! Not that I know of, so forth. I don't recall. Uh..."
"Well, do you remember any pretty girl?"
"Oh yes. Oh, yes, yes, remember a pretty girl."
"Did you ever whistle at her?"
"I get – there it is again."
"Well, what's going on here? What are you looking at there? What are you looking at there?"
"Well – well, if you must know, I whistled at this pretty girl down on – ouch! – I went down on – ouch! – down on Main Street – ouch! – one day and it was somebody's wife and he – he socked me."
"Oh, all right, you did whistle at a pretty girl, then."
"Yes, I – I did."
"All right. Ever whistle at any other pretty girls?"
"No – ouch! Uh – well..."
"Did you ever whistle at any other pretty girls?"
"Well, if you must know, I have never done anything else. It is just something that I just can't keep from doing. I try and I try and I try and I keep standing there on drugstore corners, whistling. I whistle and I whistle!" [laughter] "What are you going to do about it! Hey,
you know, it's a funny thing, I never remembered that before. I never noticed that about myself before." [laughter]

All this type of phenomena falls out of the barrel by just the direction of his attention. And you eventually will put it right onto the chain of withholds and overts. You see? But it's all in handling the attention. And as I give you again, I'll give you the wrong way to.

Now, if you "Have you ever whistled at any girls? ... Did you object to my lighting the cigarette now while I was auditing you? Oh, you didn't? All right, that's fine. Good enough. Are those leads far enough apart? Okay. Now, let's see, what were we getting at? What was I just asking you? Uh... oh. Mm-hm. Well, there couldn't have been much reaction on that; I didn't notice it. Let's go to the next question."

Now, that would not be a good sound auditing approach. [laughter] Why? Because it's demonstrating not-knowingness on the part of the auditor, the reverse of which is all-seeingness. All right. Let's get to the next point.

A person who security checks as though he's in the dark will always be in the dark with a Security Check. A person who pretends knowingness to too great a degree when he is doing a Security Check is also violating the R-factor. The R-factor is simply this: you want to know and you're going to get him to find out. And that is all the R-factor there is. And if you're in that state of mind you will direct his attention neatly every time. Not, you want to give a perfect Security Check; not, you want to follow the perfect technology; not, you want to always do your E-Meter right. See, those are not R-factors.

You're interested and you want him to find out. If those are the only R-factors present, boy, can you security check. You'll find out that a Security Check that ordinarily would take you thirty-six hours to get rid of – and some of them do take that long to get rid of – you could cut it right on down to about a four-or five-hour Security Check and you'd get the lot. It's just that difference.

You notice a fall on your meter, you know at once the pc is interiorized into some kind of a withhold. He's on a chain. It's live right now. Well, you take full advantage of that fact. You call his attention to the subject matter of the Security Check. You ask him to define the subject matter of the Security Check. You ask him what's been going on in this particular de-

And if that is the only R-factors with which you're dealing when you do a Security Check, you'll find out they really whiz. "Here's an interesting question, you know? It says, 'Have you ever raped anyone?' Have you ever raped anyone? When? You ever been worried about rape? You ever thought about raping? You ever been raped? What just happened just then? What did you feel just then? No, are you looking at a picture?" Get this kind of an approach, you see? It's all in, in, in.

And you get his attention all the way in, he'll pick it up. And he'll suddenly say, "Oh, I forgot all about her. It was Betsy Ann. I was two." [laughter]
And you say, "All right, let's see if she is clean now. You ever raped anyone?" [laughter] You got the difference of approach?

You've got to handle the pc's attention. Now, the reason why you very often fail to do this is because you do not perhaps have a sufficient reality on the weakness of a pc's ability to handle his attention on the subject of the buttons which make him aberrated.

Those things which have aberrated the pc have overwhelmed him. It's always a case of overwhelm. Overwhelm, what is that? Push in too tight. You could say, overwhelm, pushed in too tight. All right. Well, naturally, his attention must at one time have been a restraining factor on keeping things from coming in on him. That's a thetan's primary weapon. So he's restraining things from coming in on him.

Now, what do you think that we're going to have here when he gets on this subject again? We're going to have somebody whose attention cannot be controlled on that particular subject, because his attention has been overwhelmed on that subject. So therefore, if the auditor does not steer the pc's attention on the subjects in which the pc is having difficulty or on which he's having difficulty, the pc's attention does not get directed and thereby just wanders or just disperses. The pc is not capable of directing his attention on the subject of his aberrations. That is why he stays aberrated. That is why it remains unknown to him. That's the simple mechanic of the thing.

He's a man of iron in all such places except as appertains to his terminal line. And there it's solid custard. And the custard runs to the right and his attention runs to the right and it runs up and his attention runs up and it runs down and it just doesn't matter what the custard does, that's what his attention is going to do. And unless there's somebody around the auditing session who will direct the pc's attention, it isn't going to be directed by anybody but the valence. Now, isn't that fascinating?

This person, let us say, has a terminal – I'll have to pick one now that nobody here has – has a terminal called a streetcar conductor. All right, streetcar conductors are always directing things one way or the other, so we don't have the auditor directing any attention and we have a pc, of course, who is in the middle of the valence called "streetcar conductor," so the pc can't direct his attention, so we have left the session in the hands of a streetcar conductor. [laughter] Well, isn't that right? You can see it very graphically. That's correct. That's who's running the session.

Now, if this session runs overboard, of course, you say, "Well, it wasn't my fault. I was just sitting there going through the rituals, swinging the incense in the right directions, making orbital star patterns with the incense pot. And the pc, he was sitting there in the chair and we had him on the E-Meter, so it couldn't have gone wrong."

And there's a mysterious third party present called a streetcar conductor and he has said, "End of line, everybody out," and the pc says, "Well, that's the end of that."

And you say, "Yes? All right. Here's the next auditing question." You get the idea? There's nobody directing any attention around there but the valence. The mysterious third party.
And when it's a streetcar conductor everybody gets in and everybody gets out and they
get to the end of the line and they go back to the beginning of the line. And when you run an
engram with the streetcar conductor running it, look what it'd look like: You get to the middle
of the engram and lose a lot of passengers; [laughter] personnel of the engram would disap-
pear at the beginning or the end or someplace; and then all of a sudden there'd be a tremen-
dous number of people present that hadn't been present before. Trolley would come off the
wire and stop for a while. And then you ask the question, "Why is it taking so long to clear
this person?" Well, that's because streetcar conductors aren't trained auditors. You see?

Now, maybe there's a lot of bitterness and sarcasm mixed up in this, but there's a little,
a little truth to be found there, if you scrape at it. Unless the auditor directs the pc's attention,
we have a valence that will do God knows what with it, and we have the pc who can't.

So out of the three people present, in a clearing session, we've only got one person
who could direct the pc's attention, correctly, to get auditing done. And when that person
doesn't do it, no auditing occurs, except by accident and the grace of Ron. [laughter]

Now, I will admit that things are put together well enough that some auditing is al-
ways occurring. But just a minute. This is a special person who is running a special terminal.
Every pc is a special case – every one of them.

All right, now you get a pc who has a terminal of a lion tamer. And if you, the auditor,
don't closely direct the pc's attention as you're running the terminal "a lion trainer," you're
going to be trained as a lion. [laughter]

Now, don't come around and tell me that the session keeps going off the rails, because
I will always tell you that obviously you aren't directing the pc's attention. That would be the
pat answer which any Instructor could give any auditing session that started going haywire.
Now, the auditor at no time should leave a session on automatic. You leave a session on
automatic and you're just asking for it. But what are you asking for? You're asking for the
session to be taken over one hundred percent by the valence that you are running out of the
pc.

So now, don't keep complaining that the pc is a difficult pc or that the pc ARC breaks
easily or that the pc won't go into session, because pc be damned; there is no pc practically.
When you – when Newton and Watt and some of the other – and I think an Italian named Erg,
[laughs] got themselves all fixed up, in measuring energies, they didn't get a small enough
unit to measure the actual energy-attention output of a pc who is stuck in the middle of a va-
lence. It is too slightly microscopic to even be measurable.

So if you're blaming this one one-millionth of a grasshopper-power of a person that is
left, you see, after you've given full play to the terminal and then you're blaming this tiny, tiny
amount of residual remaining energy for everything that's going wrong, it'd be something like
saying, "This roaring torrent of a raindrop went down the side of Cleopatra's obelisk and split
it in half." And that just doesn't make sense, you see? It isn't possible.

Now, this pc may be a very forceful person. This pc may be able to do lots of things.
This pc is not totally a slave to his valence. Nobody ever is. But remember, you've got him in
a situation where all the mechanics of auditing have made him again a total slave to this va-
lence. And now you're going to blame him for what goes wrong. Well, there isn't any blame connected with it, unless the pc's attention – the one-millionth of a grasshopper-power left of it – is very closely directed by the auditor, of course what is left there – it's the entire investment of the pc's energy, via the valence. And you will see that valence all of a sudden materializing and going all over the place and doing all sorts of wild things with the session and so forth. You see what you've asked for?

You can almost predict how a pc will operate in a session, once you have his valence. If you know his terminal, if you're doing a poor job or if the pc is out of session or if your pc's confidence in you as an auditor is low, the session is going to be run by his terminal. So therefore, if you're going to run a bad session on him, we know at once how the pc will operate. He will operate just like that terminal.

So when this sort of thing shows up, don't say, "Well, the pc is a difficult pc." That is a – that's nonsense. No pcs are difficult pcs, but some valences are bitch kitties.

All right. Now, let's take somebody who has a terminal "surgeon." Now, wouldn't this be very interesting to audit, if you didn't run a session? If you weren't running a tight session? And you didn't have the pc in-session? Something around there is going to get sawed up, that's for sure. [laughter]

Because the terminal knows how to run a session. The terminal knows very well how to run a session: You get the anesthetic mask, and you lay it out, and you get the sutures laid out and you get the oxygen put out properly and you lay out the saws and knock some bits of rust off of them. See? And it would all depend on what part of the track, what condition of operation would take place in the session. [laughter] So some would be rougher sessions than others. [laughter]

And, of course, a surgeon is liable to do all sorts of weird things like hold the patient down. [laughter] But who's the patient around here? Well, it's liable to be the auditor, it's liable to be almost anybody. So if you're running a surgeon some time, as a terminal on a pc, and you find yourself lying on the floor, [laughter] with both of your shoulder blades pinned to the floor and him fishing around for a pen knife to cut your throat, you will at least have the satisfaction of remembering that you once heard a lecture [laughter] in which it was stated that this could happen and you will at least know what you did wrong. You didn't direct the pc's attention. That's the whole lot. I mean, you can't really say much more of it than that.

When you cease to direct the pc's attention, there's only one party left in the session. And of course, the session will go exactly in that direction. I shudder to think what would happen up on the second floor if we had a chariot driver! [laughs, laughter] You can see there that we have a point, though. Maybe put that way, maybe some of these incomprehensibles will cease to be incomprehensible.

There's an old rule, an old law, that's found in the Original Thesis. There are three laws in there. But it just amounts to the fact that, the auditor plus the pc is greater than the engram bank. And the auditor minus the pc may or may not be greater than the engram bank, but certainly minus the pc minus the auditor, and you've got nothing left but an engram bank. You get the idea? So it takes both the auditor and the pc in there pitching to hold a terminal
down and run it out. And that's about all it amounts to. Takes them both. And the way you get them both is to direct the pc's attention.

How many ways are there of doing this? Not to labor the point particularly, but how many ways could you direct the pc's attention? Now, you just think of some of the ways you have misdirected the pc's attention. Can you think of having misdirected the pc's attention? Sometimes you can be quite inadvertent. Drop the ashtray. You certainly have directed his attention. But to the wrong place. He doesn't have any bank in the vicinity of the ashtray. That's the wrong place for his attention to go to. So of course, then, the tension built up by the session explodes, the pc drops out of the session, you feeling guilty for having dropped the ashtray, drop out of the session and what do we have left? We have a lion tamer, a surgeon, something like this. Everybody quit the session but the valence.

And that's the trouble with valences, is they're educated never to quit. You see, you've come very close to the basic dynamic principle of existence of Dianetics when you come to the valence. What is trying to survive? As soon as we realize that you don't have to try to survive, as soon as you realize that survival itself, the effort to survive, is a complete idiocy in a being who can't do anything else.

The most native natural skill a thetan has is survival. So now he's got survival on a via. He's got survival all built into a beingness. He doesn't have any survival left and he has become so concerned and worried about survival that it's all built into the beingness. Well, of course, these beingnesses on a via have a tremendous amount of survival mixed up in them. And they can be very resistive. But they are only very resistive when you get two willful missings in a session: the auditor and the pc. And then of course you have survival rampant.

And, of course, the survival of such a being is interesting in the fact that none of its actions ever add up to survival. That is what is peculiar. Once you get survival on a big via, of some character or another, it winds up as a non-survival. It winds up as a succumb.

So if any valence was left to ramp and roar across the boards of life, totally undeterred by a person's native good sense, well, naturally, it would wind up to the most destructive activity imaginable. In the first place, a valence's actions and packages are usually out of time. In other words, this person is all adjusted for the French terror. All geared up. All the now-I'm-supposed-to get one through a certain period of existence – there it is. Only we aren't in the French terror. Do you see?

Now, a road – a highwayman of yesteryear – he knows how to survive. You go out and you stick up coaches. See? And you go back and spend it on the babes. That's how you survive. We don't know why – he probably had a lot of fun at that time. But that was all a very good business to be in, perhaps, when we had nothing but cavalry for police. But now the odds have mounted up. And things have changed. And you just try and disassemble a .45 automatic with the same field-stripping procedure as a flintlock pistol and you'll fumble. In other words, the skills are all out-of-date, all out of time and so on. So the actual activities of this fixed valence add up to nothing but succumb. The fellow's out of money, so he goes out and he buys a horse and he puts on a plumed hat and he rides out to Ashdown Forest, waiting for the coach to come through. And it's a wet night and he gets pneumonia and that's it. [laughter] See, it's all as idiotic as that. And I do mean as idiotic as that – if not more so.
Now, you take some fellow, he's liable to believe that being a good.... Well, let's say he was a designer, a clothes designer. And in this lifetime he's been trying to be a clothes designer. But his valence is clothes designer and he's tried to be a clothes designer in this lifetime and he just somehow or another can't be a clothes designer in this lifetime. That's one of the most remarkable points about valences: is those people who have tried to be their valences in this lifetime have laid the most gorgeous eggs. It's fantastic. I mean, how far off these things can be. Why? Because they are valences rigged up to live in another age and time and they are incapable of change.

Now, why is a valence so incapable of change? That's because it's rigged for survival, so all of its facets and aspects are fixed. It won't change.

Now, let's say at some time or another you've had a serving girl. And you've tried to teach her to set the table. Day after day, week after week, you try to teach her to set the table. And somehow or another she is never able to set the table. She just cannot do it. She either breaks the dishes or spills them on the floor or trips over the edge of the tablecloth, or... And she keeps putting the roast pans on the table and the platters back in the oven, and she keeps spilling the soup and it just is a mess. And you say, "Now look, with a little good training – with a little good training – now we'll be able to make this grade." And two years later you're still trying.

Well, past civilizations have handled it this way: They have broken the valence with punishment. And in a past time the way that servant girl would have been trained is after she broke her first dish she would have been whipped for half an hour and then sent back again to set the table. And you know the funny part of it is, that didn't work either.

They take criminals and whether they use the whip or the jail or the stock or anything else, they just keep going back stealing cabbages. The guy keeps on stealing cabbages. That's what he does. And they put him in a stock, you put him in jail, you fine him – in more modern times, why, you deny him his social security or do something rigorous like this – and he still goes and steals cabbages. Why? Because you're working against the survival pattern of a valence. And there's nothing can break it.

Now, when you finally do break the person down, the person now is nothing because all you have is a broken valence. You don't even have a person anymore, see? See, it's possibly even better to have a good operating valence, you know, than to be nobody at all, but it's much better to be yourself than an operating valence.

In handling criminals – I'm very prone to be very careless with people and so forth, because I myself am seldom in any grave and terrible danger from their actions. But I have had, as I've mentioned before, I've had a whole shipload of criminals, and I never tried to make them into honest men. It was not necessary. In the first place, they were doing a criminal thing like fighting a war anyhow and just the simple matter of saying, "All right, it doesn't matter what you do on this ship, nothing is ever going to go into your record. We're never going to make another mark in your records." That was enough. "If there's any punishments, you have to be satisfied with the punishments I hand out, and that's all right." And, of course, the punishments I handed out were as freak and unique as any jail kangaroo court. You know, very freak. You know, like, "Well, you'll have to paint that gun all over, all by yourself, and
so forth, and when you get that gun totally painted and so on, why, we'll inspect it. And if we
find one single fleck of rust on it anywhere that hasn't been adequately handled and covered
up, why, then you've got to paint the whole gun again." This was very satisfactory to that type
of mentality. Very satisfactory.

Well, what was the net result? You had no broken valences. I suppose they stole each
other ragged. But they couldn't object. And that was the way it went. And it was the most
pleasant calm vista you had ever heard of. Why, there were ships full of honest men all over
the place that were appetite over tin cup and at each other's throats day and night – but not
this ship. There was no pressure exerted. Interesting, isn't it?

So you'd say that an operating valence is better than a broken valence. But a person is
better than a valence. And you get your gradient scale. Of course, I say better than a valence,
that's an understatement of magnitude. There's a tremendous difference between a person and
an operating valence.

Once in a while you ask what is a GE? Well, a GE is just a valence. A GE is some
kind of a superpackaged valence that has been set up one way or the other, that can continue
to be regenerated. Now the particular form that man has adopted is no longer very useful to
him. Various things happen to this particular form which shouldn't be happening to it. This
form is perfectly all right in a meat-eater society. You can go out and eat and be eaten and
slug animals over the head and be overwhumped, and your main difficulty is with bodies.

Well, you get a human body trying to duplicate a machine. Ah, well, that requires a
different type of body. That's right. A thetan is not very happy running a machine in a meat
body. He just isn't. He's much happier in a robot, doll body type of setup. Why? Because it's
made out of metal and is animated and the machine is made out of metal and it's animated. So
he does a perfectly nice duplication, he never gets sick running machines. Get the idea?

And, of course, you get a society now that has a high velocity. If you're in a car out
here going thirty miles an hour and you hit a tree, the body you've got will have had it. It'll at
least get bruised. Now, in a high velocity society that runs something on the order of fifty,
sixty miles an hour on the highway and so forth, you don't want bodies that go streaming all
over the road. Why, they bleed, and all kinds of things. And furthermore, they're not good
survival for machines. Machines can't eat bodies. They're not good fuel, they're not good any-
things. You have to go bury them someplace because they start putrefying and so forth. It's a
total waste.

You take a doll body, a doll body, a crash at sixty miles an hour in a doll body would
be something like a mosquito bite. So you, of course, can perfectly afford to run a sixty mile
an hour vehicle while you're in a doll body. You got the idea?

All right, so you have man protesting, very ineffectually, about machinery. Oh, well,
there's – it's almost died out, everybody's sort of overwhelmed by the machine, but it's a big
lot of trouble. You have man organized into safety councils and all sorts of things in order to
restrain traffic and so forth.

Well, he's unhappy, because he's in a fixed-valence state. Now, at no time am I advo-
cating anything like a pastoral return to nature or that we all pick up doll bodies and carry on,
because it isn't necessarily true that a meat body – a humanoid-type body – it isn't necessarily true that it's a bad body form. It is not a bad body form. As a matter of fact you should be able to take a meat body and throw it up against a brick wall that practically flattens it till it looks like a pancake, pick it up, shake it out, put it back on again and it's perfectly all right; there isn't even a bruise.

You have the evidence of this. What holds a broken leg broken? Have you ever healed anybody's broken leg? Have you ever speeded up a healing or an injury of any kind whatsoever? Well, what was holding it? If you could help it without doing anything with it, all you had to do was run out the engram or something of this sort. If you've helped somebody get well, then it must have been that the thetan himself was slowing down the process of healing.

Ah, but let's take that just a little bit further and say, then, the thetan must himself have been perpetuating the process of destruction. So it takes an entirely different type of orientation to run a meat body in a scientific, machine, high-speed society. There's no liability in doing so, but there is one where the body is oriented to fight lions and there aren't any lions. You look every place and you look under the sofas and back of the hedges and you can find no lions. But there are a lot of things out there running up and down the highway that make a lion look tame. I'll tell you, a pat from a ten-ton truck is much more serious.

So, a fixed condition of a valence which is so fixed and unalterable that nothing can change it, not even punishment, and which is out-of-date, will of course make an unhappy person. Inevitable that it will make an unhappy person. Now, that these things have survival potential, nobody will dispute. They have tremendous survival potential. In that the entire history of healing has never been able to do anything with a valence is something on the order of an attestation. They've never been able to do anything with them either.

They've had all sorts of campaigns like "Be nice to the insane," you know? Doesn't work. There's nothing – there's been no way of handling a readjustment of beings.

Now you have a method that does handle the situation. All right, well don't be surprised that while you're applying this, the valence objects. It will.

You let a valence run on auto, be totally neglected and you're in for trouble. Now I'll tell you that I have learned a great deal this summer. I have learned a great deal this summer. I have learned, not by treating people experimentally but by doing what we have always been doing, the best that we could do at that time, I have learned that not even the basic processes of Scientology will do more than a patch-up when it comes to clearing – not even the basic processes of Scientology applied to a preclear whose valence has not been located. They won't do anything very much. It's not a permanent proposition.

Oh yes, you could cave it in, oh yes, you could change it around, oh yes, you can make some shifts; but you can't clear them. You can make an alteration of case, but you can't make a regain of case. You have to apply the route of "find his goal" and that permits you to find the valence chain and then audit the valence. Now you can get someplace. Now you can whiz, because you are right there where you should be.

You have a pc who is unaware of being somebody he is being. They don't know they're being this person. So what use is being this person to them? It's no joy to them – to-
tally unknown situation. And this sort of thing is something – is getting in their road and making them succumb on certain projects and is tripping up their lives and is messing them up in general, and they don't even know what it is.

Well, there's just an addiction to another period and zone of life, another time of history, another skill package. Fortunately, not all men's skill packages hang up as valences. You shouldn't say that everything a man can do or every package of skills a man gets is the result of a valence. It is not. It is not. A thetan is totally capable of doing these various things.

For instance, I don't think I ever got into – I probably never had a valence of when knighthood was in flower – that type of valence. Those periods come and go. On every planet you get everybody tired of doing anything and you'll get a period of when knighthood was in flower, you know, and it goes through the same pattern lines and all that sort of thing. All right, that's fine.

You arrive in a society of that character. Now, if you can excel in any way in a society of that character, then it must be that you can't be operating with a valence. How can you excel if you're operating as a valence? Because the operation of a valence is nonsentient operation. It is operation in the absence of knowingness. Well, you try to take one single run down the lists without knowing consciously how to do it. Just try it. And you're going to wind up in the middle of the damnedest scramble of tinware you ever were in. [laughter]

There are never any two runs just alike. There are never any two jousts alike. So you can't even form a good valence to do that. But when a thetan is totally overwhelmed and when he has totally given up and when he decides to totally become this thing which will thereafter be him forevermore, he's now had it. He will never be able to do it again. Isn't that interesting?

He will never be able to be a good priest if his valence is a priest. Why? Well, the basic underlying impulse is what? How did he get to be the priest? That's interesting. How did he get into this valence? It must have been by resisting and trying to knock off priests. And he must have worked awfully hard at it. And he must have scuppered an awful lot of priests. Man, the landscape must have been littered with them.

And the basic impulse of the preclear toward the valence is destruction of the valence. So, therefore, every time you don't let the pc get at it, why, you get a valence takeover, because the pc has lost – what is the first thing he thinks he loses to? He must be losing to the valence. Although he might be blaming the auditor, he thinks the auditor has now ganged up with the valence, you see? It's the valence which has overcome him again. So his basic impulse toward a valence is destruction. So you ever think you're going to get anything but destructive action from something which is being operated now by a thetan which has its primary impulse of destruction? It's primarily a destructive impulse.

So you have people who are living in valences toward which they have nothing but the most violent feelings. If they have any feelings left at all way down on the lower realm, they have the most violent destructive feelings toward that valence.

Now, this valence is going to succeed, is it? Ha, ha, ha! The dickens it is! So if we had a valence of a jousting knight and the person were totally in the valence of a jousting knight,
we would put him out on the lists, and we could put him on the horse, and we could pretty him up, and we could polish his armor, and we could give him the most dizzle-dazzle of devices for his shield, and we could give him the very best ash spears, and we could have the prettiest girls tying their most suggestive underthings around his neck, and he'd wind up in a pile of tinware. [laughter]

Because every time the thetan wakes up, even slightly, to call for a decision, he makes a destructive decision with regard to the action which he is doing. Halfway down the lists, the thetan says, "Let me see, where am I? Oh, this!" – crash! See? It just requires the slightest rekindling of the actual intelligence and personality of the being to cause a destruction to take place.

Now, it doesn't have to be in anything as romantic or as bombastic as jousting knight. This fellow's a machinist. That's the valence. He's been totally overwhumped by machinists. So this life, he's moving through Coventry, see, and there's no jobs anyplace but that of a machinist. And he finds himself there and he sort of trains as a machinist. And at first, it looks like he has a little facility of it, but he doesn't, but he does, but he doesn't, but he does. And then one day he's standing up at the machine and suddenly the thetan wakes up slightly and says, "Where am I? Oh! Machinist!", crush, you see, and into the machinery he goes, that's it. Get the idea? And he finds out he can't push him into the machinery because the machinist gets well and is back at his platform again. Now he could make him sick. See? He could make him feel bad. He could make him lazy. He could make him inactive.

And you might say the primary battle of the universe is the battle between the thetan and the valence. And the impulse of the thetan is total destruction of the valence, which ought to make your job as an auditor awfully damned easy.

Because you're auditing somebody whose first wish is to get rid of this thing. And as soon as he has, he's won. He'll come back to being himself and he'll be able to walk with his head in the sky again. But until that time he's defeated. He's defeated from the moment that he was overwhelmed way back a hundred trillion years ago, right up till now. He's been defeated the whole ruddy lot.

So that ought to make your job very, very easy. And if you look at it like that, you'll see. You'll also be able to understand the activities of men. You'll understand why this fellow is dramatizing being a bank president and always going bankrupt. Now, there's another fellow who is a bank president and he isn't going bankrupt. But he has trouble with a boat. You see? It's all kind of unexplained and all hit or miss.

Well, it's just that very solid fact of what valence is he in? Because that for sure he will commit suicide with. He'll commit suicide with it because his primary foe is that valence and that's all there is to that; that is the thing he is trying to kill.

And when you find that, the valence will ebb and flow and he will go through all the propitiative attitudes toward the valence and it will look for a while as though he really wants to keep this valence and so on and all kinds of misemotional reactions toward this valence. And it'll get on up the lot and when he finally comes out in the clear he is not any longer overwhelmed. So that is what you're trying to do, basically.
So, that is the attention you are trying to direct. You are trying to direct the pc's attention toward eradication of all of the points which made him a slave to a valence. And if you fail to direct his attention, of course, there is nothing else there to be directed. There is nothing else present except this valence. And if you overwhelm the pc in some fashion, he will dramatize the valence. So don't blame anybody but yourself if you have a rough session. And you can always predict how the pc will operate.

If you had somebody who was a trancer, let's say he had a valence called "a trancer" – you know, it's a person who went into trances. You'd know whenever the pc was out of session. Because the pc would trance. Pc isn't any longer present, the valence is present. You see that, as an immediate detection? All right, get the rudiments in. The rudiments must be out because the valence took over. See? It's as simple as that.

The more you know about the valence, the easier it is to audit the pc. And the more you know about the valence, why, the easier it is to predict what the pc will do and what you've got to do. Now you could sit down and have yourself a nice thought about that, if you know the valence of the pc you're operating. Just have a nice thought about it. Say, "I wonder what this pc would do," and just mentally forecast, what would be this pc out of session? What would be this pc as the total valence? What would this pc do as the total valence? Because that's what the pc is doing as a total valence when the pc is out of session. So anytime the pc does that, you know you should get your rudiments in. See how tricky that is? This information can be used.

All right. So, the first signal that you have failed to direct the pc's attention and that you have complimented the overwhelmingness of the valence, is a breakdown of the rudiments. Well, now you should be a clever enough auditor not to let it go that far. You shouldn't let rudiments break down. You should be able to catch them before they fall.

Now, some people have a fast reaction time and when an egg falls off the table, they are very able to catch it before it hits the floor. And other people, when the egg falls off the table, they have to go get a mop. And the auditor who has to go get a mop all the time, which is to say put the valence in [rudiments in] just isn't reacting very fast. See, he's got a slow reaction.

Now, what you want, when you're adding all this up – what you want in the final analysis, is ways and means of observation, of observing a pc to know what is going wrong and why it is going wrong. To know when the pc is in-session, when the pc is not in-session.

Now, I've just given you ways and means by which you can do that and it'd make you appear pretty clever if it.... Well, you know what the pc's valence is; pc's valence is a robot. Don't think you're really getting down to it when he starts to clank. No, the valences [rudiments] are out when he clanks. The pc doesn't clank. You can have a pc sailing all around and he doesn't clank. But a robot clanks, and you must have brought that into total replay. Must be a valence out – I mean, a rudiment out for the valence to be in. See that?

The pc who dramatizes his valence has a rudiment out. Simple? There are many ways of looking at this sort of thing. And, of course, one of the ways of handling this wrong would be as follows: Pc's terminal is a robot, so you've got it all figured out how the pc would operate if he suddenly went out of valence, he's going to go *whir-clank*. All right, so the pc is run-
ning through some terrifically heavy stretch of engram or something of the sort, and he starts going "Rrr-rrr-rrr-rrr."

You say, "Rudiments out. All right. Well, that's the last command of that particular process. Now let's get these rudiments in."

I don't think that'd be the way to handle that. As a matter of fact, I think that would have let the valence totally overwhelm the pc. Don't you see? No, the way to do that, is just be a little more positive, a little more direct, and direct the pc's attention. You forgot the pc someplace along the line, that's for sure. And you start directing the pc's attention and that whir will turn right off. You caught the egg before it went splash.

These are all the nice little niceties of auditing. These are little tiny thingamubumps that makes the difference between clearing in ten thousand hours and clearing in a couple of hundred. See?

It isn't enough to say to you challengingly, "Well, now, if you just had sufficient powers of observation and if you would just learn to look, why, you would be a good auditor. There. Now, I've said it, and that's it." And anything you did wrong, why, then just say to you challengingly, "Well, you just don't know what you're looking at, and so forth, you see, and so on." That would be a Germanic method of teaching.

I went to Heidelberg once. They specialized in it. When they could get you into class. But fortunately at Heidelberg there was no compulsion of attending class. But the favored method of handling a student was just to show him continuously that he was wrong. Give him some wide generality of observation, you see, something that could be interpreted in fifteen dozen different directions, and then give it with complete German didactiveness – usually an involved paragraph, you see, where everything modified everything and then all the clauses modified the lot. And then just with the most contemptuous, lordly tone of voice, call the students' attention to that, as though that solved all the problems of the universe, you see. It's quite a method of teaching.

Well, we don't pursue this method of teaching, and I would feel I was doing it to you a little bit if I didn't tell you what you should be looking for and what you should be looking at. And if you as an auditor have an idea that you're looking for anything else than compliance of the pc for the auditing command, direction of the pc's attention to his case, keeping the pc in-session – if you think you're doing something else, you ought to shed it as excess baggage. You ought to drop it over in the canal. Because the canal's a long distance from here. And because it's just so much excess baggage.

Anything that doesn't contribute to this exact situation of getting the pc into session, directing the pc's attention, getting the valence plowed out, and bringing the thetan back up to where he can breathe light and air again, is not auditing. Anything that detracts from it, you can jettison, at any time. If you do those things, man, can you get a case to run! And a case can really run.

You would be amazed how thoroughly and how solidly and how much of a sprint of gain can be done in one session, with the pc totally in-session and the auditor in there pitching the whole session all the way through. Wow! I mean, tremendous changes can occur just by
never letting the pc's attention wander. You say the auditing command and he says, "Whir, whir, ah, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir, whir," Well, from about the second whir on you are wasting time. He hasn't got your auditing command; that's what's wrong. The least you could say is, "Did you get that?"

"Oh, uh – wha – hmm?"

"Well, here's the auditing command."

Or, "How'd you do that? What were you looking at? Okay, that's good. Good, here's the next auditing command, bang. What are you looking at now? Did anything happen then? All right. What's going on?"

For a while he'll say, "Nyyrrr, nyyrrrr," and he'll act like a robot or a lion tamer or whatever he is. And all of a sudden he'll say, "You know, there's somebody in here looking over my shoulder. Maybe I'd better start working on this. Do you suppose I ever could... Do you suppose in some slight – do you suppose that there's some tiny, tiny, tiny, faint little chance that at some time at some undetermined future I might possibly get up parallel with this lion tamer? Do you suppose? I don't know, sounds pretty – pretty something or oth – . Ah, yeah. It's not true. Couldn't possibly be...."

And then the auditor's back in there again saying, "All right, you can lick that lion tamer, you know," kind of a thing, "You can direct your attention around," and so forth. "You don't have to do what the lion tamer does. Now, what I want you to do is so-and-so and so-and-so." The next thing you know his confidence starts coming up and his confidence gets bigger, you know, and there's less and less lion tamer, and there's more and more pc.

But it can ride for a very long time if you just let th – matters take their course and remember to do everything technically perfect and think to yourself, "Now, let's see, let me make sure that I get the acknowledgment across to the pc. I wonder if he got that acknowledgment. No, I think the next time. Now I'll give a more forceful auditing command this time. Now, let's see, is the E-Meter all tuned in properly?" and so forth and so on.

You go on worrying about how you're running the session, you won't run one, because you're worried about directing your attention. And you couldn't possibly be worried about directing your attention and worried about directing the pc's attention at the same time because now we've got two pcs. And two pcs don't make a session. And the only thing which is in your favor and the only reason auditing can be done is, you very seldom have the same terminals. [laughter] But wouldn't that be a ball!

You know, auditors will sometimes deny a pc their own terminal, or become upset because the pc has a terminal similar to theirs. All kinds of wildball things can happen. But fortunately, there's an infinite number and the chances of match-up are very slight. So you fall amongst – you fall in the sunlight that lies amongst the shadows and you can do your job very easily.

Thank you.
TEACHING THE FIELD SEC CHECKS

A lecture given on 26 September 1961

Okay. This is the what? The 26th of September AD 11.

And some are departing and some are arriving and some are getting Clear and some are spinning in. That's the majority, of course – the majority, of course. And the fate of the world is in your hands. I say that very lightly, but that happens to be true. Interesting state of affairs, isn't it? And here we are congregated in a little basement room at Saint Hill and the fate of the world is in your hands. Well, look, that's very interesting.

There isn't a single Saint Hiller has gone home to date without getting into a very high state of indignation at what is being called Scientology in the far corners of the world.

How would anybody know about Scientology, whether it worked or didn't work, unless it were practiced? Now, you're going to come in under, when you leave here – after a long series of this – you're going to come under some heavy fire. If you get Clear, you're going to come under some heavy fire. If you simply go home released, you're going to come under some heavy fire.

And, by the way, I – we have had some Release certificates in the process of being printed, and I think there's only one or two students have left here that haven't been a very high state of Release. I'm going to start issuing those certificates.

The state of affairs is, there should be something that signalizes this fact, because I don't like to see anybody go out of here who isn't in a – in a pretty fine state of knowingness and whose case won't be able to stand up to it a bit because of this other factor. And this other factor is that if you go home and in the vicinity in which you will be operating, you are bound – and it is inevitable that you will stand up to some fire. Why? Because your own state of indignation will invite it.

Female voice: Yeah.

That's perfectly all right. Be indignant. You'll find Scientology, she ain't practiced in that area, you're going to raise hell. That's for sure. I know. And I can see the bodies strewn around now.

And this is going to cause what? This is going to cause the people you shoot at a small amount of unhappiness. People are going to demand of you that you promptly sit down in their immediate vicinity and their auditing chair and process them and take on the immediate
responsibilities where they are. And, of course, you probably won't do that and that will make them unhappy with you.

That's just one source of things. That's already happened and so forth.

But there hasn't been anybody left here who had a course completion, there have only been two students left here without a course completion that haven't found a great deal to be very hot and snarly about in the way of Scientology practice, because it practically hasn't been done. And you might want to know at this stage what is the thing you can put people to doing that will produce the best results in your immediate area? Would you like to know that?

_Audience_: Yes.

All right. Well, get them to – this is technically – get them to doing TRs and get them to get down pat the E-Meter and Security Checking. Get them to get down Model Session and the new rudiments processes.

Now, if you do just those things with them on the technical basis, you will find there's an enormous increase in it. It's not all the doodle-daddles and theory. You see, people who are low on the effort band most easily go to thought, not action. You see? And they'll just sit around and figure forever and ever and ever about the difference between two theories, you see, whether or not the theta-MEST theory is correct or something like that. And they just can't even do their TRs, don't you see? And you'll find there are a lot of people very learned on the subject of theory who can't audit. That's because it can't go any further than theory, you see?

Well, let the theory fall where it may. If they can perform these technical actions at a professional level, they will get auditing results. And if they can't, they won't. And it's as simple as that.

Now, I'll add one more to that as an afterthought. They should know how to do the CCHs, because they are inevitably going to run into this problem. Somebody is un-security-checkable. And so they're going to have to know how to do the CCHs. That is the prime indicator as was just practiced and just discovered – not newly, but rediscovered and so on. But again when you cannot security check – and we're talking now about field auditors; we're not talking about you. We're talking about a practice way out someplace, where they can't security check. Person gets off all kinds of things that should be withholds and there's no needle reaction. Got the idea? And you say, "Well, did you ever rape anyone?"

"Oh, yes, I raped fifteen girls and twenty-seven men and seven dogs and – and so forth. I remember bashing a baby in the head one time after raping it and so forth and…" There's no needle reaction of any character on any of this. It's never been audited before.

But these things are not withholds; the person sees nothing wrong with these things at all.

Security Check is _an answer_. It is a good, positive answer, until it runs into that null, no-reaction.

The person's never been security checked, don't you see? And no social misconduct is a withhold – you've got the CCHs. All right. And they can be applied in that particular cir-
cumstance with success. And you apply them, of course, the way the CCHs are supposed to be applied. Not flatten CCH 1 and seventy-five hours later be sending a telegram to Saint Hill to find out whether or not you now flatten the left hand.

Female voice: Jesus!

Happened – it has happened.

You run each one flat – as flat as it looks on a twenty-minute test and go on to CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4, flattening each one on a twenty-minute test and if it produces no reaction within twenty minutes, of course, you go back to the beginning and CCH 1 – start all over again. Flatten them in rotation and you'll find out the CCHs always bite like mad.

All right. Now, that becomes a borderline, a bridge point. If you can't security check, you've got to have the CCHs. So the person technically should be able to run the CCHs properly.

All right. So that gives you actually the totality of the technical list. There are – there are no other items here of vast importance. You get many second grade items such as Auditor's Code, the various odds and ends that are the old HCA/HPA standbys, that sort of thing. But I've – just gave you the list of paramount importance.

All right. Now, what do you give them as a process then? What do you give these people as a process? Do you say, "Well, all you do is find the pc's goal and terminal and then you assess it on the Prehav Scale and then you run it and then you run some engrams when they come up after you've got a level flat." you tell them this? Well, no, you've just picked them up by the scruff of the neck and thrown them in the sea of tar as far as they're concerned. They're from nowhere.

In the first place, they're probably in a games condition with pcs. And they're not about to let anybody have a goal and they're not to let – about to let anybody have a terminal. And they're not skilled enough to put rudiments in easily. Well, all right. There's an old gag occurs to me about somebody or other and swimming Lady told a bunch of little boys who wanted her son to come swimming with them, "Well, my Abie can't go swimming until he knows how."

Now, that's very applicable here in auditing. You say, well, if the thing to do to really get a case on the road is to find the person's goal and terminal and assess it on the Prehav Scale and flatten a level or two and find some engrams and run that. And if that's the way the person will go out fastest and yet you can't do any of these things unless you're a skilled auditor, how do you ever get any auditing skill in order to do this? Well, you've got the Security Check. And what you teach them how to do is a Security Check. And boy, do you teach them how to security check. And you just keep at it and you use these various skills. And that's why you have to have this CCHs, you see, in case they can't be security checked.

You know, the person just gets no reactions on anything. They've been a – they've been a social evil, the kind that Billy Sunday lectured about for his whole lifetime and yet they never have a quiver. They get reverse actions on – you can tell this with null questions, by the way. You can find this out before you find it out. Those null questions on Sec Check 3 – if they get reverse reactions, if the person reacts every time he tells the truth – that goes
along with the reverse can squeeze. Actually, the needle rises when they squeeze the cans. You can suspect that if either of these two phenomena occur… You say, "Well, am I sitting – are you sitting in that chair?" and they say, "Yes," and get a steep fall. And they're supposed to answer – what is it – no to each one of these questions, you see?

Well, they're supposed to – if they were supposed to answer yes to each one of these questions and you asked them, "Are you sitting in that chair?"

And they said, "Yes." They would get a steep fall.

And you say, "Are you on the moon?"

And they'd say, "Yes." And there would be absolutely no reaction on the needle at all.

In other words, lies don't react but truth does. Well now, these boys around in "psyrology" who are fooling around with personnel security checks, police, (quote) experts (unquote).

By the way, they've already been legislated against in the state of Massachusetts. The unions have managed to bring in legislation dead against doing any lie detector checks of any kind on personnel for employment. I thought that was quite interesting, but it shows how the thing can be muddied up by a bunch of guys doing something they don't know what they're doing. That has no significance beyond the fact that it is a sign of the times. Such legislation, of course, could practically wipe you out eventually. A trained operator must always be part of any such legislation.

But anyway, these boys would, of course, never get a Security Check reaction – the psyrologist – he'd never get a Security Check reaction on the most irresponsible people. And if the only criteria for employment was no reaction on the machine, you would only employ psychotics or neurotics, you see? You'd only employ the totally irresponsible people. Quite interesting, isn't it?

Now, the thing to do when you walk into an area is you tell people to get these things straight. Get these things straight that I just gave you a list of there. Get those things straight. Their TRs and the E-Meter and Model Session – the things I gave you there – get those straight and do those extremely well while security checking, because they can't mess people up doing Security Checks even if they audit rather badly. And Security Checks are the single most certain case gain we know of below Routine 3. See, easy to do; positive results. Good, good results.

Now, you can do all kinds of weird things with Security Checks. Including tear up the Security Check that might compromise the auditor. You'll find that being done occasionally.

Well, this Security Check 3, they wouldn't want to give that to people, so they have something: "Do you have an ARC break with Tom?" That's a "Security Check" question. "Do you have an ARC break with Bill?" You see, those are "Security Check" questions, because you see, "Security Check 3, that's too accusative, you know?" "Have you ever cooked company's books?" you know? "Have you ever been a bad boy?" "Are you working under an assumed name?" Crash! Crash! Crash! Crash! You see, this is invading privacy with a bull-
dozer. And you'll find that people here and there just couldn't confront invading privacy to this degree.

As a matter of fact, I myself hate occasionally to run a Security Check into the teeth of somebody just off the street that are from nowhere, see? And we just drive up with a Security Check Form 3, you see and start asking him these questions. If my primary goal with the person is to preserve ARC, I find it very, very difficult to start in like that, so I do a word of explanation about it. There's nothing personal about this, I tell them. [laughter] But that's as far as I will compromise. And you'll find that other people will compromise further than that, such as tearing up all of Security Check Form 3 and substituting such things as, "Have you ever eaten candy and spoiled your appetite?" Well, that's a big withhold, yeah, you see? So they'll grade down a Security Check. So you must convince them that they can always add to a Security Check. Take out all of their proclivities for additivity on Security Checks. They can always add to Security Checks but never subtract anything from a Security Check. Ask everything on the Security Check and anything else they want to.

But the best method is to write out a predetermined series of questions as an additional thing which is for that person particularly. You figure out about what their relationship to life or something of the sort has been and then you write a little special series of questions.

We do it all the time for you here. Every once in a while you'll be sitting in the pc's chair during a Security Check session and you'll find yourself being asked some questions that are peculiarly native to your case or might be. And generally, I've written them up or Mary Sue has written them up and handed them to your auditor to be asked.

Well, so it's always possible, you see, to write up an additional list. Now, don't make that the only Security Check – this additional list, you see? Give that along with a standard Security Check. So you can always add questions to a standard Security Check. So you teach people to do this, you see? And this is getting additives and this is getting very clever and this is getting complicated enough. Now, you recognize that people who are having a little bit of difficulty in life are having difficulty because they're slightly complicated. And it takes more complication to form a reality.

You'll find that the – I've forgotten what you call him – alienist. No, no, that's not the term being used. An electrician, no that isn't it. Well, whatever we call him, he's the fellow who handles the electric shock machines and the prefrontal lobotomy lives in the nut houses.

Well, this gent doesn't believe in Scientology because it's not complicated enough. Now you – you try to convince him, you say "Well, it's simple, you can do this." He knows you can't, because it's not complicated enough.

So is – there's the old cycle – 17th ACC is my reference on this. This was gone over tremendously in the 17th ACC. I think it was the 17th, wasn't it? Complications and Simplicities.

So, you'll find out that in trying to teach somebody something that you say, "All you have to do is sit down and read this series of questions to the preclear and then if you get a needle reaction, then you keep asking him the question in various ways until you've cleaned up the needle reaction." Well, this might not be complicated enough, see? It might not be
complicated enough to – and they wouldn't think it was effective unless it was more complicated. Do you see how this is?

So, there are other complications that you can teach them about a Security Check, which is a good thing, because it measures the level of complexity. And they're all very factual. They're not anything you're just adding to make it up, because it's a good thing occasionally with a case here and there to dream up a half a dozen questions or a dozen questions and add them to a Security Check.

This fellow has been auditing for quite a while and we're giving him a Form 6. And we happen to know that he has been auditing in a very peculiarly specialized zone. And there are a lot of security-type questions that might come up on the subject of auditing for that peculiar zone, don't you see?

Like we had somebody that was just in the navy – just got out of the navy. We'd give him a straight Form 6, you see, but we could interlard it with special questions or attach to it special questions or begin it with special questions about auditing in the navy, see?

"Did you ever audit an officer in a certain way as to make him think that you ought to be promoted?" or something like that. [laughter] Oddball angles.

These things come up. So anyway, you then kind of get the idea of what kind of a life your preclear's been leading, what his professional or domestic zones are and you adapt security questions to that and you add it to standard forms.

Now, there are, at this moment, eight distinct security question forms, one of which has a subdivision making, actually, nine. We are up to HCO WW Security Form 8 right now, which I think is the number of the children's check.

Female voice: That's right.

Well, there are several more that we haven't released yet, so there are lots of them.

And, these – these all have their special usages, don't you see? And you could actually pick up any one of them and you could teach people quite a bit about just any one of these Security Checks, you see.

Like the children's check. Teaching them how to use a children's check. That's quite interesting. You, of course, mustn't ask a question which the child can't understand because you will have an immediate ARC break. He thinks he's being accused of something; he doesn't know what you're talking about. So you have to rephrase all of the questions in the child's Security Check, you see, so as to reach the comprehension level of a child.

Now, you can give that check to an adult and clean up his childhood and accomplish what Freud was trying to accomplish with – I think his standard course of psychoanalysis was 180,000 hours, wasn't it? Three lifetimes. That was optimum. At sixty dollars a week for four hours, something like that. Or four hours of psychoanalysis per week, sixty dollars a week. And they spent the first two years finding out if they could do anything for the person. Yeah, it's quite interesting, quite interesting swindle. Anyway – because it was a swindle because they knew very definitely at the beginning they couldn't do anything for the person. They just hoped.
But what were they trying to do? They were trying to plumb the secrets of his childhood. Well, you could use Form 8 to do just that fact and it'd be quite interesting. You could lay open childhood. Let's say – we quite normally run into people who cannot remember earlier than eleven. That's quite astonishing. And if it's astonishing to you, why, you just haven't asked them. But they very often have some kind of a ceiling on the number of years of their life that they can remember. Well, they remember well back to five, you see. Or they remember well back to eight or something like that.

Well, all of that is quite aberrative because it's simply unknown to them and it influences them in this lifetime and so they worry about it. And they'll have a lot of think about it one way or the other. They won't be worrying about the lifetime just before that perhaps to the degree that they're worried about their childhood in this lifetime because they're still connected with it.

And the other can drop out of sight and may or may not restimulate, but their childhood certainly will sooner or later, because they are running into the same zones and sceneries.

The only time a past life really starts hitting you in the head and gunning you down and so on, is when it's being lived in the same surroundings – it was lived in the same surroundings you are now living in. Like we had somebody, I think, on the 6th or 7th – 6th – it was the 6th. And I think she had been born three times in the same house and lived her life the whole time in that house and that was the three lifetimes immediately preceding this one and she was still in the house. Something on that order. And that was quite upsetting. Because, for some reason or other, she didn't get more familiar with it. She got less familiar with it all.

But anyway, a Security Check can be slanted in the direction of opening up somebody's childhood. Now, that actually makes very interesting auditing. It might not be the finest auditing as far as hour for hour on Routine 3 is concerned, but we have to front up to this factor. What is the most result that an auditor – an auditor, a particular auditor – can achieve per hour of auditing?

Now, that isn't necessarily the best process for the preclear. You should understand that, because this has a tremendous bearing on the duties of a Director of Processing. It is not necessarily what the pc needs that will achieve the greatest result, but is what the auditor can effectively apply to the pc that gives us the greatest result. Now, that is – there's a difference there and when you're directing auditors in auditing, it is a factor which you must not neglect.

Well, we had an auditor one time that could run nothing under the sun but SCS-Stop. [laughter] And it was quite marvelous. She even invented a new – a new bit to it. Called it Stop Supreme. Took it off of an old drill I had and that was it. But boy, could that auditor run that and that auditor could always get results with it.

And if you put that auditor to running anything else on a pc, you got no graph change, which was quite interesting. Or you even got maybe a graph cave-in. So the thing to do, obviously, was any pc that this auditor had was going to get SCS with Stop Supreme finally added, too, don't you see? And to that degree, she was a good auditor. She could do this.
And another auditor, 8-C was about all this auditor could do well. But anyhow, there is a way of even adjusting this – this is an old one in HGCs – is you get a new auditor, you've just taken this new auditor on. And, of course, people are paying for processing and you've got to have some kind of a result and you've got to have it right now. And you actually are setting up all kinds of upsets if you don't get them results instantly.

Doesn't matter what is wrong with the pc. If the auditor can process a process with confidence, he will get better results with the process the auditor can run, than the process which the pc ought to have. And that isn't just a compromise. I mean, it's a stark reality. And you ask an auditor just brought on staff that you've got to give to a paying pc, you ask this auditor, "What process have you had best results with in auditing?"

And the fellow said, "Well, I've just had absolutely marvelous results with Rising Scale Processing. I just wouldn't use anything else."

You say, "That's fine."

And during the weeks necessary to train him up into current rundown, you let him run Rising Scale Processing on any pc that sits down in the chair. And you'll find out that you have continuous wins. You get wins.

Now, you try not to give him a pc that can only be run on something else. [laughter] And then in that way you will win. And that is a method of doing it.

So now, with Security Checks you get fast wins. And that is what it takes to make an auditor reality. We are now talking about auditors auditing rather than pcs recovering, you see? And it – a fast reality.

Now, any auditor who has gotten tired of auditing and is upset about auditing has had a lot of loses. And you can just add those two factors together and they fit like the Geminis. Not interested in auditing: had a lot of loses.

It isn't necessarily true that an auditor has a lot of loses and then becomes disinterested in auditing. But it is true that if an auditor is disinterested in auditing, he's had a lot of loses.

It's true in life that when you say to somebody, "Why don't you learn how to audit if you want to really handle your staff well?" or something like that. "Why don't you learn how to audit?" you can ask him.

And if he says, "Well, no, learn how to audit. Oh, I couldn't do something like – I mean – pat – I'm a professional man who then – I'm just an administrator," and so forth "and learning how to audit."

He's just telling you, "I have many times failed to help people!" That is what he is saying in great big exclamation points. "I have failed so often in my efforts to help people beginning with my father, continuing through with my mother, my sisters, brothers, cousins and aunts; going out into all of my schoolmates; going out into my best friend – my best friend in college. I remember I helped him all one night and he went out the next morning and had an automobile accident and got killed. And life has been one long disaster in trying to help people."
That is what he is saying. If you ask him and say, "Well, why don't you really learn how to handle people and help people and know what makes them tick and so forth, if you're going to do a good administrative or foreman's job or a boss job or an executive's job or something like that?" And he tells you, "Oh, no, I couldn't do that." That's – the parallel statement is "I have many times failed to help people."

Now, you get auditors around in the field who aren't doing very much auditing. They are phasing off of auditing; they are running away from auditing. Well, God knows what kind of auditing they were doing and what they were calling auditing and what they were running on people and how many thousand times they changed the process during one session and how many goofball things were going on here. But we don't care about that.

But we do know that the person failed many times in auditing pcs. We know that. And this brings about hecticness in changing processes; hecticness in getting results. "We have to get a result in one session, you see or we should get two or three results in one session." And this tremendously exaggerated idea of what we ought to be doing for the pc is totally built on failures to help. And the more failures to help, the more anxious they get and then eventually the more they fail. And they eventually will dramatize failure to help and they sit down and it's as much as your life's worth to be audited by them, because all that they're going to audit you with is Failed Help.

They're going to sit there and prove to you that you can't be helped. Now, auditors seldom do this, but psychoanalysts do. And the most aberrative, broad, general disease, so-called in the society, is alcoholism. Although heart failure, I think, is the top dog alcoholism as a (quote) disease (unquote) comes in there somewhere. And isn't it interesting that their main society now has as a principle and primary datum that alcoholism is incurable and that you could do nothing for an alcoholic? And they prove it to their people as the first thing they have to accept is that nothing can be done for alcoholism.

You see how far a person can go with help? See, as they go down scale, they get less and less eager to and then they eventually wind up preventing it. So they've almost… Well, you could ask one of these Alcoholics Anonymous people, "What if the cure for alcoholism turned up, just like that?"

"Oh, well, that can never happen and so…"

"Oh, wait a minute. You mean to say you're going to predict everything the human race is going to invent for the next century? Oh, come off of it, man. That's – that's a little bit broad."

And yet they will just stand there didactically on that point and say, "There is absolutely no way. And the first thing you've got to know about alcoholism is nothing can cure it and nothing…" And of course they've had it, because we move in on the line and we can do something for alcoholism. And yet practically every member of Alcoholics Anonymous will be a stranger to you, if you're running a center. They won't come near you, because that's a stable datum on which they operate.
And if you say you can help alcoholism or do something for alcoholism, they stay away in droves, you see, because their first datum is that you can't. And that's just failed help, failed help, failed help.

Well, the hardest person in the world to help is an alcoholic. I don't know if you've ever tried to help an alcoholic but, holy suffering catfish, that is a marvelous way to spin yourself in, you know. They lie, they cheat, they will do anything under the sun to get another swig out of the bottle. Boy, I'll tell you, it's mad. And their baby is without shoes and without food and without milk and could they please have a dollar? You give them a dollar and you can smell their breath in ten minutes and they've had a drink, you know? And it's just marvelous. They'll do anything.

It's – the dope addict probably is less observable in a society, but does more or less the same thing, you see?

So it's a great source of failure, alcoholism. And it winds up now with the stable datum that help is impossible.

Well, an auditor is going that same route when he is getting (quote) "tired of auditing". Then "when he doesn't audit well," all of these other things. So, if you're going to teach somebody to audit, you've got to give them something that gives them a fast result now and catch up with that anxiety rate.

And the funny part of it is, if they can do a Security Check well and the Security Check is well adapted to the person's case and circumstances, they will get fast results with a Security Check.

Now, I don't know if you have any terrific reality on that or not at this stage of the game, but you pull a withhold off of somebody and he suddenly feels different.

Now, it's all how you stack up the questions of the Security Check, how fast you're going to get a "Well, what do you know" on the part of the person. But the most dogged, plugging, never cognite, slog pc – the kind that just drive you batty, you know? They sit there and they run the process and they run the process and they run the process – what Smokey used to call "good pcs," or "educated pcs." They just keep running and running and running and running and just run commands and they answer commands and they never say – and I – this – old John's comment: he said, "You know," he said, "I get suspicious of somebody that never says 'Well, what do you know!'" And it would be that absence of a "What do you know," you know, about his case that would make very sure that the person was making no progress.

Well, one of the most fruitful zones and areas of "What do you knows" is a Security Check. That is – that is very fruitful if you choose the right check.

Now, of course, here in your security checking, you're going over general Security Checks and you're keeping Security Checks parallel to case advance with Routine 3, see? So the pc's whole attention is on case advance, Routine 3. And you're not getting a very real look at a pure Security Check, because the person is all interested in finding his goal and interested in finding his terminal and interested in getting it run. He's being security checked while he is stuck in the engram, you know? You get all that kind of thing, you know? And you're security checking him as an extra. And this is a different view.
Now, a person who is pinning all of his hopes on the Security Check and that is his auditing, doesn't act this way – if you've chosen the right Security Check. Now, that's why there have got to be lots of Security Checks. And you will see more of them. I mean, there won't be any finite number of Security Checks.

Because you can do this with a Security Check: You can cure a psychosomatic illness. Just that way. I mean, it's that good. You just use the present time problem of long duration of the pc as the subject of your Security Check and you dream up a whole Security Check that has to do with the present time problem of long duration of the pc. You're looking for hidden standards.

All right. A hidden standard. Now that – very succinct: A hidden standard is that which the pc uses to find out whether or not he's making progress. So, of course, you've gotten the one thing on which his attention is fixed. I'm sure right now amongst you, you've got more than one case that has a hidden standard that you as an auditor haven't spotted. You know, is he worrying less or is he worrying more? See? This would be a hidden standard. And unless you – unless you really take these hidden standards apart, you're going to have a case stalling. It's a present time problem of long duration and they use it as a hidden standard. And it's the standard by which they know whether or not they are making progress or retrogressing.

So a present time problem of long duration becomes also a hidden standard. And you've got people that have two or three of these things maybe and they're sitting around on them. Now, the easiest way to knock them out is Routine 3: Find their goal, find their terminal and audit it. That is the easiest way to handle any hidden standard, but we're talking about another zone and area of auditing now. We're talking about auditing that can be done by almost any auditor.

And we do this kind of thing. This is quite effective. We saw around on the case until we find a hidden standard. Now, "What – what would have to happen for you to know that Scientology was working on you?" is the clue question. That is the key question to it. And the person has to think a long time, because they very often have got these things very buried.

The person says eventually, "Well," the person says, "oh, well, uh…"

"Yes?"

"Well, my arm would have to stop hurting."

Now, sometimes you get a hidden standard answer on the subject of this, and this will baffle you and you are liable to miss it, because I missed it the first time I ever heard it. I was down in Greece, by the way, when I heard this the first time. In order to know that Scientology worked, first one person and then another person would have to improve in some fashion. Only the second person had nothing to do with and no connection with Scientology.

In other words, for this lady to know that Scientology was working, her daughter would have to get better. But her daughter is not an auditor, not part of the center, nothing of the sort. Isn't that a fascinating one?
In other words, the hidden standard is totally projected, has nothing to do with the person anymore, but has to do with somebody else. And that is a hidden standard. But of course that's an *impossible* standard. Actually, we know in fact that it is not an impossible standard because we have had people get well by straightening out other people's PT problems with them. But they will come up with something like this. "What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?"

"Well," they'd say, "well, my son would have to get a job." Now, you could twist this around saying, "Well, in other words, I would have to audit your son. And your son would have to come out of it and get a job." That is not what the person means at all. It means, "If you process me, my son would have to be able to get a job."

So admit that into your rundown of what hidden standards can consist of. The hidden standard can go on any of the eight dynamics. "God would have to be happy." [laughter] I swear someday somebody processing somebody is going to get that one. That's right. "God would have to be happy again to know that Scientology worked."

Now, there's your extensional action. Now, an extensional action is a Security Check bait to end all Security Check baits. And when you can find one of those things, you can really start straightening somebody out *whamity-whamity-wham*. Because that is a natural for a Security Check. That is a perfect Security Check.

Naturally, you security check them on their son. See? You just run down a whole series of questions about anything they might possibly have ever done to their son and ask those questions; clear it as a Security Check. And they all of a sudden will have a case gain, because they've got some individuation which has made us – a terminal closure. And when you get those withholds off, you'll snap the terminal closure. You know, it will snap out. And they all of a sudden will become more themselves. And they will get a "What do you know." You see how you can do that?

So that any time you search down a hidden standard, don't consider that it's going to be on the person's body or in the person's own immediate psyche. It's liable to be tremendously projected. "For me to know that Scientology worked, my business would have to prosper."

Well, you can almost understand that, can't you, except that they don't. [laughter] You very often make the mistake of understanding something the pc doesn't. He has no grasp on it at all. You think immediately that he has said, "Well, if you made me more effective, then I would do my job better and therefore my business would prosper."

And this is not what he has said at all. He has told you, I am my business. And this lady down in Greece told me that she was her daughter. So what you're doing there is doing a terminal spring. And you can actually do a terminal separate. Nowhere near as good as a Routine 3 assessment, but nevertheless it is a terminal snap. Get the idea?

Now, wherever you can find one of those things, you can adapt a Security Check to it and you've got results. You're actually running the equivalent of "What have you done to – ?" "What have you withheld from – ?" on a highly directive, specialized basis. Because "What
have you done to – ?” and "What have you withheld from – ?" is a part of the Prehav Scale. And if you run too much of it, you are just overrunning a certain section of the Prehav Scale.

Now, withholds don't add up to withholds. They add up to overt, they add up to secreties, they add up to individuations, they add up to games conditions, they add up to a hell of a lot more things than O/W, although we carelessly call them withholds. We're asking a person to straighten out their interpersonal relationships with another terminal – is what we are doing.

Now, our normal Security Check is addressed to the individual versus the society or his family. If you'll notice, practically every one of them except 6, is addressed to the society or the family. Because it's what people would consider reprehensible that makes a withhold.

In a Catholic society, not having kept Mass would be a reprehensible action. And in a non-Catholic society, nobody would think twice about it. So that most of our Security Checks are aimed at transgressions against the mores of the group. And that is the basic center line of the Security Check as you see it normally. Do you follow that closely? Do you see that as a specialized thing?

Now, do you see as well that you could have a special mores between the son and the mother? A special mores between the husband and the wife? Just as you have a special mores, of course, between the auditor and the preclear to which Form 6 is devoted. That's a special mores. That's what a pc would consider reprehensible or what other Scientologists would consider reprehensible as actions by the auditor.

Now, that is based on good sense. And that it is reprehensible, from the standpoint of human behavior, is incidental to the fact that it is simply a specialized mores. It's a moral code that you're processing one way or the other. You're straightening out somebody on the now-I'm-supposed-to's. And they've transgressed against a series of now-I'm-supposed-to's. And having so transgressed, they now are individuated. And if their individuation is too obsessive, they snap in and become the terminal.

So all of these cycles exist around the idea of the transgression against the now-I'm-supposed-to. And that's what a Security Check clears up. And that is all it clears up. Now, you see, it's a great deal more than a withhold.

Now, you can just see some blood-dripping priest of the Old Testament asking how somebody has transgressed against the ark of the covenant or something of the sort and having some member of the cult, you see, practically faint at the idea of having to come up with the fact that one day they accidentally spat as it was being borne by. And yet this would be a very aberrative fact, you see?

Now, having released this into the open air, we get less individuation involved.

Now, the Catholic confession is only one type of Security Check that is a kind of an automaticity trick, which doesn't depend in the least on interrogation, but just depends on whether or not somebody out of the goodness of his heart is going to spill the goods and get a few paternosters or something and go his way happily. And it actually has ceased to have very much punch.
But it's transgressions against the Catholic mores. Only that. And there is no wider perimeter to it. And it isn't actually a Security Check at all because it's just whatever the person feels guilty about, which means that no criminal would ever walk near the confession box.

And, of course, the whole Catholic religion was done in by criminals. The reason it hasn't the worldwide sweep that it has today is they just had a few too many, particularly in their own high places. Alexander the Fourth is a very good example. He made lots of money for the Church. The Church became a big business under Alexander the Fourth, but I don't think he'd have anybody in occupying a cardinal's hat or a bishopric unless the fellow had a long and involved record of some kind or another.

He held his position by poisoning. You know it today as a cliche of Lucrezia Borgia. That was his, I think, niece. Anyway, he used her in that fashion.

So you see, that type of Security Check lets everything go by the boards that doesn't register, because if the person doesn't feel guilty about it, it isn't freed. Don't you see? So it requires the factor of make-guilty in order to make the process work. Right?

So, any Security Check may have this factor added to it. If they're all based on frail mores of peculiar constructions and now-I'm-supposed-to's, then making people guilty of these things is another parallel check, isn't it? Hm?

_Audience_: Yeah.

Yeah.

Now, crippling somebody's right arm is, actually, an overt, but we have somehow or another made the man guilty of having a right arm, haven't we?

All right. Now, let's move in to the finer points of how you would free up a chronic somatic with a Security Check. In the first place, the person would have to have some reality on the fact that that was wrong with him.

In other words, they would want to do – have to want to do something about it. You, out of your own fell swoop, couldn't say this fellow shouldn't have leprosy.

This is the medical code, you know? The medical code assumes immediately that everybody thinks they ought to be well. And this is a hell of an assumption, because it's a long way from true. And you pick up fellows in various parts of the world and you ask them – that have various difficulties and you ask them whether or not they should recover from those difficulties and you're liable to practically get stoned.

You ask some beggar in some far off part of the world whether or not he ought to get rid of his blindness – which is simply some ophthalmialitis or something of the sort – and he's liable to be horrified. You're trying to take away his livelihood and all kinds of things. Or you ask somebody who has been successfully getting out of every war with a heart murmur if he wants to get rid of that heart murmur just before conscription is ordered for the next war, you know? And you're going to get "No."

Well, the medical doctor's whole idea of psychosomatic medicine is based on people not wanting to get well. And that is what the medical doctor considers more or less psychosomatic medicine. It – he thinks all difficulties are an unwillingness to get well. Because he's
bucked into this so often and he's been defeated by it so often that he's closed terminals with it. So he wants the psychic trauma removed to make the person well. Well, that is quite interesting, too, because he is again assuming that the person wants to get well.

You can't assume this. You can assume that anything that is wrong with the person has some chance – no matter how slight or remote – but has some chance of being desirable to the person. Something that's wrong with them is desirable to them – some chance of this exists. But largely, in the main, something exists in their life that is wrong that makes it necessary for them to take this odd course of solution. And there is a confusion of some kind in their life that they are solving with this particular difficulty. And we have the old concept of the service facsimile. Getting back to an old friend.

Now, how do you get rid of that? How does this confusion start in? How does it exist? Well, it starts in with withholds. So somewhere in the zone and area of a person's life, there are a series of withholds which wind up with a psychosomatic as a solution.

Now, let's take the wife who is ailing. He has an ailing wife. Very, very, very fashionable – 1870's, very fashionable. It was dramatized enormously in the play about Camille and so forth. For any girl to be an upstanding piece of femininity, she had to have consumption or something like that. And you're practically a social outcast, I suppose, even today in the Bible Belt of the Middle West, if you don't have some horrible disease of some kind or another to complain about to your neighbors. Never met any of them yet that didn't have a misery. If you read their letters to one another, it's some of the most fabulous, misspelled, misdiagnosed medical hotchpotches that you ever wanted to read.

"Well, Zachary, across the road, now – well, Zachary, he's had a misery" – only they don't call it "a misery," it will be an umbilicus or something – "for some weeks now. And he hasn't been able to work." And it's just paragraph by paragraph. Have you ever read any of these letters?

I mean, it's impossible. Maybe that sort of thing is fading out, but I know that just a few years ago on a casual investigation of this I suddenly – I almost started laughing myself sick. These people don't communicate. They infect each other. [laughter]

So anyway, those things are all a protest against life. Protests against life. Illnesses are protests against life. And if you look at it from that point of view, you can then tailor up a Security Check to match the zones of difficulty a person has had in life. And they all come out clean and slick as a whistle and the psychosomatic will disappear.

Now, as you can see readily, this is not a simple thing to do. This requires a lot of figure-figure. See? And you find out lots of auditors are very fond of this, very fond of it. Trying to figure out this preclear, trying to outfigure him. Well, God bless them. More to them. I've been right there in their same boots. But it's something to do about a case. It is a problem and something to worry about, but it's something to be very effective with and they will win. They will win.

Now, this woman with the daughter. All right. Her daughter would have to be well – that's her hidden standard. That would be the first thing you would tell the auditor to try to establish. What does the person want to accomplish in processing? In other words, with this
question, "What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" That's the same thing. That would be an immediate processing goal of some kind or another.

Then you would trace this back to some area or zone of existence or personalities or some activity. Now, this would appear very, very smart to the preclear, but we know that those activities which had to do with changing the position of mass – the heavier the mass, the more change of position – is the most aberrative. That's a fascinating factor.

We find somebody that all of his life has been a railroad locomotive engineer and he's now complaining about something of the sort. I'm afraid I would just tip my hat in passing to the amenities of auditing. I would be right in there pitching, getting off a Security Check type of questioning, whether I had it written down or not, on the subject of locomotives. I would want to know all of his withholds from locomotives, his withholds from everybody about locomotives. I'd want to know everything there was to know about trains in that particular zone and area. And I would give him a train Security Check of some kind or another that would suddenly wind up with the most unlikely recovery of his hearing. Do you see how this would work out? In other words, I would go straight to the person's handling of masses and changes of space or lacking a clue in that direction, would go into his most confused motional areas – not emotional areas, but most motional areas.

This fellow has been a recluse ever since he was twenty. He has not done anything since he was twenty. He hadn't ever been anyplace since he was twenty. There is certainly nothing much to security check, is there?

Well, his hidden standard is he would "get about more." If he would find himself getting about more, he would know that Scientology was working. Well, where the hell do you start with something like this? He's been a recluse since he's twenty and he isn't getting about more. And you conclude immediately that it – as I had with error in years past. I tried to get people out of houses by security checking houses and to some degree succeeded – to some slight degree succeeded.

But there was a better answer and a faster answer. What area was he in before he was twenty? See? Staying in the house is a cure for something. So we put him on the E-Meter and now we can't find areas of moving heavy masses or changes in space before he was twenty because he wasn't working. Probably lies in the zone of maybe – maybe he was in the service? Maybe he was in a boarding school? Something like that. So all of a sudden we hit the jackpot. And we find an area of considerable activity. And we're looking for the area of activity which lies prior to the difficulty.

And then we run a Security Check on that area of activity. And we trace it back to boarding school. He's – there's one boarding school that he absolutely detests, he suddenly remembers. Boy, does he detest it. He was there between the ages of thirteen and fifteen. Well, that's what we security check.

Every question we ask has to do with this boarding school. Well, just add up the factors. Well, how many factors are there in a boarding school? How many things can go on in a boarding school? How many people are present? What is there in a boarding school?
Well, of course, there are students and boys and instructors and coaches and headmasters. And there's buildings and there's athletic equipment. You see what you're running into here. And probably there's transport from there to home. And there's probably a sick bay of some kind or another, to go nautical on you, and maybe a hospital orderly and a floor master. And let's just try and get all of this down and let's find out all the types of crimes that he might have been able to commit against these items. In other words, we can dream up a whole Security Check, see? We've got the guy on the E-Meter and we've sorted it out and we know what his hidden standard is and we know now the zone of heavy masses or we know the zone of most commotion, deestation and activity – we know all these things. Now, having done all those things, we're content with that session. And now we go dream up one. Don't just start running it off the cuff right at that point, because that gets to be nonsense. Because it looks like a big Q-and-A with the pc and so forth. And it throws the pc out of session and out of control.

But let's dream up one and let's get a nice Security Check all tagged around this thing one way or the other. One of the ways of doing it, crudely, is to take an existing Security Check and Hobson-Jobson it over – take an existing Security Check and just move it over into the zone of the school. But that's not as satisfactory as just scribbling down a – whole things that you really think he probably did in this school that he is never going to tell anybody.

And of course, you will be absolutely amazed at the life of crime he lived during that period. [laughter] Because inevitably it will be an area of tight mores.

The military is an area of tight mores. You see, there are many things – many crimes, that you could do in the military that never occur to you in civilian life as crimes, but are crimes in the military.

And it's some tight mores of some kind or another and he has cut up against those mores, so has individuated himself from the school, so cannot as-is any part of the track. Of course, he gets trapped in that particular zone and activity.

Now, I know one pc – I've heard Mary Sue say, "I know what's wrong with him" – this is from way back when, way back when – "I know what's wrong. He's stuck in college." And she pointed these facts out to me and by golly, she was right. And we've never security checked that particular person against college. And we certainly should. We certainly should, because he makes practically no case gains. He is a – he is a marvel at no case gains.

Now, he'd make – he'd make terrific case gains if you ran him under Routine 3. Don't get the idea he wouldn't, see? You find his goal and you find his terminal. And you'd run him on a whole track basis and he'd come up at the other end of it fine.

But we're talking now about trying to get a fast result on this particular case, not being able to well do Routine 3. Now, Routine 3 is something like handing a fellow a couple of Lewis machine guns, say, and put a burp gun in his lap, cock all of them and tell him to juggle them. And that's the way he feels, you know? He's asked to make like – what are some of these Indian gods that have fifteen arms? He can't do it, he thinks. See, it's just all too much. It's all too sudden. And you're not going up against the same intensity of training that you're undergoing here, see? You're trying to train this person to do something effective. Well, you
can train him to do the various things which I have said. You get him on that technical routine and then you teach him about Security Checks.

Now, I'm just trying to give you, today, some kind of a concept of how many things you can teach a person about a Security Check and how many ways you can do a Security Check and how many targets you can have with a Security Check. And which way you can go with these things.

And let me tell you that if you could get all the auditors of an HGC doing excellent Security Checks on everybody who walked in, more or less on the basis that I've been talking about right here, if you could get them first, just first, to do nothing but a straight Security Check – you know, you just read the questions off, see? They're going to get some results, aren't they?

All right. Now, you can teach them as a gradient how to fancy this up. Let's adapt the Security Check to the pc. Now, this pc has lost his memory, he says. Well, of course – you – "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" as a repetitive process. You can tailor up repetitive processes as D of P and get over to something like that. But let's get a very fast result with this character. Let's get a fast result.

He's lost his memory, has he? Well, the first thing that you could do on a broad basis, less effective, would be to run O/W against a deaf person.

Female voice: A deaf?

Deaf person, yes. Run overts/withholds. "Who in your family was deaf?" and so forth. "That's good." "Who in your family didn't recall things well?"

"Oh, well, that's different, isn't it?"

"Well, all right. Good. Now, who in your family was always losing things? – Oh, that's good," you know. You cover all the zones and areas of shut-off communication. "Who in your family was blind?" What is forget but non-observe? Or an occluded observation? So that any set of cut sensory perceptions would operate as overt bait. Do you follow me? I see you looking a little puzzled there.

Forget, is a version of not-know, isn't it? So that any sensory perceptive cutoff is an effort not to know and you have a target. Now – person has overts against that person, he's liable to inherit some of the characteristics of the person.

Now, you've got a thing like "recover my memory," you're going to have a hell of a time getting him to remember the person who couldn't remember if he's in the valence of the person who doesn't remember, aren't you?

So you could approach it obliquely and you could take all sensory cutoffs and get this type of action going. And you find out that he inadvertently really messed up a boy playmate, eventually, on a Security Check. When he finally remembers this which is totally occluded, he heaves one horrible sigh of relief and his memory returns. He blinded a boy. Well, that would operate as a side panel of forgettingness, wouldn't it?

Any version of not-knowingness. You don't have to go this far afield to get this esoteric. I probably have erred in giving you anything as widely esoteric as this. But the person
comes in. He's got a goal. He's got a goal to recover his memory. Well, you could find out not when he could remember well or what zones he could remember well, but you could find out who wouldn't remember well or who insisted on his remembering or something of this sort, don't you see? And as a subsidiary to this, who didn't want to perceive, which would be the most able method of never knowing, is never perceiving.

You could break this thing down, in other words and then you could security check the person in that zone and area where this or that person occurred. Now, we find out that his whole family – he eventually remembers that his whole family was noted for never remembering anything. They were blind, deaf, dumb and halt, you see? [laughter] And yet your pc doesn't sit there and say, "Well, what do you know." Sometimes he'll say, "Ha-ha. No wonder I've got a bad memory. Ha-ha. I just remembered the whole family couldn't remember. They were known all over the neighborhood for not being able to remember anything, you know?"

And he doesn't do a "What do you know." That'll be very rare. Well, you don't get a "What do you know" so you get a lose, don't you? Now, how often have you known exactly what was wrong with the pc and then pointed it out and that was what was wrong with the pc, but the pc never said, "Well, what do you know" and never recovered from a thing. Have you ever done that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Hm? Well, do you know how to get him to say, "Well, what do you know?"

Take everything that you've worked up to right there and now do a Security Check on it and you'll eventually get a "what do you know." He's too in the thing to see it. You can see it because you're outside of it. So you say, "Well, you lunkhead, why the hell don't you see this thing?" you're sort of thinking to yourself, you know? You kind of grit your teeth and strain so the guy can, you know, see it. But he just doesn't.

"Well," he says, "I've always had trouble with women. I do everything I possibly can do not to have trouble with women. I never go with them if I can possibly help it. I never make myself personable to them and so get them in my hair. And I remembered that when I was married a long, long time ago, why, I just did my best. I did my best not to have any trouble with them. I never came home." [laughter] And you've pointed this all out, you see? And he finally realizes that, you know and he says – and so on. You – you – you punch it up, you know?

You say, "Well, could it be possible that you've been trying not to associate with women?" or something like this, you know. You go over the edge just that far, you know? And the person says, "Oh, yes, yes, yes, that'd be possible."

That's all. I mean, the curtain rings down on a flop. There's a way to prevent this flop is, you just take your quill pen and your very best gray carbon and water and make yourself a list of all possibilities of overts on that subject. Because if you're running it on an automaticity basis of just very permissive, "What have you done? What have you withheld?" and "What have you done with women?" You're running levels of the Prehav Scale against a terminal that may not have anything to do with his case. Actually, his terminal may not be women.
This just happens to be as real as he can get. Let's do a tremendous lot of security checking on the subject of women, the family, girlfriends and so forth.

Now, we have a very good example in Sec Check Form 3. There are all kinds of things in there that you could do to women, you know? That he might have, you know? Well, if you were to give him then Form 3, he'd probably recover from all of this, see? It's just Sec Check Form 3, slog through and he would eventually recover from some of this if you got them all as you went through. This is rather a long process. And you've already isolated the fact that it has to do with women, don't you see? So you do a little special Sec Check that goes along with this.

"Have you ever thought an unkind thought," you see, "about a woman?" "Have you ever thought an unkind thought about – ?" how many things are there about a woman, you see? The way you build one of these things up. How many things are there about women? Well, there's clothes and there's houses and cookery and there's children and there's shopping and there's various activities that are the common ordinary ones, don't you see? And they have heads and feet and – you know? And you go into this various list of items or actions that a woman might engage upon. And then you make a Security Check around this thing, you see?

And it's like this, "Have you ever done anything to a woman's head?" See, you just put "Have you ever done anything…?" to a whole list and you've got a formulized method of getting together a Security Check. You see how you do this?

You write up every noun you could possibly think of on the subject of the zone, area, dynamic that he's having difficulty with and he fails to cognize on in any way, shape or form. You can immediately assume that if he doesn't cognize in that zone or area, that he's really pinned down and that he has withholds from you and from the area, on the subject of the area that not even he knows.

See, a cognition is totally dependent upon a freedom to know. And overts and withholds are dedicated to another thing. And these are dedicated to not-knowingness, aren't they? So if the person doesn't cognize, you can immediately assume that he has a large area of not-knowingness on the subject.

Well, how do you relieve this large area of not-knowingness? Now, you could run some kind of direct not-knowingness on it, perhaps, which would be your not-know version of a Security Check. But it'd still take some guidance like a Security Check to do the job neatly and rapidly. He doesn't even suspect. You as an outsider to his case, you see, can suspect. You see where this fellow is having trouble. Well, you dream up a Security Check to match it.

Now, the formula, I repeat, for dreaming up a Security Check is just make a list of all of the items you can think of that has anything to do with that target. Let's say his family, see? He always has family trouble.

By the way, you know, you can get this from a pc's PTPs. If you look at the type of PTP that the pc has, you'll know that it is a present time problem of long duration if he adds up to having – four times in a row or three times in a row or something like this – a PTP about his family. Then it must be a problem of long duration. And if you relieve this problem of
long duration, he will feel much better. That's for sure. And it must be one of his auditing goals, see? Because he keeps putting it up as a PTP, it must be one of his auditing goals. He hasn't really inspected it. And the hottest way to get rid of that particular zone – flick, flick, flick, flick, flick – is security check it.

And again, the way you security check it is make a list of all of the nouns and all of the doingnesses which you can think of. And just ask the person if he has overts against any of them. Has he done anything to, has he interfered with anything about… You get the idea. "Have you ever interfered with schooling?" See, schooling is part of the family activity, see. So you put down "schooling." "Have you ever interfered with schooling?" You look that over. "Ever done anything to schooling?" "Have you ever prevented schooling?"

"Oh, well! Oh, well. It's funny that you'd ask that, but…," you see. And he gets it little by little. And it's little by little that this cognition will take place. It's not all going to take place on a bang, you see? It might suddenly appear in the long run as a bang. In the long run, it'll be a bang. But the bang only took place because you took the pebbles off the top of the thing, you see? And when you finally got the thing uncovered, why, he could look at it and blow it. Got the idea?

Now, any zone or – this is the rule: Any zone or area of life with which a person is having difficulty, if he realizes he is having difficulty in that zone or area or if he doesn't, it doesn't matter, is a fruitful subject for a Security Check.

Any zone or activity with which a person is having difficulty in life or has had difficulty in life is a fruitful area for a Security Check. And you'll find out, every time, he's got withholds in that zone or area.

One of the indicators of that is a present time problem. He gets present time problems about this. Well, therefore, you know it's a problem of long duration. Three problems of short duration equals one problem of long duration. You got the idea? It's a good detector mechanism. A person has three times come into session (according to his past auditing records or something like that) late because of lunch. "Oh," you say, "well, it's natural." The transportation is difficult and he doesn't have much time and that sort of thing. No, no, no, no, no, no, no. You're way off beam. How come he's in a situation where the transportation is difficult? See?

All right. So we can immediately assume that he has trouble with food.

*Audience voice: With food?*

With food. Just like that. And that's your next rule, is take the most fundamental expression that you can get of his difficulty. The most fundamental expression. In other words, if a person has a problem with lunch, we don't say he has problems with lunches. No, we don't say he has problems with lunches, breakfasts and dinners. It might not be really that he's having a problem with lunches. Let's isolate it on the E-Meter. He might merely have problems with appointments. But if he has problems with lunches, we can be pretty sure that he has problems with breakfasts and dinners. If he has problems with breakfast, lunches and dinners, he has trouble with food. And if Freud in 1894, by the way, instead of announcing the libido theory, had announced instead the chow theory, why, he would have had it made. He would
have had it made, because food is a tremendous regulating factor. And this was actually what discredited his work where it was discredited, is you'd hear this long, drawn out argument and some psychiatrist or somebody would be sitting down and argue with another psychiatrist about Freudian analysis and it'd all come out to basis: "Well, if you put a naked – put a hungry man down at a table and you took a naked woman and you put her there..." This all seemed to titillate them, the idea, you see. I've heard the – I've heard the thing expressed time after time, I mean, by these Joes. "And you put a plate of hot food in front of him, he will eat the food." [laughter]

Well, I have very often upset their calculations by saying that they have selected a careful number of factors which led to a proof of their own point. Now, this sailor had been well fed over the three months' voyage at sea. And you put a plate of ship's fare in front of him and put a naked woman there. He isn't going to eat. [laughter]

But despite the academic aspects of this problem, the truth of the matter is that to Homo sapiens food is more fundamental than sex. It is. It's more aberrative because sex is not necessarily a continuous line of overts and food certainly is. Right? All right.

So, the rule here in Security Checking is break the problem down to its most fundamental expression. Then write down those nouns associated with it and those basic doings associated with this fundamental expression. And then just phrase up your Security Check on the basis of "Have you ever...?" and any other verb you want to put in. You know, "Have you ever done this? Have you ever prevented this? Have you ever...?" You know, you could run all parts of the Prehav Scale against all the nouns if you want to really get fancy. But you don't have to be that fancy, because that needle is going to fall whenever you come close to it. And you ask this series of questions one after the other. And there are things that he just never has dreamed of, man. He just has never dreamed of these things, you know? They're just out of his ken. "What – have I ever done anything to food? Food, food, food. Ever done anything to food?"

Well, that's a very broad thing, you see? Has he ever done anything with a plate? Has he ever done anything with a knife or a fork or a spoon? Has he ever done anything with a table? Has he ever done anything to a table? You got the notion here? Has he ever done anything in a grocery store? Has he ever done anything to a grocery store? Has he ever done anything to a grocer? You get the idea? Then all of a sudden it comes out he spent his whole career, as most children have, as a shoplifter in Safeways. [laughter] And since that time he's never been able to eat chocolate without a feeling of guilt. And you, all of a sudden he'd say, "What do you know, I'm not allergic to chocolate now. Hey! You know, that's..." See that's positive gain in processing. It's a win. You see that?

But it's just based on these fundamentals. That any area where an individual is having difficulty, he's stupid. What is stupidity?

Female voice: Not-know.

It's not-knowingness. How does not-knowingness occur? Through overts. But the overt has to be hidden, so it must be an overt which is withheld. So these withholds, then, add up to stupidity, so of course he has trouble. I mean, it's as – it's as – it's almost as stupid as he's being in its simplicity. There isn't anything complicated about it at all.
All right. Now, that's so much for a zone of activity in which a preclear is having difficulty which would constitute a present time problem of long duration.

Let's take up the other branch of it now, since there's two branches of this and that is the psychosomatic difficulty. And you must always assume that a psychosomatic difficulty is a solution after the fact. A psychosomatic difficulty is a solution after the fact. Of what? Of a confusion.

A confusion consists of two things: Time and space, change of particles in, predicted or unpredicted. And if they're unpredicted changes in space, you will have a confusion. And to resolve the confusion, he puts his attention on one particle and says that is it and all other particles must be ignored. That's confusion and the stable datum. It's best represented by you tearing up half a hundred little tiny bits of very lightweight paper and just throwing them up in the air. Of course, you have a confusion if you do this. That is a confusion of paper. But it doesn't look very confusing to you because you have it in relationship to the still walls of the room, the ceiling and the floor.

Nevertheless, if there were no relative stillnesses with relationship to this cloud of paper which is swirling, you wouldn't know what the hell to do about it or which one to put your attention on or anything else, if that was all there was to look at. And the solution to that is to put your attention on one piece of paper and consider that all other pieces of paper are in motion in relationship to the one piece of paper. And that is the solution that the thetan always takes. It's a good solution, except it eventually winds him up with such things as chronic somatics.

He's got a war. War to him is a problem in confusion. It is a confusion to him. So out of all of the factors of war, he has chosen one on which he is now fixed. Well, what is the one fixed factor? What is the one fixed factor? Very simple. The one fixed factor, of course, is the fact that people get hurt in war. That is the most confrontable thing because they're the only undangerous people in a war: Officers are dangerous; even your friends are dangerous because they're all armed; the enemy is dangerous; everybody is dangerous. And what do we wind up with? Everything dangerous but a wounded man. So that makes a good solution, doesn't it? Now, when we add this up to the fact that if he is a continuously wounded man, he will never have to be in that confusion again. Oh, that's marvelous. So he puts himself immediately into the confusion forever. He gets betrayed by his own solutions. And there's his chronic somatic. So it's the difficulty after the fact. The chronic somatic is always after the fact.

So all you have to do to resolve a chronic somatic is not find out how the man broke his leg, but find out what confusion existed in his life before he had trouble with his leg. And then when you've got that confusion sufficiently taped and squared around, what do you have? You have a fruitful Security Check which when executed will free him from the chronic somatic which solved the confusion. Because it was his overts in the vicinity of that confusion that made the confusion stick and made it necessary for him to select a chronic somatic to solve it with. You see how simple this is once you look at it. So always look before the fact.
This person has got sinusitis. All right. He wants to cure his sinusitis. That's why he's being audited. Sinusitis. That's the thing. That's the stuff. If he can just cure his sinusitis, that's his present time problem of long duration and so forth. Well, hell, let's not find even somebody who had sinusitis. Let's go at it in a much broader way. Let's do a much more positive, thorough job of this thing from all ways and shape and form.

Let's find out when he had an onset of sinusitis and then let's just take from that period back in this life to find zones and areas that he considered intolerable. And every time we find one, let's make a Security Check for that zone or area, run that Security Check and the next thing you know, bango! We're going to have some freedom from sinusitis. It'll get a little bit better and then it'll get a little bit better. And then all of a sudden, we will have the zone or area which made it necessary for him to have sinusitis and now it'll just cure just like that. It's just gone. Because it's no longer necessary to have it because he no longer has overts against the confusion. Do you see how it works out?

*Audience:* Yeah.

All right. All of these things can be taught as I think you will see here, clearly. All of these things are teachable. And all these things are doable. The first thing you need to do is to tell people to get up with their technical presentation and then use the technical presentation against the interestingly simple format of a plain Security Check. Then they can get more complicated with this and actually have wins right on up the line with chronic somatics and everything else. And they will really be telephoning you to tell you how wonderful it all is. This is for sure.

Right here, right now, you're not seeing a Security Check in any stellar role. You aren't for one reason, is that your attention is definitely on a broader, faster line that requires infinitely more skill and care. But nevertheless, you're running a Security Check parallel to this. And as you're doing Security Checks, you yourself get a reality on what you can do with a Security Check. Go ahead and run the Security Checks that you're supposed to run on the person, but at the same time examine what that person is doing; examine their present time problems of long duration; find out what they're really trying to get done in auditing; find out what their hidden standards are; and trace it back with the two systems which I have given you here.

One, is to find – if it's a chronic somatic – to find the confusion which exists before the fact and in the other one, find out what area of life was intolerable to them. And if you do that and tailor up Security Checks immediately against those and ask some little brief line, you'll find, my God, there are withholds there you never dreamed of and actually the pc never dreamed existed. And you'll suddenly get rid of some of the chronic difficulties of the pc ahead of the fact of the pc running them out where they actually exist, which is on his terminal line.

Now, all Security Checks add up to very thorough key-outs. That's what a Security Check adds up to. It doesn't add up to a cure. It adds up to a key-out. But it'll stay keyed out. Don't worry about that, because the individual would have to accumulate this many overts and withholds again. And once he's been security checked on it, he probably finds out that he should know better next time. But it really is a key-out, because don't be too surprised if you
run into the same somatic on his goals line which you got rid of on the Security Check – you ran into on his goals terminal line and you find out that the reason he keeps adopting a broken hip or a busted skull or something of the sort – you'll find the engram. The basic engram on the whole thing. You'll find eventually the overt, you'll find everything about this, running his terminal line. The somatic will turn on sharply, as-is and be gone. You'll hit it again. But because you've done a Security Check on it, it's very reachable when you're doing a goals run. Okay?

All right. I hope some of that is some benefit to you.

Thank you very much.

*Audience: Thank you.*
QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: STATES OF BEINGNESS

A lecture given on 27 September 1961

Thank you.

Now, I suppose it's about time you asked me questions. This is the what of what? What year? [laughter]

*Audience*: Twenty-seventh.

Twenty-seventh? I've been dating letters all day 26th. What do you know? 27th of September AD 11.

Well, you'd better come up with some questions. I'll count to ten. One, two – yes.

*Male voice*: Would you say a little bit about how obsessive individuation makes the person eventually become the thing they're individuating from.

Will I say a little bit about how obsessive individuation makes a person eventually become the thing he is individuating from.

*Male voice*: Please.

Right. All right. It's a very simple mechanism. An overt act is an effort to individuate. It is a withhold of oneself from. And if you get an idea, let's say, of – well, let's see: Br'er Rabbit and the Tar Baby – this is a pretty good example.

If you had a huge lump of tar and you didn't want to be part of this piece of tar, so you didn't permit yourself to come near the tar, every time you came close to this lump of tar, you say, "Well, no, I'm not going to become that tar." You would eventually find yourself slightly misemotional about this tar, because you're cutting communication with it. And you would try to push yourself off from this piece of tar, because you would find yourself drifting in toward the tar. You would one night go in the room and it's dark and you accidentally touch the tar and this is a counter of one of your postulates, you see. And so you push yourself off and away from the tar and the more you push yourself off and away from the tar, of course, the more tarry you get. And eventually you get into a state of affairs where you were tar. Just all from a forceful effort to hold yourself off from the tar.

Well, of course, this only starts to happen after one begins to use effort to withhold oneself from the tar. You get the idea?

Now, the way this works in the field of the mind is this way. There is a thorn tree. And let's take a denizen of Arizona. The denizens of Arizona have rather uniformly done this. Cactus. And they are rushing around out in the desert avoiding cactus. And they avoid cactus and
they avoid cactus and they avoid cactus and they avoid cactus. And they sort of push against the cactus, you know. Every time they come near cactus, they sort of push themselves off from the cactus. They have some very interesting cactus out there. Some of it is ... Actually, I had it confused for the moment – the most interesting thorn bush I ever ran into or the most interesting piece of shrubbery was spare-a-momento bush, which is the "wait-a-minute bush" of the tropics, which has its thorns growing wrong way to, like fishhooks. It's a wait-a-minute bush, all right.

Well, their rivalous piece of vegetation is a particular type of cactus which has very yellow spines in a bunched group. And these spines are quite invisible in their last inch or two, so that it actually makes one feel that the cactus has leaped at him.

In other words, you can touch the cactus without being aware of the fact that you're that close to the cactus because the outer spines of these bundles of spines are invisible. And it – people all there, all claim – all the Arizonans claim that this cactus jumps at you. And I've forgotten the name they call it by, but it's a – a very annoying cactus.

I remember one time I was pulling cactus out of Mary Sue's ankle after a motorcycle ride and – with a pair of pliers and so on. And what made it most interesting is the fact that I tried to get the cactus spines out originally with my motorcycle gloves. And of course it just saturated my motorcycle gloves and I couldn't wear those and so I got cactus in me and we just had more cactus all over the place than you could well appreciate. Went straight through her boots.

Well, Arizonans with experiences of this particular character, eventually begin to avoid this cactus very carefully. At all times they avoid this cactus and they're all convinced that it leaps at you, which it doesn't. So anyway, imagine living in a country always avoiding this cactus.

Now, what does the thetan do every time he sees this cactus? He takes a picture of the cactus. He resists the cactus, which makes an energy picture of cactus. Right? So that far from avoiding cactus, he is actually duplicating the cactus in his bank obsessively. So the more he pushes back against the cactus, of course the more pictures he gets of the cactus.

Well, eventually he finds out that his bank is prickly. He doesn't like his bank. He gets a few traumatic experiences with the cactus and of course this sort of submerges and the engrams all get tangled up and that makes a chain out of these pictures of cactus. And one fine day he's being awfully pointed to people. Don't push too close on some native Arizonans because they're very cactusized. They're highly individuated and so on.

It's interesting how unfriendly a can't-have land actually is. You're walking out through the vast reaches of desert: there's no food, there's no water and that sort of thing – he's very unfriendly. And eventually the denizens of the country will become very unfriendly and everybody's having a beautiful can't-have run on him.

But there is an example of pushing against the cactus and of course every time you push against something, you get a picture of it. And you must avoid the cactus. You just must not. Well, of course, you can't see the pictures you're making of the cactus, so they don't as-is.
That's an important point, because we must avoid the cactus. We are taking pictures of the cactus and therefore we never as-is the pictures of the cactus, don't you see.

And eventually it's these pictures which cause one to feel that a closure has taken place. Actually, it is not directly true that a person avoids the cactus and then snaps into the cactus. You see, that's a simple look, but it is not a correct one. Actually, by avoiding, he takes pictures then which he doesn't as-is and these pictures not being as-ised can become quite dominant and after a while he thinks of himself as cactus. All because he tried to avoid cactus.

Now, he has already said – let's go back one step earlier. He's had – he's already had to say that "cactus can overwhelm me." He's had to make that postulate. And that is the initial postulate. And in all valence difficulties, this is the initial postulate: "Cactus can overwhelm. That can overwhelm me." And when a person has made this determinism, of course, he has started on the road of a valence closure. "That can overwhelm me." And that's the way that goes. Now, do you see how that mechanism is? It's a – it's a relatively easy mechanism.

When you're taking it apart as an auditor, what are you doing? You are trying to make somebody confront things. They then start confronting the things they haven't confronted in the bank and then the next thing you know, it turns up that they have a number of overts. Well, they are being this thing, so of course they haven't any overts against it. And therefore they're totally irresponsible for anything they've ever done to it, because they aren't doing anything to it. They are it.

And the first thing they would tell you is that they've never done anything to it and you'll get a null reading on the E-Meter, with regard to questions – regard to it. But as you go along and in general processing, the person begins to confront more and more of the pictures of his bank and we phrase it as "his responsibility rises."

Actually, it's not even as complicated as that. It's just the fact that he's now confronted enough of his bank to individuate slightly from his pictures. And the moment he does that the string of overts which he did against the objects appear. And so your Security Check begins to work. And this is why a Security Check is an excellent index as to whether or not your processing is getting anywhere. Because if a Security Check works during the third intensive and it didn't work during the first intensive – some question of it – it is only that during the intervening time you have caused somebody to confront bank.

Now, if you've caused him to confront bank, then, naturally your Security Checks will work later on things they wouldn't work on earlier. But if the pc is totally irresponsible on the third intensive on the same things that he was irresponsible for on the first intensive, then we are making no progress at all. He is stuck totally in the valences that he was stuck in at the beginning of the intensives.

So your Security Check gives us a wonderful index. If more withholds don't appear – constantly and continually during processing on things that were clean before – then the person is not getting out of any valences and he is not confronting his bank better. Processing is not working if new withholds don't turn up on Security Checks you have made null.
Give you an example: we give Sec Check Form 3 and we get all the way through it and everything is just fine and we say, "Well, that's wonderful," and we clean this all up now and – wrong adjudication: "Well, we won't have to do a Form 3 again." That's a totally wrong adjudication.

We give the pc twenty-five hours of – particularly something like Routine 3, which is straight at valences and at the end of those twenty-five hours we could go into Form 3 again. You understand, we got Form 3 all clean before these twenty-five hours were given. Now we give him twenty-five hours of Routine 3 processing and now we give another Form 3.

And if we don't get a whole bunch of new withholds, our processing during that twenty-five hours might as well have been garbage-canned. It was nonfunctional processing. Do you see why this mechanism is? The mechanism is actually a simple one. It's that an individual is not responsible for the things that have totally overwhelmed him, because it's responsible for having overwhelmed him, don't you see?

So he is *being* these things, so therefore he doesn't have any Security Check reaction to them because he is them. You're talking to a cactus, so therefore he hasn't any overt against cactus. He just *is* a cactus, that's all.

Now, as you processed him, all of his times of resisting cactus, have come up little by little or this way or that, until you have a confront going. And you have a little as-is going of some of these pictures and of course this has shifted him from being cactus to somebody who has overt against cactus. So a Security Check on the subject of cactus would not work.

There's two tests of rightness that are invariable tests and are very wonderful ones and that's new withholds on the same Security Check that was null is the best representation of case advance there is. That is better than profiles. It's better than IQ tests. It's better than anything else. It's a direct representation. Security Check was null. You processed him. It is not now null.

That one and the other mechanism is the Prehav. These are the two most important mechanisms in Scientology. If you have the right goal and terminal and you have made an assessment on the Prehav Scale, less levels will be alive on subsequent assessments – on the Prehav Scale – if the terminal is right.

If the terminal is wrong, increasing numbers of levels will be alive at each successive assessment on the Prehav Scale. Those are very interesting things. And those are two things which you should know and have a good reality on. You need to observe those things when you see them and get a good grip on them because it tells you at once "Claw off to windward, man. This boy has not got the right terminal." And it is utterly dynamite to run the wrong terminal. Complete dynamite. It just must not be done.

If you've got the wrong terminal, the first time you assess the terminal on the Prehav Scale to get a run, you had 5 levels live and you found 1 level and then you ran it. And you ran it (quote) flat (unquote). And then you assess him again on the Prehav Scale and you have 12 levels alive – *oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh*, you have the wrong terminal on the pc. There's just no arguing with it.
And you should go back and check it all over again. And then if you still think you're right, so you run this new level that you found and then you find 15 levels are now alive — well, don't commit suicide. We need auditors. But it's almost that kind of a condition. That's really wrong.

The other one is, if you give a person a Security Check, ask him certain security questions, audit him for a while and then fail to get new withholds off the same questions, you're not advancing in processing, because you're not splitting him out of any valence.

So those are the two most important tests. So thank you very much for asking that question.

_Male voice: Right._

That answered?

_Male voice: Yes, I've got it. Thank you._

Good. All right. Any other question?

_Male voice with French accent: Yes. A preclear can have one goal and then you find one terminal. And after you've run that terminal on all the levels that will fall, you may look for a new terminal. Correct? And you may find a new terminal and run it again._

You lost someplace. This is not routine. This is wildly off. You're asking me to do a whole recapitulation of Routine 3. Now, let me see this. And I won't scold you for asking a question. I'm glad you did. Instructor, take note. Bulletin checks are in order. Because this is a very clean, clear activity. Very clean. You get one goal. The pc only has one goal. You get one terminal off of that goal. You run that until it is completely flat on all levels of the Prehav Scale and when that is completely flat and you get no more reaction on it, you check, make sure your rudiments are all in, completely and then you check the goal and check the terminal, once more, before you leave any terminal.

Now, having established for once and for all that you have actually flattened that terminal, you try to find if there are any more terminals for that goal. Now, only then, would you depart from the first terminal. Only if there were more terminals for that goal.

Now, if there were, you would assess them and run them. The same way – Assessment by Elimination – but you've actually started Routine 3 all over again.

_Male voice: Yes._

Person accidentally has the first goal is still alive – he's got another terminal for that goal. Now, once more, we do Routine 3 all over again. We just keep doing Routine 3 all over again. But, the way you phrased it there and what I heard or what I seem to hear, was off-line, in that running a number of levels, you then find a new terminal. No. No, that does not determine anything about it at all. What is determined here very cleanly and clearly is the fact that you've run that terminal utterly, absolutely flat on the case. And then go back and do Routine 3 again.
If the goal that he had before is still alive, you assess for a new terminal. But remember, you are only doing Routine 3 over and over and over. And there is no shift from Routine 3. It is the same action every time. You always do the same action. It is invariable.

Male voice: Thank you. I get more clear now. Ah – so it is likely that he may have more than one terminals for that goal. And would it be likely that he would have more than one goals?

Well, if you get that goal gone, yes, he's going to have other goals. But it's – he's never going to have more than one goal that you can find. You're never going to find more than one goal on him. You're never gonna find a pc with two goals. And you're never going to find a pc with no goals.

Male voice: Yes. And after the goal that has a ...

And if you've got the goal, you're never going to find more than one terminal. You'll never find no terminals and you'll never find two terminals. You'll always find one terminal. This is an oddity. There is only one level of the Prehav Scale, never two levels. Never no levels, unless the terminal is flat. It's always one, one, one.

There's a reason for that, is this is a two-pole universe. And the only way a thetan can get into trouble is go one pole. So you found the one-pole track. And it's one goal, which is utterly foreign to this universe, so therefore hangs; one terminal, which is utterly foreign to this universe and therefore hangs; one level of thought on this subject, foreign to this universe and therefore hangs.

But once having done this whole action of finding the goal, finding the terminal, finding the level and then running that level flat and then finding another level and running it flat and finding another level and running it flat and make sure after you have a flat level – only after a level is flat – find some pictures the person has had. Run those things as engrams. Get that two or three engrams out of the road, find a new level, run that. You keep doing this and eventually that goal will no longer produce any reaction of any kind no matter how well the rudiments are in or anything else.

Now, you can just scrub any complications, because all you do is Routine 3 again. It just so happens that that goal is still alive. Well, therefore, you'll find another terminal now that'd fit that goal. And you'll find a new level and you assess that level and you run that level and you just go through the whole action again. So it's actually – you can't say, you can't say that you run a terminal flat and then go back and find another terminal and run it flat, because if you looked at it in this way, this is very unneat. It looks complicated and it looks like there is more than one Routine 3 and it looks like he might get hung up. No, this thing is much more simple than that. Routine 3 is just Routine 3.

When you have flattened a terminal utterly on the Prehav Scale, all levels, you do Routine 3 again. It's as simple as that, you see. And of course, you take a Goals Assessment and naturally if the goal is still alive and it's – and there's another terminal to be run on that particular goal now, naturally, that goal is going to show up again. But there's no reason to be complicated about it because you might as well say, "Well, we scrubbed that terminal. Now we're going to go back and do Routine 3 all over again." And just do Routine 3.
And all you have to learn how to do is do Routine 3. And you can learn how to do that well and just do it repetitively over and over and over. And the case will go Clear. That is all you have to know. And also that there is only one goal and at any one time there is only one terminal will show up and there's only one level on the Prehav Scale. Also, there's only one engram in the chain that, actually, the pc is hung up in, that can be run at a time. He never has two engrams in restimulation. You'll only get one to react on the meter. This is the most one-one-one-one affair you ever heard of, you see. It's one goal, one terminal, one level, one engram. And it's quite remarkable.

And once you've gotten Routine 3 done with, you've said that's it, you go back – with a terminal, you see; you can't find any more live levels on the Prehav Scale – you just go back and do Routine 3 all over again. And of course, if the same goal is alive, you're going to get the same goal. But nevertheless, it's still there.

Now what goals list do you use to get the second terminal? You use his first goals list. Use the first goals list you ever saw. Therefore, the papers on a person who is being run on Routine 3 assume considerable importance, not for the record and not for my research files or something like that. No, they're of great importance to the auditor and great importance to the pc. And therefore the records of Goals Assessments and so on must be carefully preserved.

There's another reason for this. Is once a case is stalled some – because somebody has done something weird, you've got to have his auditing records available, in order to track back and find out what he was run on before. Because the cure for all this is, oddly enough, to go back and do what was un-... not done.

And you go back and find the first undone do and do it. [laughter] And it's always invariable, the same thing. If you've missed the fellow's goal entirely, you always return to the first list. Don't go on with these interminable lists, see; it – go onto the first list. Therefore, that list must be preserved.

If you've missed his terminal and after you've gotten up to five, six, seven hundred terminals and you still are getting no place, well, you'd better decide that you are driving a tricycle all over the wide plains, because that terminal is right back in the first group. But the rudiments or something or something about the case or something like this or some withholds or some suppressions, have knocked it out. And you put this all in order and then you go back to the first list of terminals.

And if you're putting somebody to rights who has been misrun and you can't find a Prehav level live, then the thing for you to do, if you get the rudiments in and you still can't find a Prehav level alive, then you had better go back and check and find out if there was any level left unflat at any time. And get the first level that was left unflat and flatten it. And all of a sudden the whole Prehav Scale will go alive again.

So you always go back and do what was left undone. And you always cover the same records. And it's one of these interesting, circular activities. And the person is Clear when you can no longer do any of them. You can't get the rudiments in because they're in. You can't get any goal because he hasn't got any stuck goals. You can't get any terminals because they don't exist. And you can't get any levels on the Prehav Scale because there aren't any. And you can't run any engrams because they're blown. And of course, at this interesting state of affairs, you
have, fortunately, another indicator, so that you don't just have somebody who is ARC broke and so isn't registering on the meter, you see. You've got another state of affairs and that state of affairs is a floating needle. The E-Meter is unreadable. The E-Meter is useless. And the E-Meter becomes a completely useless instrument.

When Routine 3 becomes completely useless and won't work, when the E-Meter is completely useless and won't work and when the pc will sit down and go through any endless number of doodle-daddles and whatamagoodjits and processes and – you just go ahead; if you want to audit it, that's all right. In other words, not even bad auditing works, why, he's Clear. And that's, that's – if you want your final test for Clear, that would be it. The final test for Clear is that you can't run Routine 3 on him anymore because the pc works but the meter doesn't work. Pc, by the way, will go on being audited, which is quite interesting. They don't do a big blow and say, "I'm too busy and I'm really Clear and I want to get things done." They will go on being audited. You make an auditing appointment – you want to audit him and so forth. They'll be audited. And it leaves a very upset auditor very often.

Well, he does manage to find an engram. He does. He manages to find one that wasn't run. And there it is and so forth. And he's got it and it reacted on the meter. The meter stopped floating. Damn it! And it stopped floating. And he actually got a reaction and it fell and so forth. So he rolls up his sleeves and he gets all set to run it and it's not there anymore.

And so he decides the pc must have escaped. And so he goes over the track carefully and he runs the Attack and Escape Process in order to get the pc back into the incident. And the incident is there; it must be there and – but it isn't there. And you can't get any reaction on the E-Meter. It's a very disappointing activity.

Heartbreaking. More auditors have been upset by trying to run Routine 3 on a Clear than any other single action. It's very upsetting. And they start blowing engrams by inspection and this is fantastic. When everybody knows that they ought to be 75 hours on the engram, you see, and they blow it by inspection.

So when you run into that sort of thing, you've got that. But don't make an error into the fact that Routine 3 is complicated. It is not. It is a very simple action. But therefore, because it is a simple action, it requires superlatively well trained auditors to follow it through. Okay? Yes.

**Male voice:** Thank you. How long would it take – time?

Hm? How long would it take to what?

**Male voice:** How long would it take uh – how long would be the maximum time allowed to run the first level off?

Aw, you can't even guess. They'd vary, vary, vary. I'll tell you how long – how long the last Clear took. Audited by a Clear. A Clear audited a person to Clear in 118 hours. That was the last Clear that was made just a week or so ago. Last week, I think, in Australia. Just checked out by HCO and the whole auditing time was 118 hours. That is a Clear auditing. So.

**Female voice:** But Ron, what about the one that was produced in fifty hours? In Mauritius.
Fifty? Oh, well, yes. I've just given you a time. I'm just giving you the time of the last Clear. There's no other complications in what I'm saying. [laughter]

Male voice: What I really meant was the first level ...

Oh no, you want to know how the first level ... Well, if I could tell you that it took 18 hours, 17 minutes and 63 seconds, I would first have to predict how many boo-boos you're gonna make, how far your rudiments are going to be out on the pc, how much trouble the pc is going to be in in life, what the pc's actual case state was, how difficult a terminal it was and how muggy a goal. Now, when we've got all those things settled in, we could estimate this. It would just take anything that you can guess. Just think of a figure. [laughter]

Male voice: Now, let's say if I knew that on the worst case if I have more than fifty hours, that would be bad auditing on my part. I would have a ...

No, no. I wouldn't want to go that far. Nope.

Female voice: It takes as long as it takes.

Will you take – will you take this as an example and as an answer? Just think of a figure. Right now. Think of a figure.

Male voice: Fifty hours.

All right. That's how long it takes. All right. Okay. Got it? I mean, it's just anybody's guess. All right.

Another male voice: What are the indications that a pc is ready for Routine 3?

What are the indications that a pc is ready for Routine 3. Will he sit in the auditing chair and answer your questions coherently?

Audience member: Any pc then. Anyone who ...

Any pc, any pc if he'll sit in the auditing chair and give you some coherent response to questions can be run on Routine 3.

Audience member: Thank you.

Any coherent response. Now that word coherent will be susceptible to numerous interpretations. And I had better define that word for you a little more closely. Intelligible answer.

You say to the pc, "How are you today?"

And he thinks for a little while and he says, "Well, I'm not so good."

That is a coherent response to your question.

You say to the pc, "How are you today?"

And he looks at you and he says, "Well, I don't know. Aunt Mamie is pretty good."

Now we're getting a questionable coherence, but nevertheless is in the zone of coherence. Now we say to the pc, "How are you today?"

And the pc says, "Cars should eat crackers." [laughter]
This is not a level of coherence. We say to the pc, "How are you today?"

And the pc says, "Uh – I'm not going to talk to you because I am mad at you."

That is a level of coherence. That is a level of coherence. He's still talking to you and it is in response to the fact that he's being addressed. That is a level of coherence. You say to the pc, "How are you today?"

And he says, "Gooba, gooba, gooba, uba-uba."

Well you probably aren't talking his language, so that isn't a level of coherence. [laughter] In other words, the thing is susceptible to numerous interpretations. But it merely means that even with a little struggle you can get the pc to concentrate on what you're doing and respond to some degree on what you want him to say. When you ask him for a goal, why, although he might occasionally wander off and comm lag and so forth, he will give you a goal. That much response is all the response you need to run Routine 3. And it doesn't matter what his sanity is or what his profile is or his graph or anything else. You could probably find many, many people – probably the preponderance of people in an insane asylum could be run on this. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right. All right. Yes.

Another male voice: Could you tell us something about the difference in what the Clears are today, whether they're Theta Clear or MEST Clear?

You are dealing with MEST Clears entirely, with a very upgraded definition of MEST Clear. A Theta Clear is a very finite definition and a very clean-cut definition. It is a person who operates exterior to a body, without need of a body. Now, you see, you're not making that type of Clear. It is an upgrade from this. Actually, a Theta Clear is cleared on all dynamics, including the fourth. All dynamics.

He is simply cleared on these dynamics. He therefore, does not have a tremendous dependency on a body and that is it. Now we have upgraded the definition of MEST Clear because it is the first stable state. We have got a state of stability for this particular state and this is a state of stability, so, just make it what it is. It is a MEST Clear, but MEST Clear before had a much lower requirement. It was a person who was not troubled by a bank particularly.

Now, today you're not doing that. Actually, a MEST Clear is inoperative on a meter. A meter merely floats. A MEST Clear totally stabilized – takes them some months to even out. They will run into things. Life itself is a sort of a confusion. And they've got the confusion of life stabilized and that sort of thing. They are, however, operating as a person and they are operating as a member of the human race and so forth; so could not be considered to be a Theta Clear.

Now, the probability is that the borderline between a MEST Clear and a Theta Clear is developed not on the button of can somebody operate exterior to his body, but on the button is he anymore controlled by the symptoms of hunger. Does he need food? Air? And these other things to survive? And it is these buttons. Those buttons rather than some esoteric button of,
could he sit on a mountaintop and regard his navel with an x-ray eye. That would establish this particular facet.

Now, you go up to the next grade. You go up to the grade of Operating Thetan and you notice that the word Clear has not been used for that grade. And there is no idea of Clear. You're talking about a different being entirely.

And that state or status would be, therefore, one who didn't have a bank that was troubling him (in other words, his reactive bank was not an unknown series of factors to him), to one who was not influenced in favor of one more than another of the dynamics and who did not experience need or necessity for food, clothing, shelter and the rest of these things. Didn't have to have a body and so forth.

Now, we go up to an entirely different aspect on the upgrade. And that is somebody who can handle mest. He is not in a state where he could take it or leave it alone. He is in the state where he could be quite aggressive toward it or he could be quite manipulative of it.

Now you get the clever states of moving the ashtray, you know. This kind of thing of – of starting the whirlwind. This is your trick – the trick level. Oddly enough, some very aberrated thetans can on some very reactive system or another of something terrifically emphasized produce poltergeist. And some magician here or there in past times has been able to start a whirlwind. And, well, for instance, you could probably – there's undoubtedly somebody here, although you possibly haven't noticed it, who could disintegrate a cloud by looking at it. And this odd trickeries – but these things are too channeled and they're too fixed and the band isn't broad.

An Operating Thetan, well, you could disperse a cloud and you could collect one and then you could move one. And then you could precipitate one. Got the idea? Then you could put it back the way it was in the first place. And then make three clouds and make three pretzels and Ballantine's Beer and hang it over the cloud.

You could do something weird. You could do something with mest. And the best index of that, the best explanatory statement that could be made is "Someone who has no consequences connected with creation." And when he's – the person is totally recovered from all consequences of creation, you could say, well, OT. That's about the only test there would be there.

And one of the tests would be, you'd have him mock up a whole bunch of things and see if he's spun in. I mean that's – that'd be the crudest level of testing we would have right at the present moment, you know. And it's a great liability having OTs around. It's a very great liability. It must be because the state has been fought tooth and toenail by practically every society that has ever been formed.

And right now the one thing to which the Roman Catholic Church owes a tremendous success line, is the fact they promised everybody to get rid of all of the spirits in their vicinity. And whether these spirits were good, bad or indifferent, they never bothered to inquire, but they promised everybody they were going to get rid of all the spirits and save their souls. Well, we don't know what that was all about. But it was apparently a lot of people were afraid of this particular state because they made a lot of smoke about it.
But of course, the people around who were in that state at that time were in such a limited state, it was something like, well, being able to dissolve a cloud today. They couldn't do very much. That, and they were possibly sufficiently irresponsible, though, that they were dangerous members of society. Who knows?

It was three states with which you're dealing – you're dealing with the fourth state. And this fourth state is Release. When you have found somebody's goal and terminal and level and when you have really nicely completed a Security Check, you will find that you have made a tremendous difference in this particular person.

And if you have at the same time – let's expand the definition a little bit – eradicated his present time problems of long duration, let me assure you you have something which is so superior to anything you had before that you certainly had better designate it as something, so you designate it as a Release. The basic definition of Release is somebody who doesn't think he's going to keep going downhill. That's all. He doesn't think he's going to get worse. He thinks he's going to get better. He knows now he's going to get better. He's got a certainty on the fact that he's on the road out. That is a Release.

It's the same state of mind that you've opened this jail door and they can look down the road and there are no soldiers with pikes and nobody in the watchtowers with Sten guns and there's no booby traps or mines on the highway and they all think there is at first and they inspect these things very carefully. If you were to suddenly go to Wormwood Scrubs or something and suddenly throw open the gates and say, "Well, all right, boys." You'd find there are tremendous numbers of them that wouldn't even go near the gate or inspect it.

You'd say, "Well, there are no guards out here. There's nobody in the watchtowers anymore and there's nothing on the road, and you can just leave. Go ahead. The gates are wide open" and turn your back. You'd come back in some hours to inspect it. You would find that some of them had not left at all and were not about to leave. They knew they had been fooled. This would be their first mental reaction. "If anybody tells you anything like that, this must be total foolery." "Uh – and it's just a new – a new technique of betrayal" – that's their big certainty. And they're still cowering back in their cells, sitting apathetic about it all and so on.

Another group you would find milling around the courtyard trying to get nerve enough up to look to see if the guards were still on both sides of the gate. They would just be trying to get up their nerve.

There'd be another group out in the courtyard satisfied that there were no guards at the gate but recognizing that the ne plus ultra would be to take the guards off the gate and then have machine guns in the towers, you see. And as soon as you got outside, you would probably get it in the back. And they're satisfied that they're free for the courtyard, but they are pretty sure that they had better not go down the road.

And then you'll find another group who are outside, dodging down the road but jumping back of bushes and jumping in and out of ditches and progressing in short bursts, you see, from cover to cover. And then way down the road someplace you'd find a group of guys walking along saying, "Wasn't that nice of somebody to open the gates?"
And these – these various states are reflected, of course, in the attitudes of pcs. And when they've gotten over the idea that – this is the principal idea they'd have to get over – is that this freedom is a new betrayal. That's the principal idea that a Release would have to get over.

If he got the – if he still had the idea that this offered freedom was just a new betrayal, you couldn't say he was a Release because he's never going to walk past the front gates or the watchtowers. So he has to be over that particular state of mind. And you could counterphrase it and say, "Well, he knows he isn't going to get worse," and so forth, but he knows he is on the road out and up. And he knows that he isn't going to get tripped down and thrown to the wolves again.

Now, he knows this, so just knowing that actually produces an enormous difference of case level. And it isn't something that collapses. It's a fairly stable case level.

So those are the four states you are operating with, right at the present moment. Of course, that first state is terribly easy to attain and one of the best ways to attain it is by Security Checks oddly enough.

But a Security Check just rendered endlessly on somebody may take quite awhile. You find his goal, you find his terminal; he gets a greater reality on himself and now he understands a lot of things that he did and you complete a good Security Check on him and he gets off all of his pretence and feeling of fraudulences about himself and odd doubts and that sort of thing. You've made an enormous difference in a person. The person now looks factual to others. He has a level of reality which is very good and so forth, so it's dignified by this term Release.

Although of course, being the lowest of the states on the road up – not the lowest of states but for the lowest of states on the road up – it of course is a far more complicated state and far more difficult to establish than the upper three states. These are very easy – much easier to establish.

Probably the easiest state in the world to establish right now is the state of Clear. Anybody could check for Clear. Anybody could check for it. If he could operate a meter, he can check a Clear. I mean, it's as easy as that because the meter's inoperative. The person isn't hanging at 2 or 3 on the apathetic underbeat with a stuck needle, you see, because the meter's still operative. You can still make that meter operate, but you got a floating needle that's drifting around and it floats and you ask the person various questions and you don't get any responses and so forth. That's a Clear test. That straighten out these states for you, Arthur?

Male voice: Thanks so much.
You bet. All right. Yes, Bonnie.

Female voice: Two questions, Ron. One ...
Only one at a time.

Female voice: Where would you read ... ?
I'm in this universe, huh? [laughter]
Female voice: All right. Where would you read a Release on the meter?

Where would you read a Release on the meter? Oh, well, that's very difficult to say. I can tell you where he wouldn't be.

Audience voice: Not at Clear.

Now, that's – no, no. No, I can tell you where he wouldn't be. And this is the only thing you've got to be careful of, in checking out a Release. And you'd better be careful of this because lots of auditors have been fooled in the last decade by this one.

He sits at the Clear read for his body and he's a dead body. He's totally irresponsible. He gets no fast needle reactions. The needle is pretty sticky. And to get any response at all, you have to advance the sensitivity, but the tone arm does locate him at his Clear read.

Of – that is the lower harmonic of Clear. And it is total apathy. It is total irresponsibility. And it's a giddy-giddy, whee, "All us people in seventh heaven" – some kind of a weird state.

And every now and then some auditor has enthusiastically offered one of these people up as Clear. And he hasn't noticed, you see – he hasn't noticed that any time he was auditing the person never has had a response on the meter. The person never has been able to go all the way through a Security Check, merely because the person hasn't any withholds. Nothing is a withhold. He has no responsibility for anything, so of course nothing is a withhold. You get the idea. Nothing. You never get a single reaction on the needle when you're asking him about anything. And to get any kind of a reading you have to have your sensitivity very well advanced and it is very far from a floating needle. And anybody who knows E-Meters could look at this particular case at once and say, "Clear? Near beer, man. That's nowhere."

Yet that has fooled people. And people have even occasionally been checked out as Clear, who were in total apathy, whose chronic somatics were in full scream, who – just a complete flub.

Now, this is – this is interesting because it means that you have to know what is a floating needle. And it is quite distinctly different from this other phenomena. The other phenomena is very distinctive.

But I was fooled one time by this other phenomena. I had a newspaper reporter who was doing some press work for an organization here. And he was one of these cases. And only when I suddenly realized the man couldn't work, couldn't think, didn't think it was possible to get any press or publicity, was totally negative along all these lines, I took another look at the situation and sure enough, he was one of these spook cases.

He sat directly on 3. He didn't respond in any particular direction to anything, but his needle was stuck – couldn't get any response to what it was. And what it turned up – the clue was – that he couldn't run Help. That was the clue. He couldn't run Help and he couldn't run Control. See, he couldn't answer a positive question. He couldn't make a decision. He just was a dead body. He was a dead-thetan case. And he had no initiative; he couldn't work. He was in horrible condition.
But nevertheless, at first glance on a meter, you see, you say, "Well, the man is reading..." This was many years ago, by the way, when we didn't know very much about this. And he was just sitting at this Clear read and apparently wasn't too stuck up and so forth. And I just happened to notice this in passing and then later on noticed his behavior on post. And it was fantastic. Complete irresponsibility. He just could not get anything done in any direction. He could not work. He could not think. He couldn't make a decision. He thought everything was impossible. And another thing he thought was everything was a fraud and everything was going to betray him and he was really betraying everybody. And, oh, it was the wildest package.

Well, I was interested in the package because that was the first one I ever saw that was a perfect dead thetan. He was a perfect dead thetan. He really thought of himself as having died a long time ago and hadn't been alive ever since.

All right. Now, there's your – there is, in essence the behavior of that.

Female voice: But how would you recognize a Release on the meter?

Well, the Release has no action on the meter, but he doesn't have that one. You see, he doesn't have that one, but neither does he have any other. A person actually could, possibly, theoretically be stuck in 7 on your dial and still be considered a Release. I mean, you cannot lay down now something like this because a person in processing from day to day if you will notice, if his case is making any progress, he's liable to be reading these days at 1 or 6 or almost anything. A Release is not necessarily not on a Clear read and a Release is not necessarily high. A Release is necessarily, however, not one of these dead-thetan cases and he, of course, is not reading with a floating needle. If he were reading with a floating needle, he would be Clear. So it's not determinate. It's not determinate. You'll ...

Female voice: How would you recognize him, then?

Hm?

Female voice: You'd recognize him by his case not worsening.

No, I'll go over this again. His characteristics are very finite and very easily established. If you call these characteristics that of Release, you will be absolutely certain not to make any mistakes. You don't want somebody who is going to be a disgrace to you. So he's got to know he's on the road out. He's got to know he's been helped. And he's got to know that he isn't being betrayed. And so if you lay down these characteristics, you will have such a person. (1) You have found his goal. (2) You have found his terminal. This will make an enormous difference with a case. And (3) has successfully gotten through a Form 3 Security Check and has it all clean for this particular level. Now, if those things have occurred, the chances of this person now being in a state of fraudulence, betrayal, upset, superchronic somatics, no road out, it's all blocked, you're gypping me, tremendous numbers of present time problems, skidding all over the place – these things are relatively well ruled out by these conditions.

Now, if you wanted to add another one to it to be absolutely sure, you would say that you have handled his problems of long duration – which is his chronic somatics have been handled. Now, that for sure would be a Release.
Now, if you've put these things together, you could, if a person had met all those characteristics, it would be the safest thing in the world, the safest thing in the world to say, well, he is a Release because he is a stable case at this point and he is not going to cave in again.

_Female voice:_ Thank you.

You betcha. All right. Now what was the other question?

_Female voice:_ How would you audit a MEST Clear to OT?

How would you audit a MEST Clear to OT? Well, that's very good. That's very fine. Now you are dealing with unknown data. You are dealing with a vast number of processes which have been turned out. And nearly all of these processes have – were covered over the years. And they are totally out of reach, but it'd be something on the order of he could do any process in Scientology.

I released some from South Africa called Ultimate Processes. Now, if a fellow could do those Ultimate Processes and they were all flat, given the fact he was Clear in the first place and he could do all those processes, why, you would find that was fine.

But of course, you're – you've taken a double jump here. You want to know how to audit a person from Clear to Operating Thetan. Is that right?

_Audience member:_ That's right.

All right. Now, Operating Thetan and Clear are not next to each other. There is Clear and then there is Theta Clear. And you would be operating him from Theta Clear to Operating Thetan or you would be operating him from Clear to Theta Clear.

Now, taking him from Theta Clear to Operating Thetan is relatively easy, because you have the old book _Creation of Human Ability_. Now, you'll find all those processes in there are applicable. You'll find the Ultimate Processes which I released last fall in South Africa. Those are all applicable. You have all of Creative Processing released in England in the 52, 53 – all of that is applicable. You'd find that we've already covered the ground. It isn't an unknown zone at all. It's a zone that has been developed.

Now, the other one – what you really ought to be asking about is – how do you take a person from _MEST_ Clear to Theta Clear. Now that is very pertinent. And how you get him over _that_ jump is under study right at this moment and it's very difficult because you are totally inoperative. You're not guided by any meter.

_Female voice:_ What about the oscilloscope?

Well, that's all right, but we haven't made the total jump on there. We merely have some clues. We kind of know where we're going. We're feeling our way. The subject is one of these research projects of some magnitude.

The first goal along this line and the first big discovery along this line occurred just forty-eight hours ago. I found out the common denominator of all cases that have bodies. And it's not very startling since you could have suspected it, but of course it'd be a violation of havingness in some fashion or another, naturally. But their attitudes in – of havingness are
incorrect, incorrect to this state, is they hunger. They can starve. And they have anxieties about procurement of food, air, heat and these other factors.

And I finally isolated this thing to my own satisfaction only about forty-eight hours ago. You clear a Clear of hunger. You see, he's already Clear. But there he is in a body and he's eating and he's breathing and he's still hanging around and he still considers himself exclusively a member of the human race. He still swats flies with great enthusiasm. Get the idea?

All right. How come all this? How come all this? Well, he is Clear on the fourth dynamic. You'll find out – you're going to have trouble, by the way, from time to time, administratively and politically in Scientology. It's entering right now because just about the first place a person who is good and Clear heads, is, of course, the fourth dynamic. And they get over this, so suffer them – suffer along with them on it. It's – it's an almost – an occupational illness of a Clear. The fourth dynamic. And they go intensely onto the fourth dynamic, you see. Up to this time they'd been on third, they'd been on second, they'd been on first and all of a sudden, bang! They find themselves on the fourth.

Well, they're cleared on the first, second and third. And that fourth dynamic – they suddenly wake up with a tremendous reality on the fourth dynamic and they say, "There is mankind! Wow!" See?

Well, now this isn't the lower harmonic of let's all go to Trafalgar Square and sit down. [laughter] This is very overt. That is the lower harmonic of the same phenomenon, you see. All things have their lower scale mockeries. This'll make you feel funny more than once in your lifetimes. All things have their lower scale mockeries.

All great dancers are now and then imitated by lousy dancers in burleycue shows, you know. I mean, it's lower scale mockeries – always occur. Just like there's a lower scale mockery of Clear. A person sits on his Clear read, is absolutely dead and completely useless, you see. A person says, "Well, that's what a Clear is, I don't want to be one." Well, I don't blame him, I don't want to be dead either, because it's so inactive. That's the only thing wrong with being dead.

And so we look over the attributes of the Clear as he goes up the line and we find out, crash! He discovers the fourth dynamic. Only, now the aberration is not in his bank. The aberration is right out here right now. And you take a bunch of people who aren't Clear and try to persuade them up, that they ought to do something on the fourth dynamic and you lay ostrich eggs, robin's eggs, very frail eggs, very tough eggs, but they're all eggs. And you don't get – even get an omelet out of it because nobody pays any attention to this at all.

But nevertheless a Clear has an ability to lead. You'll find most of them are, well – are – they will lead. And they can infect people with considerable enthusiasm along a – certain lines like the fourth dynamic and that sort of thing. So you'll have here and there throughout Scientology, I can absolutely assure you whether it's South Africa, Australia, the United States and so on – South Africa has right now got one of these things going – very laudable to its degree, but it's impractical to this extent: is the Clear in this particular case is talking completely beyond the reality of other people and they're not going to know what the hell this person's talking about. That's all.
Now, the best way to do something for the fourth dynamic is, of course, get people into the PE Course and have an HGC that clears people. Now if you can get those two things, you're doing the most for the fourth dynamic that you could possibly do. To do much more than that at this particular stage of the game exceeds reality. You'll only cause a tremendous cross-commotion of some kind or another and it'll only wind up in the soup.

But this particular aspect of the Clear is that he has found mankind. And he has found them out here now. And he finds them a present time problem now. It's not a case of his bank. It's not a case of the bank condition whereby he has got to do something because it hurts him so on his little toe every time he sees a woman, see. That's his motivation before that. His motivation right now is this fourth dynamic as we look around this particular, rather small planet on a twelfth-rate sun seems to be in one God-awful mess and it seems to be causing it a number of problems. And these are very observable to the Clear. [laughter]

And it's – they enter into it in the same enthusiasm that you'll find in a pc when you eventually uncover the problem he's really worrying about. Have you ever had this happen with a pc? The pc's going on and on and on. He's talking about nattering problems this way, nattering problems. And all of a sudden he finds a problem he's really worrying about in life. He takes off with enthusiasm. Well, that's it, you know. Bang!

Well, a Clear, casewise, does this. And sooner or later, you can expect that phenomenon to occur. Well, of course they're on the road up and they will eventually blow that and go on to the fifth and the seventh and the eighth and come back to the sixth. And by the time they've got these more or less whipped, you will find that they're upwards toward Theta Clear. And then if they thought there was something to be done about mankind, they would probably do something about mankind. For instance, I can tell you a very practical way of stopping a war.

You mock up a small herald and he walks up the steps of the White House and he's got a tabard on, you see. And of course, the G-men of course all shoot him and the bullets go through him and don't make any impression which upsets the G-men. And he goes on in and he pulls out – he blows a blast on this trumpet and he pulls out this long scroll and he reads to the president, "People of Earth, we come in peace. We bring a plowshare not a sword," you see, that sort of thing "And unless a conference is held amongst all nations with – whereby they are sincerely going to operate along peaceful lines," something like this, you see, "in a fortnight, why, we're going to have to put the president and the other heads of nations under close arrest." And then, of course, just disappears in a small cloud of smoke. [laughter] Now, that's very effective.

Of course, they don't do anything but natter for a fortnight. And then you mock up some very tough space opera characters standing around the gates of the White House, standing around the Kremlin, standing around here and there, you see and so on. And they don't let anybody leave or enter.

This is upsetting because the G-men and the NKVD and other such nonsense peoples can't shoot them, you see and it's all very upsetting. And so they finally do hold a conference of some kind or another, you see and they come to some agreement to scrap bombs or turn them into the running of merchant ships or something else practical.
See, now there is a method of doing this, but you'll find somebody as he goes up scale will collide with this as a solution. Actually, this is not much of a solution. But it's a pretty good stopgap and it's much better than going to Trafalgar Square and sitting down in the rain. [laughter] Because the pavement is so damp!

Ah, dear. These things, of course, are problems of politics, governments, civilizations and a person starts colliding with these things. Then eventually, as you go along, why, a lot of people are Clear, they'll eventually realize "Mores? What mores? People aren't operating with any mores. They're operating with a bunch of prejudices which they themselves do while enforcing them on others and we don't have a civilization. We have a games condition."

Well, they start straightening out this, you see and that keeps them busy for quite a while. That's about the way it goes. You don't necessarily have a quiet peace when you wind up, by the way. They eventually get up to the point where they recognize the imposition of inaction on everybody is a fine method of making everybody ill. All you've got to do is make everybody be quiet enough and they all get sick.

You notice, the medical doctor is always making himself enormous future fees. Always. He tells you – you must be quiet and you must go to bed for a week or so and you must do this. He must – you must – you must be quiet – that is the main thing. Whereas truthfully speaking, the best advice, as you could get a good reality on, is tell somebody who is coughing and wheezing and having a terrible time. You tell him, "Well, walk around the block for an hour and note everything you see carefully." In other words, get a little bit active. Get a little more active than they are. Now of course, there's a finite point where this becomes impossible. And that is when a person can't move his legs or his arms or his head, you tell him to get up and walk around the block, you've given him a lose.

But I don't think at that stage you should tell him to be quiet. And the medical doctor can never resist. You couldn't get him out of bed practically with a derrick, you see. And the medical doctor can always be counted on, in the patient's hearing, to tell somebody else particularly, "Well, you have to keep him in bed for a few days." You know?

Can't you – don't you recognize this is a very familiar – has a familiar ring to it? Well, they just never can resist telling everybody to be inactive, which is a marvelous piece of nonsense because it's going to make everybody sick, but of course that increases their fees. They're practical men, at least. Even if rather shortsighted on the dynamics. I don't think a medical doctor even gets to the first.

But your best system of doing anything for a society – the most practical system of doing something for a society is rehabilitate knowingness. If you rehabilitate knowingness and ability, people will work things out. If you pull the rug out from underneath everybody and tell them to be utter slaves and that sort of thing, you don't work things out. It becomes a no-solution of magnitude.

Common solutions on the track which many of you have a reality on. You – well, you do such things as set up a huge electronic computer that figures out everybody's lives for them and they all go by the ticker tape. And go in for their inoculations and truth serum or something like this. Or you have a thought tower prominent in the middle of town. Everybody any-
time thinks a hostile thought, why, he immediately reports himself to the police because he realizes it's been picked up by the thought tower and so on.

We're skating awfully close to that, you know, with Security Checks. And the only thing that a Security Check has to excuse itself is that it makes people free. And the thought tower mechanism never did anything but make slaves because if somebody reported in that he's thought a hostile thought against the administration, of course, they immediately put him in the electric box and that was that.

Anyway, those are your various states. Well, I've overanswered the question but given you some various views on things which you've probably been thinking about. Whither are we drifting? I imagine a Scientologist every once in a while looks up and says, "Whither are we drifting" Well, the only way I'd modify the statement is, should we ask, "Whither are we gegangen at such a helluva rate of speed?" Because we're on our way. We're not drifting anyplace.

Now, the basic modus operandi on which I operate politically or administratively is that the only solutions are technological solutions which restore comprehension and self-determinism. And those are valid solutions because at the same time comprehension is restored, people can understand what is going on. And when you reestablish self-determinism, then you have made a person capable of responsibility for his own actions. And you'll find out that when somebody is responsible for his actions across a number of the dynamics, that he does not commit crimes. He is not evil. And you don't necessarily put him into motionlessness, you see. And so on.

And you'll find out the more people that can know the difference between right and wrong, the more people who can understand, the more people who can reach decisions, the more people who can act to straighten out any given situation, the better things will be. That is all. It's a very simple solution. It's too simple that one could very often be accused of some subterfugens, deviative, offbeat pitch of some kind or another. He could be accused of all kinds of odd things. Because there is an old mystical law though that a fellow has as much power as he can be trusted with. It's not quite right. That's theosophy. There's normally a little pitch connected with those things. The proper statement is "A person has as much power as he will trust himself to have." That is the proper statement. That is the real basic law of that. He will have as much power as he can trust himself to have.

And when he can no longer entrust himself to have any power, he then starts running on some kind of wild automaticity that has nothing to do with self-trust or self-distrust or anything else. It's just – it's just motion. And the more you have to do with criminals, the more this fact is impressed on you that a criminal is not any longer dealing in right and wrong; a criminal is simply dealing in forms of action and inaction insentient. A criminal does not make sense. After he steals something, he never does anything with it. He's quite amazing. But, of course, any confusion is amazing.

He s as – he s like MEST, in that MEST turned loose on MEST simply collides with MEST. You pour a bunch of liquids into the same bowl. There's no decision on whether they associate or don't associate; they simply do. And you separate them out in test tubes and
there's no question on the subject of – the MEST doesn't think that it's being separated out or not being separated out. It simply separates out.

Any exterior force, any exterior stimuli brings about some type of response. But response in the individual only occurs by reason of exterior stimuli. And you have packaged the criminal in a very tight package right there. All things occur by exterior stimuli. Only exterior stimuli is responsible for anything.

You talk to him. He is the most amazing fellow. A confirmed criminal is the most amazing fellow to talk to you ever heard of. Cawooo! He just leaves you utterly baffled. The way to get unbaffled about it all is disabuse yourself of the fact that you're talking to sentients. You're not talking to anyone or anything that is sentient. You are talking about a mechanism which activates on exterior stimuli. The bottle is on the counter and because the bottle is on the counter, it makes him put it in his pocket. Because the whisky is on the table, it makes him drink the whisky. You got the idea?

See, he has nothing to do with anything that is going on anywhere. And if you understand him at all, you had just better put it in the phraseology of MEST. You don't think of an ashtray deciding whether or not it is going to be moved. Well, don't think of a criminal as deciding whether or not he is going to do a criminal act. There is no understanding there, so of course it's incomprehensible. His actions are then incomprehensible. Well, incomprehensible is because he has no understanding. It's as simple as that.

Now, when you get a large section of the populace down to certain low levels of irresponsibility and all things start operating on a stimulus-response basis, there is no sentence left to furnish any direction and there is nothing going to happen but indirection and collision of some kind. There's nothing going to occur but confusion and randomness. That is about all that occurs and you see a society which is disintegrated. It has many interesting dramatizations and aspects and oddball activities and mores and all these things and eventually they're just merely a confusion. Because they're none of them sentient, none of them directional and all of them occurring because of exterior stimuli.

Why did he kill the girl? He killed the girl because the room was hot. You'll find out that's where it's gone and that's it. And of course, the poor police, they sit around and they grant this fellow beingness, you know. They're always granting the criminal beingness. And they're granting the – he had some motive for killing the girl. They're – if they're any – sure of anything, you see, they're hung with that security, see.

They think well, he had a motive for killing the girl. "Why did he kill the girl?" You see? Well, they put him under the hot lights. "Why did you kill this girl?" You see? And he says, "Well, the room was hot and that's why." And they say, "Well, he won't answer the question," and question him for another twenty-four hours, you see. And then decide that he's crazy and then put him in a mental home where he stays for five days and is then released. I mean, some weird things are going on in the society at this time.

It's basically on the basis that the society is rigged for people to be responsible in. And then you have vast numbers of people who are being irresponsible in it, you see, so it becomes incomprehensible how it is running. Somebody, Mr. Jubba-Jubba Pangawonga, is suddenly elected as president of the Algerian secret consuls of the upper hinterland or something,
you see. Why, hell, he hasn't any responsibility for it. He has no administrative training. He has nothing of the sort. He has no tradition, no background of anything else but throwing spears at gazelles, maybe.

And there he is. But everybody says, "Well, he is president of the upper Abyssinian hinterland, so therefore he is a responsible authority. So therefore, the things which he is doing make sense." See?

You see? That's what doesn't make sense, is the assumption that what he's doing makes sense. You see where it breaks down? The stupidity is interjected by the interjecting of a pretended knowingness. It's a false knowingness. They know he knows what he's doing.

But of course, this country might, two thousand, three thousand years ago, when it had an administrative, political tradition, when things were running in the country, when it was set up at one time – for instance, Abyssinia was the conquering entity of Egypt and actually ran Egypt for God knows how long, you see. They weren't always stupid. And there they are and at that time, if you'd elected Mr. Jubba-Jubba Pongawonga as president of the upper Abyssinian hinterland and so forth, you would have had an administrator in the place and you wouldn't have had to ask all these odd questions, you see.

But now the society decays, goes to pieces, is conquered by this one, conquered by that one, overrun by somebody else, everybody carefully shoots anybody in that society who has any political leanings. Naturally, if they want to control the thing, they've got to kill everybody that has any political leanings. And they gradually weeded out ...

The Japanese in Formosa were quite interesting. They made everybody who had any political aptitude or was demonstrating any, they made him into an opium addict. What's more simple? That was their basic government policy in Formosa. Well, for Lord knows how many, many, many, many decades, you see, they carefully made sure that there are no leaders and nobody to take responsibility for Formosa. And all of a sudden the Japanese pull out and we elect one of these people as in charge of Formosa. And their first action – I think their first action – was to shoot fifteen thousand students. That seemed to be a good political action. The proper action to take. Well, the students were around and they had some banners and they were in motion, so of course, you had to stop the motion and they did. Total responsibility – the stimulus-response. You get the idea?

So you get any kind of a – if you want a chaos, all you have to do is remove all responsibility from the chaos. And if you want to disestablish a chaos, all you have to do is return responsibility into the area. And that's it. Very simple. Except it's such a simplicity that it has apparently escaped man for a very long time.

I didn't mean to get off onto a harangue like this, but whither are we drifting, I think, probably should need a comment here and there.

You see, we might very well be part and parcel to the Fifth Invaders conquering Earth, you see. We might be a secret adjunct of the space command which is really interrupting everything. We might be this and we might be that. There's every reason why we might well have been part of the Marcab Confederacy, don't you see, as an extensional arm of invasion on
Earth. There's every reason. Because this is a timetable on which Earth is operating right at the present moment.

But the truth of the matter is, it's too simple to observe, you see. It rather escapes the eye. We are just us. You see, that's the most we could be – could be said about us because we are definitely more and more us. And we are more us than any other us's. [laughter]

On the simple rationale that the more effective we become individually, why, the greater effectiveness we will have as a group and the greater sentience and responsibility zones will occur and of course, we can't help but win, because it's not very complex. And the complex structures break down.

But every once in a while, somebody looks into Scientology for some vast, complicated complexity of some kind or another. There's every reason in the world why we might be one. But you just – it evades people's thirst for complexity, you see, that we aren't. And what we're doing is very, very simple.

It's just the more the individual is self-determined, the greater his zone of influence, the greater capability there is there, the more potential that is built up in that particular area and this is – I'm only talking now third dynamic on Scientology. Why, naturally, you build up a tremendous potential, there isn't anything that'd stand up to it. There's not much doubt about that.

Reversewise, there is another one that goes on simultaneously and that is the simple action of setting men free. And that's a perfectly simple, laudable, understandable action.

You're going to find sooner or later there's going to be some Scientologist stood up against the wall because he was overthrowing Earth. Let me tell you, man. We're getting up to a point where authority could here and there shake in its boots. But actually, more than shake in their boots, they succumb. Because remember that the world is basically running on the basis of exterior stimuli today. And the most stimulating stimuli there is around in the field of human relations is us. So we couldn't help but win.

I think we could try to go backwards at this particular time. I don't think we'd make it. I think our forward impetus is too great. I'm not even talking hopefully. Australia is unbearably cocky at this particular instant, see. Probably, you – none of you would find it capable of living with any of them, you see.

They're making Clears. They're doing this and doing that. All you – all they do is put something on the grapevine and the government does it. That's right. I mean, it's that positive.

I had a big discussion one night with a bunch of Scientologists in Australia. I said, "Well, the currency is inflating because you don't have enough goods in the country to absorb the money. And the country is doing something very stupid in that it has a very high tariff wall. Now, what we need to do is organize a resistance against the tariff wall and keep you from being cut off from the Commonwealth utterly." And we discussed it all over. And we even had demonstrations that we were going to organize. And we were going to have all the workmen in the country refuse to work with tools on which a tariff had been paid. All the housewives to refuse to serve food or use utensils on which anything had been paid. You know, make a bit of a demonstration and so forth.
We never had a chance. Went straight to Canberra. Ten days later they lifted all tariffs – all tariffs to the United States. I think they left 10 percent of them on some goods being established, were left on, but the rest of them were all lifted.

That was quite interesting, wasn't it. It made me do a double take. I said, "What is going on here?" Well, what was going on is very simple. Our lines of influence were much stronger than we realized. And amongst the people I was talking to, of course, they had lots of friends and the friends had friends. And what we were talking about and what I was talking about was very acceptable and they thought this was a very fine idea. And it went straight to Canberra and it got done instantly.

There are other such instances of that down there. They're not having much trouble now. Doctors – we made the doctors get rid of their secretary of their association because he was objectionable to us. Goofball things like this, but they're – the Australian Scientologist now is pretty cocky.

The South African Scientologist is getting very cocky – and should be. And the atmosphere is changing one way or the other. And you won't notice the degree of the influences. You will sometimes make a mistake. You'll say, "Well, they're copying us." They're not copying you; they're obeying you! There's a big difference. And they will change off to more practical aspects of it as fast you get Clear. That's all there is to it.

Well, I want two by tomorrow. So you better get to work. And right now, good night.
Grades Of Auditors

A lecture given on 28 September 1961

Thank you. And this is what?

_Audience: September 28th._

It's the 28th. What month?

_Audience: September._

28 September 61. Well, you better ask some questions today. What question do you have? Yes.

_Female voice: I have a question. I would like to know, earlier you said in a lecture that to be sure that the terminal is flat, you would check it on the Prehav Scale at sensitivity 16. Is that correct?_

Hm! It's an exaggerated check, but it's all right.

_Female voice: Okay._

The best way to check to find out whether or not a terminal is flat is clean up your rudiments. The more practical way is clean up your rudiments and then check it with a high sensitivity.

Some people apparently have the idea, by the way, on flattening rudiments – I've noticed one in passing – apparently have the idea that a rudiment is – all levels on the whole Prehav Scale have to have been run on a terminal before it can be considered flat. I just wanted to get that one very straight. You only flatten those levels on the Prehav Scale on a terminal which react. No levels react and the terminal is being audited with all rudiments in … The terminal's being assessed with all rudiments in and no level reacts, of course, it is flat.

But when you check a terminal on the Prehav Scale for a level, you ought to get all of your rudiments in and then check your _past_ level which you have been running to find out whether or not it still quivers or merely do an assessment. It doesn't matter what, you see. Your old level that you were running is still on the Prehav Scale. But before you do any changes with regard to the Prehav Scale on what you have been running and what you should be running – before you do any changes at all – get your rudiments in and then check.

Now, before you bring a terminal or a goal to somebody else to be checked, you yourself should check it out, find out if that is the goal (in checking a goal that somebody else is going to recheck) and then get all the rudiments in and then check it yourself and find out if it's active. Otherwise, you're – just a bunch of useless checking and appointments and that sort of thing. But you see, there's another way of going about this.
Instead of having the person throwing the responsibility for checking it off on the person who is going to do the checking – well take the responsibility yourself for the rudiment factor and then recheck it yourself. Then when you take the terminal over to somebody else to be checked – or the goal, whatever it is you're going to get checked – you'll know for sure that it's going to continue to react or not as the case may be.

In other words, you've actually checked it yourself before you had it checked. Because what does a terminal check consist of? It consists … a goals check. It consists of first checking the rudiments, you see and then checking the goal. Or first checking the rudiments, then checking the terminal; first checking the rudiments, then checking the level.

And when you're doing checking on somebody else's goals or terminals, when you're doing this, that is the first thing you should do – the first and foremost thing you should do properly and at once. The person comes in to be checked, you check out the rudiments. If the rudiments are out, you don't check the goal or terminal or a level. You don't go that far. It just gives the pc another invalidation, don't you see. See, because you're actually now checking him with the rudiments out.

Now, you as checker do not put the rudiments in. You merely find out whether or not they are out. And then you give the pc back to the auditor to have the rudiments put in. Otherwise, you are violating the Auditor's Code – too many auditors.

Now, you should know – in this unit particularly – you should know how to check a terminal, check a goal and check a level and how to patch them up if they're out. You should know this definitely because an HCO Policy Letter has just come out which grades auditors. It puts auditors into four classes in HGCs and the whole system depends on their having somebody that has had the Saint Hill Briefing Course. That's part of the rundown.

In other words, you could never have a Class III – grading on up the line, Class I being the lowest class – you could never have a Class III Auditor unless you had had somebody in the organization on the Saint Hill Briefing Course because the requirement of it is that they be trained by somebody who has been trained at the Saint Hill Briefing Course or of course, had been trained on the Saint Hill Briefing Course.

This classifies – reclassifies auditors. Classifies them in four grades. This is for purposes of staff use in organizations, which you'll find this gets very widely reflected. Part of that bulletin is your lecture of September 26, 1961. That's part of the bulletin. The lecture I gave you about how to train up auditors in the field.

So your first grade is … uses the old wise?? I'll explain this bulletin to you a little bit because it'll be in your hands shortly.

Auditor comes in. You say, "What have you had success with?"
He says, "Well, I've had success with Rising Scale Processing."
You say, "All right. That's all you can run on pcs."
And you'll get better – you get better pc gains. That's all.

Now until this person is ready for and can be checked out as and classified as Class II as an auditor, that's all he does. He takes a process that he himself has had some success with,
all right? Whatever process that is as long as it's Scientology and that is all he is permitted to run on pcs.

You'll find out it's ordinarily 8-C or it's Havingness of some kind or it's SCS and Connectedness or it's something like this. See, he'll have had some spectacular wins in his own line. So what are you doing? You're making sure that your staff auditor gets some wins and that your HGC pc gets some wins.

You're making absolutely sure of this right at the in – at the onset.

Now, to get an auditor to audit something with which he is not familiar, on a pc and in which he has no confidence, of course asks for the auditor to get a lose. And it asks for the pc then to get a lose because he's being audited with an auditor who has absolutely no confidence. Right?

Now, a Class II Auditor is one who has been checked out on the fundamental bulletins which you have to be checked out on with a perfect score. He's got to have had perfect scores on all of these bulletins and on the tape of the 26 of September 1961. He's got – in other words, to know Security Checking cold. And if he can pass all those things with a perfect score, he becomes a Class II Auditor and all he is permitted to do on anyone is security check them. That's all he does. He doesn't do anything else.

And then we have a Class III Auditor. And a Class III Auditor is one who has had some success in Security Checking and has done a good job of it and who has checked out everything necessary to the handling of Routine 3. Knows how to assess, in other words and knows all this cold. And when that person knows all these things cold – we don't let him audit these things on pcs while he is learning them, you see – after he's got them all cold with a perfect score, we call him a Class III Auditor.

All right. Now, he can run, then, SOP Goals on pcs, but part of that requisite to become a Class III Auditor is to have been trained at Saint Hill and have had a course completion – of course, that's understood and I don't think it's even mentioned in the bulletin – or to have been trained, which is mentioned in the bulletin, by somebody who has graduated from the Saint Hill Briefing Course. So a Central Organization couldn't make a Class III Auditor unless they had somebody present who had been here that was training them.

All right. Now, that goal and terminal has to be checked out by the Saint Hill Briefing Course person. We permit none to be run that aren't checked out by the Saint Hill Briefing Course person. In other words, a goal and terminal that has not been checked out by a Saint Hill graduate cannot be run on a – on a Central Organization pc. That's it, bang.

It's no nonsense about this because it's far, far too dangerous, it's too touchy and you will find that they will run the wildest hobbies you ever heard in doing assessments.

For instance, a guy just can't stand the idea of being a ship captain. So if the pc's goal is to go to sea and the terminal is a ship captain, he isn't going to let him have it. That's it. He's always had an ambition, you see, to be a – himself, he's always had an ambition to be an accountant. So he gives him the terminal "accountant." Of course, every time you mention accountant, it ARC breaks the pc so you get reactions, so it is obviously the terminal, isn't it?
If you don't think this isn't prevalent in the human race, look at the conduct of so many fathers. Wherever you've had a father or a mother failing in her goals line, she insisted on the child doing a life continuum of that and there it is.

So now that's a Class III Auditor and once more the requisite is a perfect score on examinations. And these examinations – same type of examination as you're taking here. You get constantly examined on these things. Possibly they won't be constantly examined on these things. They will be asked to study these things very hard and pass their examination on them, but must be a perfect score and the examination must be a minute examination. You know, the niggling, the exact word. You get down to the exact word.

That gets pretty grim, but it's the niggling type of examination of you found some obscure fact, way down in the corner of the bulletin that nobody ever noticed before and you ask him that and he fails it and then he's had it, see.

It's that type of examination. Very niggling, you know. Very, very nasty. "How many lines are there on bulletin of … ?" [laughter]

He says, "I never counted them, you see."

"Well, that's it. You flunk." I mean, that's – that's going pretty extreme. But if they failed to answer perfectly any question you ask them, they have flunked it. They have flunked the whole examination. It's very easy to examine this way. Let me point out to you. Maybe you've been examined this way consistently and continually, but you may not have noticed the mechanism. You maybe have been so involved with getting examined that you didn't notice how the examination was being done.

The proper way to examine on these things is the person goes over all of the material as a unit. That is to say, he takes the HCOB on which he's being examined. He studies this HCOB and then he takes his copy of it in to the Examiner and gives his copy of it to the Examiner. That's the way he should do it. Or in a case of a tape, the Examiner has the examination. And the Examiner asks questions until the student flunks. And that flunks the whole examination. He doesn't ask any further questions after the flunk.

Well, this makes for very rapid examination. Now, we've all been supereducated into the idea that it was all right to get 70 percent. Well, I'll tell you: you can't get 70 percent of a question on a Security Check clear. You can't have 70 percent of a goal right. So there goes the old traditional 70 percent, you see. It has to be perfect.

The Security Check has to be perfect. And the goal has to be perfect. And the terminal has to be perfect. And the level has to be perfect. And the auditing command has to be perfect. And there's no compromising with it. So, of course, you can't compromise with examinations. So anyway, that's a Class III.

And then you get up to a Class IV Auditor. And a Class IV Auditor can do all these other things and can run engrams on assessments and runs SOP Goals on pcs, plus engrams.

Now, the rest of this is not discussed in this particular policy letter, but I might as well say a word or two about it since you will probably – all of you, sooner or later, will receive the full brunt of this thing because we have just launched the campaign which makes Clears
in HGCs. This is the first shot actually. The first official, noncompromising, no-more-pep-talk, this-is-what-we're-going-to-do, see.

I think you will agree that that is a very, very practical method of going about it because it permits HGC pcs to come in and get results. And it permits auditors to get wins and it inhibits flubs.

Now, we have grooved training in to a point where it isn't changing. There isn't anything changing about training. Hasn't been for quite some time. There have been some round-ups, horse wrangler-type activities. You'll get the full brunt of this when you get back into an area where you are having to train up people and so forth, you will do a lot of horse wrangling. Just make sure you don't Q-and-A with the escaping pony.

Extraordinary solutions: All of you will err sooner or later – all of you will err sooner or later – in dreaming up the extraordinary solution to fit the extraordinary case that exceeds all rules. You'll all err in this direction sooner or later. The only thing I ask of you is catch yourself when you find yourself doing it. Because of course, you always get a flub with the pc. Extraordinary solutions are only required when the basics of auditing are violated and that is an extraordinary solution, definition of. That activity which somebody thinks he ought to do because all the basics of auditing have been flubbed. The extraordinary solution.

In other words, we have to do an extraordinary type of process on this particular pc. why do we have to do an extraordinary process? Well, that's because we didn't do the basic process.

This is horse wrangling. And you got this crowd of ponies. And it's out on the wide, wide-open prairie and there's no fence in any direction. And you're trying to tell them there's a road here. And they know better than that, see, and they all say, "Well, there's no road here. Look there's just wide-open prairie; there is no track. And nobody knows how to do any of it. And there isn't any right way. And besides there are eight thousand hundred million other ways to do all of these things." And they just invent them all the time, consistently and continually and you have to keep saying, "Well, there's a road."

Actually, there is a road. It's four lanes, it's concrete, marked with sodium-vapor lights the whole distance, you see. But they're odd ponies and they're blind to this phenomenon. They're blind to the roadway and they say, "Well, it's just open prairie." And you have to keep pointing out the road, you know.

And you point out the road until they themselves have a reality on the fact that there's a road there. You don't make them follow the road because they're afraid you will hit them. That's the naval, military-governmental method of doing it. You take all the revolt out of people by beating them down.

No, there's quite another way of handling the whole situation, but only bright people can do it and that is you take the randomness out of the situation by pointing out to people that there is a fact. There is something there. There is a reality to be gained and you educate them until they gain that reality. And you go ahead and work at it and you'll eventually find that they're able to stand up to this and say, "Well, what the heck. There is a reality here. Well, what do you know? What do you know?" There's something to be found out.
"Oh, well, you know, I never pay any attention to those TRs. I mean, I just audit, you see. I'm just natural. And that's why I have my feet over the back of a chair and …", you know. And finally, in horror, one fine day, finally in horror, they suddenly discover that the reason they don't audit with the TRs is because they can't. That's the first – about the first great discovery that they make, you see: that they never have gotten an acknowledgment across to a pc as long as they've ever been auditing. There's something there to be done.

Up to this time they didn't think there was anything there, you see. It was just a number. And this type of thing:

Well, there is no trick to Goals Assessment. You just ask the fellow, "What do you like to do in life?"

The fellow says, "Well, I don't know. I'd like to have a Pepsi Cola."

And the fellow says, "All right. Well, let's see, who would have a Pepsi Cola?"

Well, the fellow says, "I would."

And "Good. 'I.' All right. That's good enough. Now, let's assess it on the Prehav Scale, that's fine. All right. Now I don't happen to have a copy of the Prehav Scale right now. Think of doing something."

"Oh, I don't know. Going. Going to have a Pepsi Cola."

"All right. That's fine. That's the level we'll run. Where are you – where are 'I' going?"

[laughter]

Yeah, they will do a thing like that if they didn't realize that a person has just one goal and they just have one terminal and they just have one level. They realize that and as soon as they realize that, they say, "Oh, but wait a minute. How the hell do you find these things?"

And then, will ensue, possibly, the same cycle that has ensued since February.

Unless you had a reality on the fact that it could be found, wouldn't find it. I mean, that's why they weren't found. I mean, there's nothing more esoteric to it than that.

They didn't think they could be found, you know. And it was just all a good idea. But there wasn't any reason to really do anything very serious about it, because, you know? And you'll find right here in this unit, is – occasionally, where somebody's terminal has been messed up. You know, somebody wouldn't let him have his terminal, auditor will turn right around and won't let the other fellow have his terminal. You have people auditing, finding terminals – . I beg your pardon. There was one other condition to Class III Auditors. Class III Auditors had to have found their goal and terminal.

There's a clause in Class II Auditors that isn't there but probably should be. They have to have passed a full Security Check. That would be a very good one to add in. Probably will get added in.

Anyway, it's a part of Class IV. The Class IV Auditor, of course has to have had an engram run on his goals-terminal line successfully. He has to have had a subjective reality on this here action.
So all of these things are based on subjective realities. And your job in instructing, and your job in handling such people, of course, is to keep them steered and sooner or later, they will collide with one of these realities. You know, up to that time, it's doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, pretended know, pretended know, pretended know, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, pretended know, pretended know, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt.

Well, that's just a bunch of ponies wandering all over the prairie and they don't think there's any road to travel on and nothing of the sort and any bunch of grass is a bunch of grass and – no criteria, in other words. It's – no sensibility. And you just have to keep it rounded up.

And sooner or later one of these here ponies will start walking on the concrete and he will say, [knocks on the table] "Wa – whoa, what do you know. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. I got a hoof on something here." And they put it over here on the prairie. "That's different. That's different. Ah, haaaaa! Hey! Hey!" Turn around and tell you, you know. "Hey, you know there's a road here?"

And you – you generally, being of kind heart, you ordinarily respond – if he hasn't been an exceptionally dumb pony – and you'll respond and you'll say, "Well, yes, that's right. That's right. I'm awfully glad you find it – you'll – you'll be very happy with – found it."

But every once in a while, he's been a particularly obtuse pony. And has been – kept falling into arroyos and doing other things, you see. Anything but trying to find the road. You almost can't restrain yourself from saying, you know, "That's what I've been trying to tell you. What did you think that was?" See? Kind of make him guilty for being so stupid.

But the truth of the matter is until they find out this one phenomenon, you know, that there is something there to walk on and there is something there, why they – you'll just – you just can't round them up, that's all. I mean they have an awful time. They're all over the place.

And that's what normally happens in HGCs. Auditors come in. They pay lip service to all these things that are supposed to exist. And they hope they exist. And they got a fair reality that they do exist. And they think they do exist, I hope. And then there's no reason to do any of them. See? No real reason to do any of them. Because nobody would ever know whether they had done them or not because actually "There are no factors. Are there? Maybe?" You get the idea? It's just all sort of mush.

So this IV-scale is based on certainty and a common denominator of it is how certain is the fellow of his mind. And you let him walk on certainties the whole line.

Well, somebody who has been educated HPA/HCA level has some kind of a certainty. He winds up with some kind of a certainty, if he wants to audit at all. He's got some kind of a certainty. Something. Doesn't matter how dim. He ran "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" on somebody and it turned on a somatic. And so he said, "That's unusual. That's very odd." And so he goes home and he gets ahold of his elder brother or something and he says, "Hey!" he says, "What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting? Sit down in the chair. Yeah. What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting? What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting? Yeah. Good. What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting?" Turns on a somatic in him, you know. "Yeah. Well, there's something here." And all of Scientology be-
comes "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting." That's the whole lot. There isn't anything else in Scientology but just that one process.

Now, you, as the DofP, take this person, you put him on staff and you say to him, "All right. Now what we want you to do is take this E-Meter. I want you to security check this pc and get this thing all straightened out. And I want you to do that, I want you to do the other thing. And make sure that you get all the rudiments in and so on. That's enough for you. Now, let's see. Now, Joe, how about you?"

Person walks off, stands in the hall a minute and says, "You want me to do this? Well …" He knows what he ought to be doing. See. He ought to be going – running this pc on "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting," you see.

So he does a very – he tries. He tries hard. And it's all to his credit that he does try hard. And that he goes in and he actually tries. He tries to follow these instructions and he tries to do these things. And that's fine. He tries. Nothing much ever happens either here. But he tries. Where as a matter of fact, he'd be cocky as a grenadier, if he – after the winning battle, if he were just told, "Well, all right. Now, you see that pc over there? Well, you just take him up to that room there. And what process do you have a great deal of reality on? What have you got some wins with?"

"Well, it's 'Something you wouldn't mind forgetting'. "

And you say, "That's fine. That's what you run on that pc. You just take him right up there in the room."

Happy as a clam, man. Of course, he'll get some results. He evidently can run it. And most – most pcs could benefit from it, so what have you got to lose? Nothing.

Same way with Security Check. A person who has had no Security Check run on them – doing a Security Check? Hah!

You'll find people will give you all kinds of reasons why they can't give Security Checks or they don't want to give Security Checks or what they don't think Security Checks are. All their doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, pretended know and uncertainties and so forth, all come up in a horrendous black tornado, right about the time you say, "Do a Security Check." What's basically wrong is that the individual doesn't have any reality on a Security Check ever doing anything for anybody – and of course, has withholds.

You get a person with a lot of withholds doing a Security Check and they do a fantastically oddball job. Very peculiar. A very peculiar job. Let me tell you. They're going to make all kinds of flubs. Well, they're all natural. The flubs are just natural and they will usually leave questions unflat on which they themselves have withholds. All kinds of oddball things occur.

So a person has to know Security Checking cold and also, as should be in the policy letter, should have complete clean hands on Security Checks, before you turn them loose on Class II things. And now you'll find out that they get their best results on pcs by Security Checking. And they can Security Check this way. By the time they're all groomed up on Security Checking and they know – they've had lots of experience with Security Checking, and
that sort of thing, why, they get very fancy with it indeed. And you can do some very fancy things with Security Checking.

Oddly enough, because we haven't pushed Security Checks very hard. Not even you have – have the – a total reality on what fantastic things you can do with a Security Check. You've got a reverse reality. You know what weird things can happen to a case who does gather up a whole bunch of withholds he hasn't let go of. See? You've got that reality.

Well, there's another reality there to be found and that is what you can actually do with a person with a Security Check on the positive side of the ledger. And that's pretty, pretty wide. And now that I've pointed this up to you, I'm sure you're slugging ahead and doing something with it and all of a sudden the stars will be dawning in all directions.

And as far as Routine 3 is concerned – well, what the hell. It's too wild to even contemplate until you've found a pc's goal and terminal. Skip it, man. Till a person really knows his business and has found a goal and terminal on the pc, they will do all sorts of wild things. And the first wild thing they will do is take forever to assess.

Why do they take forever to assess? Well, they know it isn't there. They don't think it's there. They don't really realize it's there. They haven't any reality that they will be able to do it. They get very disheartened. These "forever assessments" are hinged on the rudiments being out. That is the mechanical fact. But the background music to it actually is that they don't think it's possible. Otherwise, they would be in there pitching.

They're wandering all over the prairie, you see and there's no road. And when they get a reality on the fact the pc has one goal, the pc has one terminal, the pc has one level and no other – doesn't have two – and when they suddenly get that as a reality, why you'll have people who can do some Routine 3 work.

As far as engrams are concerned, it's absolutely catastrophic to take somebody who has never had an engram run and ask him to run an engram. That is wild. If you want randomness, just set that going. Once you've had an engram run, why, you can run engrams.

Well, I just wanted to give you this particular rundown. I know this will be put into effect by Central Organizations particularly because the first Association Secretary that heard about it at once added something to it and said, "Well, that is an opportunity to – to change the pay scale of staff auditors." Very highly practical consideration and that's a sufficiently practical consideration that will back up the – the sensibilities of it and there we go.

This is our first elephant-solid step in the direction of full HGC clearing.

Now, I'd better say something about the workability of this in running any kind of a clinic or a group of auditors because all of you, whether you like it or not, will wind up somewhere in that direction, whether in Central Organizations or otherwise.

And that is that the auditors, you would say, then, naturally, that the auditor who have gone through Class I and Class II and Class III and is now a Class III, you would say then that auditor – all that auditor did, you see, was do the full of Routine 3. Well, that's not necessarily true, you see. This auditor could do the assessment. Could do the assessment and could handle the assessment factors and handle some of the basic runs, but wouldn't have to handle the
Security Checks, because you got auditors around that can handle the Security Checks, don't you see. So a pc could then be audited by two auditors – one who is a Class II and one who is a Class III.

And then supposing you had one Class IV in the whole shop. Well, when engrams got ready to be run, he'd run them. You see how that could work out? Now, that's apparently at first glance a violation of the Auditor's Code, but it isn't. Because you're not changing the pc's auditing on what the pc is auditing. You are not changing the auditor on what the pc is auditing. This is an interesting point.

In other words, if you change the pc's auditor on what the pc is being audited on, you will have trouble. But you can always have somebody else running something else and that happens very often. It's only when that becomes a withhold that it becomes very disastrous – being audited every night by one auditor and aren't telling the other auditor in the daytime that they're being audited on the same thing and this really gets to be quite a mishmash. And that is upsetting.

But you can do this other one. You can push a pc into the HGC and you would let him be run for a while, until you had somebody who could do something else about it, by a Class I Auditor. And then you get a Class II Auditor devoted to it on something on the order of two-and-a-half hours a day or something like that, you see. And you can give him a general run on SCS and Connectedness or something in the morning and in the afternoon they'd be getting security checked by a Class II Auditor, you see. You could split it up this way.

And then that could move over to where a Class III Auditor was doing the morning, you see and a Class II Auditor doing the afternoon and that way you could handle more pcs with more advantage.

In other words, you could mix up the auditors on a pc and you could straighten this thing out and you keep the pcs moving. And you'd find out this was quite successful and the fact glares now that HGCs must start clearing. And this is a very firm, forward motion in that particular direction and it hinges on this Saint Hill Briefing Course.

Well, if there's anything you don't know about checking terminals or anything you don't know about this particular thing before you get out of here, you certainly better find out because you'll find yourself in a lot of embarrassment someplace or another. Because you're supposed to know.

And of course, I'll help you out. I'll say, "Well, when they leave here, they know all about it. Yes, yes. Well, I know. Yes, Bob was here for quite a while. He was here all summer. Yes, he certainly knows all about that. Yes, well, you just ask him."

And the only esoteric thing that you're going to run into is you're going to run into the imponderables – the pc who doesn't move, the pc who doesn't respond, the pc who just nothing happens with and your temptation – because that is what is being urged on you all the time by a Class I Auditor – your temptation is consistently to dream up an extraordinary solution. There is your first temptation.

I know. I did it for years, and so on. Finally recognized what I was doing and your only fault is not recognizing what you're doing. Go ahead and dream one or two up and lay a
gorgeous egg, but recognize what you're doing. You're avoiding the fundamentals and cutting it in someplace else with some extraordinary solution of some kind or another. It is always a *gross* auditing error. I don't care what the staff auditor said he was doing. I don't care what the field auditor said he was doing. That had nothing to do with it.

If that case isn't moving, there is a *gross* error. It is always a *gross* error and when you think up an extraordinary solution, you just perpetuate the gross error. And that's why the extraordinary solution is wrong. You haven't actually found out what was going on. Gross error.

I'll give you an idea. A Clear down in South Africa. Two cases not moving on CCHs. Absolutely not moving. Not moving, not moving, not moving, not moving, not moving, any way, shape or form. Nothing happening, that sort of thing. And this couldn't be called, at first glance, a gross error because the CCHs – you're just supposed to run the case, don't you see. Well, actually, the gross error was the CCHs were being run wrong or they would have done it. It was simple, wasn't it? See? We – so we got a datum in our laps to the effect the CCHs aren't working on two cases. Well, our first impulse is to say, "Well, let's do something else that is new and marvelous and strange because the CCHs aren't working."

Your first job in rounding up ponies is to find out what they're doing. Never take what the pony said he was doing. Find out what he *was* doing. And that is very often, somebody who has a low reality on his tools, will often tell you with good faith, that he has done all that and you have to have a closer checkup on it.

Now that, by the way, was solved – down in South Africa, it was actually solved not by doing the CCHs right. It happens to have been solved by the Instructor going in and just asking these people if they had present time problems and just cleaning up the rudiments and asking them with real pressure and going really at it and discovering that they both did have and blowing grief charges off both of them on their present time problems and after that, even these misrun CCHs worked.

Well, that was an extraordinary solution, but didn't necessarily get CCHs working, did it? So, there's a datum sitting there that the CCHs wouldn't work on cases with present time problems. Yes, the CCHs would work, if run right, on people with present time problems. But the easiest way to have done it in this particular instance, of course, would have been to have put the rudiments in, even though you were running the CCHs. If anybody had ever done that, they would have found out something. But that is not a particularly gross error. That's just a mishmash, see.

The gross error, of course, CCHs weren't run right. Of course, you can always do something for a case by putting the rudiments in. So these two things go together. And – but we have a misunderstanding when we come out at the other end of it. And that is to say, the misunderstanding is the CCHs don't work on some cases. Well, that's the misunderstanding. Yes, the CCHs run wrong, don't work on most cases.

You sit somebody down and pump his hand for seventy-five hours and nothing happens. [laughter] You're violating the Auditor's Code in all directions. You're running a process that is flat. You're running a process that isn't producing change. Well, there you are.

All right. Let me tell you some more extraordinary solutions.
An extraordinary solution: The pc – we just can't clue what this pc is doing. We just haven't got an idea what this pc is doing. The pc – God knows! Well, we just keep running this and – and it – just don't know exactly. Actually, we found the pc's goal and we found the pc's terminal and it all seems to be all right, but nothing has happened.

Well, I don't know. There must be some other level to the Prehav Scale that we're not running. Let's see. Let's – pc responds to "indignity." All right. We'll run the level of the Prehav Scale "indignity." That must be about the way it is. Yes. Well, we'll try that and after we've wasted a dozen auditing hours, well, we try something else and after we've wasted twenty-five more, we try something else. And after we've wasted fifty more, we try something else. What was wrong in the first place? Gross auditing error.

Since finding the pc's terminal, from there on, the pc had never done the auditing command. Now, that is the most gross auditing error there is. There is no more gross auditing error than that: to give a pc a command which the pc does not then execute. Isn't that simple?

So, how do you think dreaming up new levels to the Prehav Scale is going to do anything for this pc who has never done any level of the Prehav Scale even after it was assessed, huh? Now, where is this going to come out? How is this going to make things right? By adding new errors onto old errors, we're going to wind up with what? New errors. So, there is no more gross error than an auditor auditing a pc who is not doing the auditing command.

Now, let's define what is "not doing the auditing command." All right. Not doing the auditing command is defined as: simply not executing it or doing something else – or executing the auditing command indifferently and then doing something else. You know, they say, "Well, have you ever – have you ever shot a duck?" You know? And the pc says – thinks to himself dimly, "Well, yes. I've shot a duck," and then applies it to his lumbosis, which is hurting him today and says, "Well, let's see. I wonder if there could be any shot in the lumbosis. I get the idea of mocking up some shot in the lumbosis. Yeah, all right. That didn't work. Okay."

See? The pc is not being audited. The pc is – is answering the commands and self-auditing. He's doing two things. You could say not executing the auditing command, technically, could be expressed is: not doing it and not just doing it – not just doing it.

Now, when a pc has a present time problem of long duration, the pc will have a hidden standard and every auditing command which is given to the pc – the pc then audits something else in order to affect the hidden standard and they'll do it every time.

The pc had a headache, so you give the pc an auditing command and then the pc has figured out that if he audits the mass against his stomach, that this will affect his head. So the pc then does the auditing command against the mass of the stomach, only, and then sits back to find out if it has done anything for his head and no matter what you say to the pc, no matter what command you give to the pc, the pc does these things. He receives the auditing command, thinks about it for a moment, gives you some kind of a response, then applies it to the ridge in his stomach and then checks to find out whether or not it has affected his head. So, he hasn't just done the auditing command. See, he's done a lot of things.
The first time Mary Sue ran into this down in South Africa – as a very fine example of this and really punched it into view – was auditing somebody who was – had been audited for just – oh Lord! You know, just tremendous numbers of hours. And everybody had been thinking up extraordinary solutions for this fellow. Extraordinary! Absolutely extraordinary. I mean, the most marvelous solutions had been thought of for this fellow's case. A catalog of them would have filled the wall, you know. And just shelf after shelf of books to all these beautiful solutions.

There was only one difficulty. The case had never done anything but audit an electronic incident in an effort to change his sex. No matter what was said to the pc, the pc then audited to the electronic incident because he knew that if he got rid of the electronic incident, then his sex would change. And for literally hundreds of hours, actually, the pc had never done anything else. The pc then had a present time problem of long duration. He did not want to be a man. It was a terrible problem to this pc to be a man, so this was all the pc ever did.

Now, that is more broadly understood by the fact that any pc who has a present time problem, particularly a present time problem of long duration, will use the auditing command to resolve the problem, no matter what the auditing command is. How do you like that? And that's why you can't audit up against a present time problem. And that's why you can't leave present time problems of long duration just floating. Because the pc will never do the auditing command, they always do something else. So that's the most fundamental error that could exist. And you could go on thinking up solutions until your hair was down to your knees and you wouldn't ever have the pc doing anything but just sitting there unchanged. Interesting, hm?

You must be inquisitive. You must find out what the pc is doing. Now, if you have to find out too often and too much what the pc is doing, you obviously have no confidence that your rudiments are in. Well, doesn't that follow? Because if the rudiments were all in, the person wouldn't have a present time problem of long duration or short duration. Awfully simple, isn't it?

Now, the pc who applies the auditing command to a specific target may or may not ever apply the auditing command to the terminal you just got through assessing. Isn't that fascinating? That is very disheartening. The pc with a present time problem of long duration will apply an auditing command, not to their own terminal, but to the terminal which is troubling them. And this may be the wrong terminal. So you think you are auditing "a ghost" and you are busily auditing "a sixteen-inch gun". I mean, that's as stupidly simple as that, see. You're not running the pc's terminal. That's all. And that's the gross auditing error.

Every time the pc answers the auditing question, you eventually find out from the pc, realizing the pc is stalled in some fashion and has been for some time ... You see, you got a great apparency that you can get going these days, marvelous apparency. You see, the Security Check the pc is getting can give him a case advance. So, you look at the case advance the pc is getting from a Security Check and you attribute it to the auditing you're giving the pc – because the pc isn't receiving any auditing from you. You see how that could work out?

The pc is receiving auditing from a Security Check, whether you're giving it or not, but you think by running his terminal the pc is getting an advance. Well, the pc isn't getting an
advance if he's not doing the auditing command. He might not be running a terminal. He might not have any idea of the terminal. Always a good thing to ask the pc if they can get an idea of this terminal and what is their idea of this terminal as they run it, and so forth. And you'll find out very rapidly that the terminal they are running is not the terminal you have just got through assessing. Isn't that fascinating? Well, we get some kind of a case going where this fellow is auditing – being audited on a – on "a skin diver", and that's dandy. He's having a marvelous time on a skin diver, but every time he answers the auditing command, he actually applies it to Mary Ann. Well, he's in a state of non compos mentis. He isn't thinking in this zone. It's not his fault, because he is frozen in this particular zone. He is irrational on this particular point of course, or it wouldn't be his terminal.

So, you ask him one day, you – you notice he's not making any progress. And you decide it's his Security Checks that are giving him the progress, not the running of the terminal and you get very bright. You have a long, blue streak of lightning, you see. You get this marvelous idea. And you say, "It just may be there's a gross auditing error here." Now, that is the first idea you ought to get with regard to the pc who is not making progress. Whether you're auditing on a via, through some other auditor or whether you're supervising auditing very casually or whether you're doing it yourself If you're not getting progress, you should think to yourself there's a gross auditing error here of some kind or another and the first and foremost one is that the pc isn't doing the auditing command. That's the first thing you should search out. And you get this long, bright blue spark and you say to the pc, you say, "Who do you think of when I say, 'Have you ever destroyed a skin diver?'" And the pc thinks for a long time. There's quite a comm lag.

And says, "Well, I think of Mary Ann."

And you'd say, "Well, is Mary Ann a skin diver?"

And you get another long comm lag and the pc then says, "No, come to think about it. Mary Ann is not a skin diver. Mary Ann has never had anything to do with skin diving."

Now, I know that sounds completely idiotic, but then you're handling a zone and sphere of idiocy. Everyone is very bright until he gets on the subject of his exact goal and terminal. And then he's a complete idiot. So, there you go.

So having asked this burning question, don't say then, snarlingly, "Well, after this, after this, when I ask you the auditing command, apply it to a skin diver!" You know, that would be the wrong way to go about it because obviously the pc is incapable of doing so and you just asked him to spring up to the top of the Empire State Building in a swan dive from the pavement. He can't do this. So you give him a kind of a lose.

Now, you say, "Well, what cooks with this Mary Ann?"

"Oh, I don't know if I've ever told you, but she and I had a lot of trouble."

All right. That – that would be the way to go. You're auditing somebody with a present time problem of long duration. You're not auditing somebody's terminal. Your rudiments are out even though they're not registering as out. They don't register as out, because the thing is totally submerged. The thing is completely out of sight. So therefore you have to supplement rudiments with interrogation and what kind of interrogation do you have to do? You have to
ask the pc, "Well, what would have to happen to you in order to find out if Scientology worked?" you know. It comes right back to that thing.

"Oh, well, I have to get over this trouble with Mary Ann."

There it is. Present time problem of long duration. This can give you a lot of trouble – present time problem of long duration – and could have given you much more trouble a few weeks ago than it would now. Because now with your Security Check aspect of the broad tool – Security Check is a very broad tool – you have the rule of the prior confusion and that is one you must remember because he is not fixated on Mary Ann at all. Mary Ann is the solution to a problem of which Mary Ann had no part. And you can audit Mary Ann till hell freezes over and you won't free the pc from Mary Ann. Why? Mary Ann is the one piece of paper that was motionless while all other pieces of paper moved.

It's the rule of the prior confusion. The broken leg – the broken leg is the solution to the confusion. Believe it or not, it is. And that is hooked and it violates the rule of auditing the stillness. Don't audit stillnesses. Audit motion.

Well, what is there motionful about a broken leg? There it lies pointing the wrong way. It's awfully still and it's sure been still ever since, hasn't it? It's gone on for some years being still. Guy's got a psychosomatic now called a broken leg. Only it's not called a broken leg. It's called an articulo metalosis of the tibia.

Female voice: of the what?

That's very interesting. The one you didn't get is a proper word for a leg. [laughter]

Anyway, here we go. Chronic somatic, then, from – viewed from a Security Check basis, is a solution to a prior confusion – always. It's never considered otherwise. Now how do you get rid of one? I can tell you how to get rid of one today as I told you the other day, but I can repeat it.

It's a very simple activity. What do you do? You find the prior confusion by assessment. What confusion reacts the most on the meter just prior to Mary Ann, the broken leg or anything else the pc is using in running? What is the prior confusion?

You assess it. And you find out that just before Mary Ann turned up, God help us, it looked like the Battle of Gettysburg at high speed. Yeah, man, it really was motionful. And whatever it was – whatever it was that assessed out, you take that series of personnel and run Security Checks on them and you never run any Security Check at all on Mary Ann or the broken leg.

Now earlier, we were making very slow but positive progress by running Security Checks on Mary Ann, or pardon, not Security Checks, but running O/W on Mary Ann, running O/W on legs and we were getting someplace. We were getting someplace. That was no doubt about that. Very slow, but very positive.

We could run O/Ws against a fellow's bad ear. You know, "What's he done to an ear? What has he withheld from an ear?" and so forth, we would have gotten someplace. But now, this new data has turned up that the ear ... Well, the new data that turned up is I had to find out for ever and aye, whether you ever audited stillnesses and I find out you don't. And of
course, this is the stillest stillness you ever heard of. This ear's been floating through time, it isn't even moving on the time track. It's awfully still, isn't it?

So obviously you've got to find the confusion for which the ear is a stable datum and our tools are now adequate and our sessioning is now adequate, with rudiments in, to actually audit confusions. You can hold the pc in-session, which you might not have been able to do some little time ago.

So, what do you do? You find the prior confusion and the personnel and objects involved in the prior confusion and you security check them. You find out what the pc did to them and how the pc tried to make them guilty and you find out all about it. And now when you've done that Security Check, you will find out Mary Ann has blown and the broken leg is now moving on the track, which is quite an interesting thing.

Now, look at what this pc is doing. It's not ever as flagrant as this. A pc who's doing this is having a hell of a time. "Let's see now. If my ear got well, then I would know that the auditing which is being done on me is working."

Every time he does an auditing command, he looks over to see if his ear gets well. He does an auditing command, see if his ear gets well. Then he thinks he'll audit something else in order to see if his ear got well. Then he'll audit something else and he'll have something else as a target – which he doesn't tell you anything about – and then he looks back to see if his ear got well. Hell, he's not in-session. He's running a self-audit. Also, he must be running some kind of a weird oddball mechanism called "doubt." He must be doubting everything that is happening. He must be in – a hell of a lot of doubt going on of one kind or another for this sort of thing to be going on. He has no positiveness and he has no assurance. Therefore, he has no confidence. Therefore, there's no boost to anything that is happening, so therefore, it's all slow freight through Arkansas. I mean, he's not going to have anything happen.

So you got now the rule of the prior confusion. Now, that's his present time problem of long duration. Find the present time problem, confusion. The confusion that went before the present time problem of the long duration and you've got it.

Now, this even might apply to engrams. It might be that the person is stuck in some portion of an engram as a solution to the confusion which went before and maybe it forecasts a new way to run engrams – which is to say, you don't run the engram, you find out where the fellow is stuck and then you assess the prior confusion. And having assessed the prior confusion, why you could run a Security Check type action on that and the engram would blow. That's – that forecasts it for engrams, but I'm – I don't have any experimental data on it. It's just theoretical.

This other is not theoretical. This other is quite factual, that it is the prior confusion which sticks a person into a present time problem of long duration. Now, he cannot confront that prior confusion and so he has his attention stuck, you see, on something he can confront. And you'd be surprised, but thetans can confront busted heads, bad legs, hopeless love affairs.

The Japanese – oh, the Japanese ever … Show you what a thetan will do (the Japanese are, too, you know) and I would love to see you – I would – I would just love to – to see your reactions to a real honest-to-goodness, not faked-up for export, but a real honest-to-
goodness Japanese movie – a real, sound movie from Japan, for home consumption. I would love to see your reaction to it, because – in the first place, I could tell you about it, but you still wouldn't believe it. It's not something on which anybody could have a reality. Because I myself, the first time I ever saw one, I said this is impossible. And I sat all the way through the thing and I hadn't seen it at all because it was all impossible. And it was mostly for practice in understanding Japanese customs and frame of mind and also practice, obliquely, in speaking Japanese.

But the next one I saw – I'd already seen it happen once, so there was a probability that it could happen again – and I realized that when I had heard and read of things like this when I was a kid around the Pacific, that I had just not-ised them. They were just total not-is. I didn't believe anybody ever considered this drama and yet there it was.

Well, their fairy tales are very easy to get hold of – very easy to read. But they don't exaggerate it to the degree that the Japanese has got it exaggerated now in the later days of his civilization.

Oh, I'll give – I'll give you a plot of a movie in Japan. I mean it runs like this. The soldier comes home from the wars and greets his girl and then he goes off to the wars and is killed. You are now at about ten feet deep in the film. You may not even have seen him. This we are suddenly collided with – we suddenly collide with this immediately after the titles. We're – we're acquainted with this almost immediately after we find out that it was directed by Kobi Mitsuyu. This is totally incidental. And now, my God, we have five reels where she does nothing but wander across scenes and areas where she has seen him before he died – and that's the movie. [laughter]

And of course, the Western mind is educated to a bunch of action. And then finally, why, she receives the news that her lover is dead and she lies down on the bed and cries and that is the end of the film and that's very modern and very something or other. That's – that's really something marvelous. You know, that's a very tragic picture to us, you see. Very dramatic. Not to Japan. The whole picture now takes place. Now it takes place, see. You have a hell of a time sorting out who this fellow was. [laughter] All this is incidental. The action is entirely missing. There is no action.

Beautiful photography. Have these circular bridges and so forth and cherry blossoms. And the cherry blossoms are falling, blossom by blossom, you know and the circular bridge. And she is reflected in the water. And then she's standing on the bank, you see and she looks into the water, and she doesn't see her own reflection, she sees his face. [laughter] And then she walks on … [laughter] and this goes on for about five reels. Coo, man! [laughter] You read about these things, of course, they'll give you a Westernized version of the plot and they'll say, "Well, her lover was an aviator and he got killed bombing the Saratoga and so on. And this broke her heart and she became a geisha girl." That's the plot. And you say, well, there must be … You know, and you get the idea of rahahahahah, a-a-a-a, [imitates the sound of an aircraft and a machine gun] and all this kind of thing. Well, it has nothing to do with the picture. [laughter] We don't even find out the guy's name, you know.
Well, that's a grief engram stuck after the fact of action and you can run it till hell freezes over, of course and there's no action in it, you're running the still. There's the still.

So, of course, if there isn't any action in it, what's – keeps holding it in place? It must be the confusion which occurred before the action. Actually it wouldn't have occurred if there hadn't been all that action. Well, the Japanese can no longer face any kind of action. Not even in war could they face action. They went out and did the most suicidal things. They could face death and they could face that very well, because it was good and still.

I know I spent about four years making myself numbers of enemies amongst naval officers in the West by trying to tell them something about Japan and I don't think they've even grasped it yet.

But the Japanese, of course, he's already in a still, and he obsessively duplicates and so forth. They're not a bad people, long way to, but they – they very easily slide into this particular band. They shudder off of the motion. They shudder off of the confusion and they will pick up some fabulous stable datum and they will carry on with it. And their attitude toward war is "What is war for? Well, war is to get killed in." That's some kind of a wild stable datum, isn't it, for a war? So they lose.

And if the Japanese cannot succeed with their first pound, why, they've pretty well had it and they almost did succeed with their first pound at Pearl Harbor. They almost did. And after that you kept wondering why the hell don't they push the attack home? Because they really never did. They never – never really pushed the attack home.

And American marines were absolutely fascinated with the conduct of Japanese marines. Japanese marines would line up in a company front formation and march down an open beach against machine guns – at routine marching pace. What can you do about something like this? Well, you can kill them, that's all. And the Japs go and hole up in caves. And then they just had to go on killing Japs in caves and killing Japs in caves and killing Japs in caves. Very tenacious. Very tenacious while holed up in a cave and that sort of thing. Because it was still.

I'm just taking up this one particular racial side just to give you an objective view of what a – what a person is doing with a psychosomatic.

He couldn't confront any part of the motion which proceeded this. And it was all too confusing for him and he had absolutely no datum of any kind whatsoever. So, he holds on to a twisted leg.

Or domestically – domestically, he says, "Well, my – my first wife did me in." He says, "She did me in." That was it. And he's got stuck pictures of her and so on, and it's just all stuck. And he's stuck in the first home they lived in. And it's all miserable and it's all stuck. Ah, come off of it. To free it – Why did he get married? See the kind of question you have to ask? It's not "What did your first wife do and what did you do?" Because you're Qing-and-Aing with him to that degree. You are interrogating the stuck. "Well, why'd you get married?" Well, of course, this sounds to him perhaps flippant. You know, like, "That'll show you," you know. So you have to ask the thing rather diplomatically.

"What was going on before you were married?"
"Oh, well, I didn't know her very well. I knew her for some little time."

"No, no. I mean with other people," and so forth.

"Oh, well, that. Oh, well, no, no. Nothing there."

The E-Meter goes mad.

"What was happening before you were married?"

"Oh, well, uh – th – that's, uh – well, actually, that has nothing to do whatsoever with the marriage."

"Well, okay, but …" Your meter will be going mad. And you say, "What was that confusion? What was that confused area of life? What was going on during that area of life? What were you trying to do?" And you get some wild tales, man. There's the drama. There's the action. There's the confusion.

"Ah, oh, well, there were five – there were five girls. And they were all cross-suing something or other, but it was all kind of involved and it got me in a lot of trouble with my parents." You get the idea? "And I was this and I was that, and so on. And it was all very rough. And we really shouldn't go into that."

And that will be his immediate reaction, is "We really shouldn't go into that." And you'll get that constantly. Why? Because he wouldn't be stuck on what he's stuck on if he could face what had happened and you're asking to face what's happened. So I could see that if you weren't alerted to this other thing, you might Q-and-A with the fact that it's nonconfrontable, which it isn't at all. It's perfectly confrontable. But he will keep telling you – and down through the years, if you run this trick, you will accumulate enough people telling you that it is impossible to confront it, that you'll eventually start running the stuck again, unless I warn you.

So what do you do? You take the personnel – the rule of the prior confusion – is you take the personnel involved with the confusion and you security check on this basis. Now, you could run broad O/W on these people. You could do a lot of things about this and maybe shake it all out. But it's a longer route than a direct Security Check.

So he had trouble with this girl. She was down in New Orleans and actually, he had to pay for an abortion and so forth. And actually she didn't really have a child. And he found out about it later, but the same time she was blackmailing him. This is not his wife, you see. This is somebody else! And unless you tailor up some kind of a Security Check to find out what this person did do to them, they're liable not to own up and it's liable not to come up on an automaticity, you see. You're not checking against specific questions. You're just letting him wander and he won't face it because he can't. But security questions – yeah, he'll face it. Just by getting it off, why, it'll free up. That's the anatomy of a stuck point on the track and we've searched for it for eleven years and there it is.

What is a stuck on the time track? What is a chronic somatic? What is a stuck engram? What is any of these things?

Now, this also predicts – and don't bother, don't – don't take this very seriously – it also predicts (and I'm sure you're not going to reach it by this technique) that a hell of a lot of
confusion went on in the case before the person picked up the valence which is his terminal. See? I've already given you some lectures on that last summer sometime. To reach that is possible, maybe it's not possible. It's not been tried.

The reason why it hasn't been tried is we have other routes that are successful. But you possibly could blow that valence. You possibly could blow that goal. There's a possibility of doing so. So I'm – would be dishonest if I didn't tell you there's another prediction. Just like you could blow an engram – a piece of an engram – you might blow the last hundred trillion years by finding out what was so confusing before them.

But my experience with cases has been that all gets very unreal and bucking them into it is asking too much. And the earlier they go on the track, the beefier they were as thetans and the messier the ridges are and the more velocity things have. And boy, for the last hundred trillion years they haven't been able to confront an electronic machine gun, you see. And the type of machine gun – if you turned it loose in Trafalgar Square, it'd knock down all the buildings for a quarter of a mile in all directions with one swing. You see? And that is an awful lot of motion. That is an awful lot of action.

The idea of a hand grenade in those periods, you see, was something that flattened a city. Be a lot of motion. When a thetan stared you in the eye, you lost your eyeballs. You know, this kind of thing. And you get going on early track stuff, the fellow has no acquaintance with his bank. He's not worked up on it and there's plenty of motion surrounding this terminal. So my feeling about it is, is you ought to be satisfied with that. [laughter]

If the terminal isn't blowing a gross auditing error exists. Gross auditing errors – I gave you one gross auditing error which the pc is not doing the command. Other gross auditing errors is the rudiments are out, way out. Another gross auditing error is the auditor's attitude toward the pc is such as to drive the pc out through the bottom. This is a very gross auditing error. It's almost too gross to even be admitted, but you must discuss it and you must realize that it can exist. Fortunately, not in any majority. It's very rare, but it – it can be a very gross auditing error. The auditor just hates the living guts out of the pc. He just hates the pc like poison. He's just not going to see that pc get anywhere. And all he does is make the pc guilty and try to trip the pc up and all of this kind of thing. Gross auditing error.

Another gross auditing error would be to try to audit a Scientologist who has been around for quite a while without getting the auditing Security Checks like 6 in hand – the last two pages of Form 3 and the Sec Check 6. And if you haven't got those a bit in hand, why, you shouldn't expect anything to be happening, because they can be quite wildly out. And if they're out, just because they are overts against the exact activity which the person is performing – not – you might get the idea that those are – the reason why those have to be free is the worst thing you could possibly do under the sun would be to have an overt or withhold on the subject of Scientology, see. Or the worst thing that you possibly could do anywhere from horizon to horizon would be to injure Scientology or some of its personnel, or something like that. You get an idea that that has an order of magnitude.

Well, the only order of magnitude it has is to stop a fellow's case advance. Because it's an overt act against the exact thing that they're expecting benefit from. That is why it is a rough one.
Now, of course, that incidentally does work out to be the most horrible overt act that they can pull. Because it's against themselves, because it stalls their case, but it's only an overt act to the degree that they now don't recover. You see how – how this thing all works out?

You find all kinds of weird attitudes. You find all manner of weird attitudes amongst field auditors. Here, there, they've been gone out of perimeter, out of touch for a long time. They've been nattering around and – and so forth.

Of course, they haven't had – made very much – such a person hasn't made any progress because his overts would stop him from making any progress in auditing. The fact that he doesn't make any progress in auditing then makes him hostile toward auditing, you see. And then because he's hostile to auditing, you see, he has more overts against auditing. So, of course, he makes even less progress. And eventually he stalls down and then all of his fake ridges key in, you see. All the times he's infraudulated people – key in. And all his doubts key in and he goes kind of spinnny.

All right. Well, this person finally – he hears that somebody has gotten some results and you find yourself auditing him. This is an extreme case of this sort of thing. Why, he isn't going to make any progress – not until you get the last couple of pages of a – of a Form 3 flat and not until you get a 6 pretty flat. You're actually wasting time doing very much with him until you do those things.

Oddly enough, you can, if you're very good, find his goal and terminal while this is being done – if you're very good. But it makes it very rough. It makes it harder to do.

It's quite interesting. You look at mail coming in from such people, and so forth. And they – they look down the line, and it's quite – kind of horrifying, you know. You say, "Boy, this poor guy. He's got himself stalled in a box," huh. There he is. There he is. Sitting there in upper Kokokomo and he's having himself a ball.

And as I told Robin today, I said – somebody had said, "Well, we've just – just got through having our sessions." And I read the rest of the letter, you see. And the rest of the letter is rather insouciant and insolent and – and so on. We know the past history of this particular couple, and it's not good, and – see, why are they getting audited?

Because I'm sure the last thing that they would do in the area that they are in would have anything to do whatsoever with a Form 6. It would be immediate tacit consent. See, they – they both would have so many overts along these particular lines, you see, that there wouldn't ever seem like there was any overt to it, don't you see. So therefore, they would say, "Well, there's no sense in running that because … You know, well, you can't do anything with that." And, well, why are they getting processed? See. Why are they – why are they fooling with it? Because they have overts against what they are expecting benefit from.

And I suppose you can have overts against castor oil and still get medical benefits from it, but unfortunately Scientology doesn't work that way. [laughs] Ah, me.

Well, all right. I said I was going – you were to ask questions, but you had one proclaimed here which I thought I had better cover and then I had that news about this policy letter I thought I'd better give you and give you some rundown because it does have an effect
upon you. It does have a rather broad effect because you run into it more than once. Even if you aren't even near a Central Organization, you're going to run into it.

Well, what do you have to do … I just brought up this hypothetical case and how desperate it all was about this couple who were way off some place or another and with nattering overts and yippety-yaps of one kind or another.

Just today I – we received some interesting news about another Clear, and, all checked out by one and all. Oddly enough, the person was (quote) cleared (unquote) and then took an HCA Course, but no engrams had been run and ran into a mishmash of engrams that took twenty hours to get rid of. And then checked out Clear as a bell.

In other words, engrams – completely outside anybody with any advice that they had to run them – they had to be run, that was it. This has happened twice now on Clears. They get cleared and then nobody has cleaned up any of the engrams on the chain. And these engrams key in and they have to be run out and then they eventually straighten up and that's it. So the stabilization – what's in the road of stabilization is the engram.

So, anyhow, discussing the couple as I've just discussed there, what do you have to have in order to – to handle a situation like that? Well, in this particular case we had a couple that weren't on the line by a long way and I got a hold of one of them and put him in an ACC. And I rode that right straight down and taught that ACC hard, myself. And I made sure that that person got straightened up.

And I devised … we were at that time running O/Ws and I made sure that this person got off his O/Ws on the subject. He went home. His wife came in. And his wife got Clear. She went home and they started clearing people. They're living a wonderful life. Everything's going along fine. Everything's just gorgeous in all directions.

So what do you have to have to straighten anything like that out? You have to have a positive assurance that in a Central Organization or in centers around the world, when you tell such a couple – to one or the other of them, to go on in and get straightened out, that they go in and they get straightened out. And their engrams are neglected until their Security Checks are square. And their Security Checks are handled and all that's flat. And then they get some results, and they get a subjective reality on what they're doing and they go home and they can do something. And this has a great deal to do with the future dissemination of Scientology.

There is a modus operandi. We have to have Central Organizations in which we can base a total security that this will happen. And we can tell such – such people to go in and – one or the other of them – and get run through the mill. And when they have been – to ourselves have a total security that all of their overts, their Security Checking has been done, has been done well, has been very effective and what has been run on them has given them a good subjective reality on what they are doing – they go home and they sail. They have done it every time. And we have – do – this – these are not isolated cases.

Now, up to this time, I myself have had to do it. So you just better be getting geared up on the subject of being able to do it. When you get some of these people and they've been nattering around and they've been having a hell of a time on the fringes and so forth and they've been trying to get audited this way and that way and they're auditing each other, but
they don't like that "Well, that Hubbard and that Central Organization – they're pretty terrible people and everything’s all bad, you see. But we're going on with it," you know, this kind of a thing. Well, they're got – getting no place. What do you have to do?

You have to furnish the areas of the world, you see, where you can pick up such people, straighten out one or the other of them. Give them good, sound Security Checking. Make sure that's all in the groove. Make sure they got good subjective reality on what they're doing. Then turn them loose and then all of a sudden you will see action.

So we do have the formula more or less worked out. Our task is to make sure that there's a total security – that when we tell these people to go in and get straightened out, that where they arrive and where they go into, does straighten them out and straightens them out very expertly and well. And when we've done that, you're going to see dissemination take place by the cube over what it is doing now. You'll see that with great rapidity.

Okay. Well, I've given you a lot of odds and ends. I hope it is of some value to you.

*Audience: Thank you.*
The Prior Confusion

A lecture given on 3 October 1961

Thank you.

[part missing]

Okay. This is one of those days. What's the date? Third of October?

Audience: That's right. Yes.

And my watch stopped last night. How would I know? And 1961. Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

[part missing]

Now, Suzie's been giving you an explanation up here as to the prior confusion. And I'd better give you some material on this and some other things. I could give you a lecture on a brand-new series of discoveries, but you haven't caught up with these. [laughter] I'll mention these in passing just to get them as a matter of record, however. There is a great deal to be known about mutual motion. Mutual motion is a terribly interesting subject. It's the motion of two generating sources. This has something to do with problems. And mutual motion runs with great rapidity, and so on. There's a lot more about that, but I just wanted to get this little slight note on record.

You're interested in the prior confusion, the hidden standard, because this puts into your hands what the hakim, the witch doctor, the bone rattler, the medical doctor, and all such ilk have been trying to do something with here, now, for a good many thousands of years. This puts something into your hands. And if you grasp this, you've grasped something. And if you haven't grasped it, you're stuck in one. [laughter]

Chronic somatic is a stuck moment on a time track which is the stable datum of a prior confusion. A hidden standard is the stable datum of a prior confusion. Prior confusion. Now, in trying to explain this to you, you take a look at a chronic somatic, you try to look at the prior confusion and you swing back up into the chronic somatic again, and you don't even know that you looked at the prior confusion. This is a very, very easy one to forget. It's a very easy one to slip on because it is, actually, the basic anatomy of how pictures and illnesses and concepts of one kind or another get very, very stuck.

Now, the way they get stuck is the confusion and the stable datum. Now, that confusion and the stable datum has been known to us for many, many years. And what we've done to it is add time to the span. The confusion is in one place and the stable datum at a later place. So in all time track plotting, you get the confusion, and then you get, after that, the stable datum. So actually, they're linear in time. In other words, you don't have the stable datum
and the confusion occurring necessarily – and certainly not very aberratedly – you don't have these two things occurring simultaneously in time. In other words, the stable datum and the confusion do not occur in time, if they're going to become aberrative, which is the same time – you don't have the stable datum and the confusion in the same instant of time.

Now, by that we mean twelve o'clock, second of October 1961: There's a confusion while a person is sitting at a table. Well, the confusion doesn't make the person necessarily sit more solidly at the table. That's not the kind of stuck that we're mixed up with. This is the way we get the person if the person is going to be stuck at the table: At eleven o'clock there was a hell of a confusion, and the person had an upset and had an upset stomach and so on at twelve o'clock, and sat down in the table – at the table to ease their upset stomach, and somehow or another it didn't ease.

Well, there was no confusion at twelve o'clock. The confusion was at eleven o'clock, just an hour before. Do you see this now?

In other words, the confusion is at an earlier instant of time than the stable datum that the person adopted afterwards. But we find that the stable datum which is adopted afterwards is the sticker. Of course, you can always adopt a stable datum in the middle of a confusion. This is, er... it. But that isn't the one that sticks. The one that sticks is where you have a stable datum adopted after the fact of the confusion.

The United States goes to war with Japan; nothing much occurs as a result of the war – perhaps. And then we all of a sudden have President Eisenhower talking about loss of face. Well, it's very interesting to have an American president use a Japanese term. [laughter] We give the Wehrmacht a hell of a shellacking, and during the war nobody is being the Wehrmacht, that's for sure. The 88s are going on one side and the 22s are going on the other side, and we have a good, solid, flat-out, knockdown-drag-out war. And nothing happens during this period of time that is at all upsetting, except people getting killed and buildings blown down, and so forth. But everybody is too interested to have any stable data to amount to anything.

And then after the war, there's a discussion about "should American troops goose-step?" There was, you know? Now, we add in World War I to it and we find American troops wearing German helmets. It's fascinating. This gets more and more fascinating.

Now, we can understand the Confederacy all wearing Federal uniforms during the Civil War, because they didn't have any, but there were lots of Federal dead to take them off of. That wasn't much of a stable datum. But today we find the Confederacy is very stuck in the Confederacy.

Now, we think that something happened, like the assassination of Lincoln or something, and all of this. Well, we certainly know all about Lincoln's assassination. Well, how about a lot of the other people who got assassinated by bullets in that war? You see, we're not worried about them. That stable datum isn't sticking, but something that happened after the action is sticking like mad.
This is a peculiarity, and it's not necessarily sensible. It doesn't necessarily follow any logic; this is an empirical fact. By empirical fact I mean one that is established by observation, not established by theory or reason. This is true only because it's observed to be true.

Now, you can develop a lot of theories about why water doesn't flow uphill. There could be lots of theories developed about it, but you stand alongside of a river, and then you go find another river, and then you go find another river, and then you go find another river, and you observe all of these rivers, and you find out finally that the common denominator of all rivers was that water was flowing downhill. The points downstream are at less altitude than the points upstream. And we establish the fact, then, that water flows downhill. We don't have to have the theory of gravity; we don't have to have any other theory connected with it at all. All we have to have is the observation that all rivers we are able to contact are flowing downhill. That's an empirical datum.

All right. Now, this "prior confusion" is an empirical datum, and that is all it is. It's empirical. It's just observed that this is the case: that the person is not stuck in the marriage that they are complaining about but are stuck in the marriage because of the confusion that existed before the marriage; they're not stuck in the marriage because of the confusion of the marriage.

Now, you've always been assuming that the marriage got stuck because of the confusion of the marriage. All right. Now let's get down to workability – solid, sound workability. How many marriages have you squared up by knocking all the confusion out of the marriage? Well, it's sort of a lot of little failed lines on that. We've straightened up a lot about marriages, and so forth, by knocking out their confusion. We've done a lot about marriages by knocking out the confusion of the marriage. But the reason we couldn't do it rapidly, and the reason we got bored stiff trying to do something about it, is if a person is stuck on the subject of a marriage, the reason they are stuck has nothing to do with that period of time but has to do with the prior period of time that predated the marriage. And if you free up that prior period of time to the marriage, the difficulties of the marriage blow. Now, this is an empirical oddity, an oddity of magnitude.

We've got somebody who has got to have their liver operated on, something wrong with their liver. We find them stuck in an operation on a liver. They've got to have another operation on a liver. They know it's their liver. Their attention is stuck solidly on the liver, and so we go ahead and process the liver, but we never find the basic-basic on the chain of when their attention got stuck on the liver.

When did their attention get stuck on the liver? Actually, it got stuck on the liver immediately after a confusion. Immediately after a confusion. So the way to blow this operation on the liver is to blow the confusion which preceded the difficulty with the liver. It's so peculiar. It's sufficiently peculiar that this occurs when you try to learn it: You immediately think of your own chronic somatic. You try to swing your attention before you had the chronic somatic, and you wind up with the chronic somatic. And you say, "Well, there is the chronic somatic, and of course, that is all there is to it."

And then one tells you again right away, "Now look. Let's look before you had that chronic somatic."
And you say, "Yes. Chronic somatic." It's just as though we're trying to put your attention on top of a spring. And as you put your attention on the spring, it rebounds, and blows you back into the chronic somatic, do you see? And your attention just doesn't go on to the prior confusion. It's quite remarkable.

You say to somebody, "All right" – you'll do this as an auditor, now, many times. You'll say, "Put your attention now on the period" – or "What happened" – you say in some other fashion – "What happened just before you got all upset with this marriage?"

And they say, "Well, I got all upset with the marriage."

And you say, "Well, what happened just before you met this person and so forth?"

"Oh, well, just before I met this person, um… uh… yeah, well, we certainly had a hell of a time in that marriage."

And you say, "Well now, look-a-here. We're talking about just before you met the person. What was the date before you met the person?"

Well, they're liable to do something like "Well, I had an awful lot of trouble when I was a little child."

And you say, "Yeah. But just before this marriage. Just before the marriage."

And they say, "Yeah. Well, I had an awful lot of trouble in that marriage."

What's happening is, is the pc's attention bounces to later periods of time. Chronic somatics are always the result and solution of an unconfrontable disturbance which occurred immediately before them. Hidden standards and present time problems are always the result of a confusion which immediately preceded the difficulty. And when you get the pc to put his attention on the confusion, you are asking him to do what he couldn't do, and why he pinned his attention just after the confusion. You see? He looks at the confusion, and then his attention, without his recognizing anything, bounces straight into the stable datum.

Man has a broken leg. And this broken leg has just been going on and on and on for years and years and years. He doesn't recognize it as a broken leg. The medicos say it's a "tibiosis of the filamoriation," and that he's suffering from a decay of the tendon.

Well, he busted his leg sometime or another. Let's get it down to simple language us folks can understand, and – you see, if you don't know anything about a subject, you can get awfully fancy. As a matter of fact, the more fanciness and the more oddball opinion and crosscurrent of opinion you find in a subject, you can assume that that is in direct relation to the amount known about the subject.

The more confusion in the subject, the more crisscross, the more learnedness, the more pretended knowingness there is in the subject, the less is actually known about it. You can get a terribly complicated idea about life and the mind from fields where it isn't known. You understand? There's a lot of invented, pretended knowingness on the thing. For instance, I don't know how many medical terms there are for a leg, and yet this leg won't heal, and they can't make it heal fast, but they can sure call it by lots of names and have lots of opinions on it, don't you see?
Well, they're sort of bouncing off the confusion. All right. So the person's got a busted leg. Well, the leg should have healed up in five or six weeks and that should have been all there was to it, and that's it – finished. But it isn't. Seven years later, like the children's doctor, the fellow is still limping – I think two years ago. He kids me every time he sees me. You know, he comes in limp, limp, masking the limp very consciously as soon as he's on the premises, trying very hard not to limp. He was in a skiing accident a couple of years ago, and I told him I was going to process him, and it scared him within an inch of his life. And so he always has some kidding remark to make to me when he comes in to look at the children's tongues, about whether or not I'm going to process him. But look, it's been two years and he's still limping. Ah, well, then this isn't just a skiing accident, because there's nothing really in bad shape about the bones. They were all put together by the very best orthopedic surgeons. He had the best of care; he's a doctor.

So what must have happened? Well, he busted his leg in a skiing accident. And two years later it has yet to heal, really. Oh, well, the bones are grown together and it isn't bleeding anymore, but it isn't operating. All right. Now let's take a look at that.

Was it the instant of the accident? Ah, well, we know more about the mind than they do. We know very well that before some fellow does a practiced action, if he's in a smooth frame of mind – he's used to doing this action – he goes down the slope and slaloms like mad, and everything is just dandy, and he winds up at the bottom upright and saying "Whee!"

But if a fellow is in a disturbed frame of mind, and his attention is on many other things – he just received a letter from his wife or his girl saying, "Well, I've just gone out again with Pete," don't you see? And there's nothing he can do anything to but himself. He can't do anything to anybody but himself. There's nobody else around or he's powerless or something like that. Then this practiced skier starts at the top of the slope, and he goes halfway down and he says, "This is a good place," and wraps himself around a tree.

Then they put him pathetically in the hospital and bring him home by ambulance plane and so on, and it goes on for years, don't you see?

So the high probability is that the accident had nothing to do with the motions of skiing. Skiing probably has nothing to do with the confusion which resulted in a broken leg, mentally. Because we have to ask the question, how did he get himself bunged up, and why?

Now, a fellow doesn't get himself bunged up by accident. See, it's not by accident. That's the first thing you have to recognize. That there's some kind of a postulate in there to bung himself up. And he'll manage it every time.

All right. So this medico, all right, we ask him, "Now, what happened just before you broke your leg?"

And he'll say, "Well, the snow was flying all around, and the wind was going whee, and so forth. And then there was this condemned Switzerland pine tree, and it pulled itself up by the roots and moved over in the middle of the ski track."

And you say, "Good."
And we keep on running this. And at the end of many hours, we actually do get the thing to remove to a marked degree. We get an abatement of the chronic somatic. Yes, we can do that. We have done that many times.

Well, how would you like to see that chronic somatic vanish? Well, that would be a much better procedure and much faster than that. Ah, well, we'd have to find out what went on before he went skiing that day.

Well, he was on vacation, we know, and we know that he felt he needed a vacation. Why did he feel he needed a vacation? An odd thing to need – me particularly, I never get one so I don't dare need one. [laughter] He needed a vacation. Well, what was the randomness that preceded that? What was his mail like while he was on vacation? Let's search in this area. Let's find out anywhere in the last six months what had been going on. And all of a sudden we wind up with the damnedest, knock-down, drag-out confusion. If it was enough to make him break his leg, it will be sufficient to bar out his inspection of it. And at first he won't be able to inspect the prior confusion.

It takes an auditor sitting across from him to chunk his attention into that period and do an assessment of it. And all of a sudden he finds out that he thought the broken leg happened last year, when it happened two years ago. And he's completely forgotten that he broke the same leg when he was five; and all kinds of oddball forgettingnesses turn up.

Now, what causes forgettingness? It's the inability to confront a motion. The inability to confront a motion brings about an occlusion of that area of time. Now, you've got postulate – the first-, second-, third-, fourth-postulate theory. The first postulate is not-know. The second postulate is know.

All right. So you've got a big not-know, you see? He had a big lot of mysteries and a lot of confusions he couldn't confront, and nothing he could do anything about of any kind whatsoever, and he got himself a know which immediately succeeded it in time. In other words, this not-know area, this confusion area, is followed by a know area later in time. Now, this is quite interesting because he follows a not-know by a know, and the know might be quite stupid, and it might be quite painful, and it might be quite destructive, but nevertheless it's a knowingness. Some fellow who is gimping around with a bad leg certainly knows something: He knows he's got a bad leg.

You might say all psychosomatics and hidden standards are cures for mystery. They give themselves a knowingness, following a period of not-knowingness.

Now, people can get stuck in relief, and very often when your pc feels better, he will feel better momentarily and quite artificially and not feel better at all. Now, for instance, supposing we were all sitting here and we heard a high whine and a dull thud out in the park, and an airplane full of screaming passengers had apparently just crashed, you know, and we could hear the whole works, sitting here. And so we in a big flurry crowd out the door and rush outside to see this airplane that's crashed, and so on. And it's just Peter left one of his record players on. [laughter]

See? Quite a feeling of relief, but the relief followed a period of confusion. Now, I'm not saying this is very aberrative. This would be so light that it's very easy to face indeed.
Then, you see, we'd have a little period of relief, and it actually would stick slightly on the track. See, it's a period of relief. It's a period of know. Now, you see, at the moment we heard it crash, we didn't know what was happening, so we've got a not-know. And then we go out and we find out what happened, we find out nothing happened and that it's all all right, so we know. You get this. This is just in vignette. What I'm talking about is not at all aberrative. It takes much greater volume of magnitude to make one of these things.

All right. Now, let's go into what Mary Sue was showing you here just before I came in. And we have ourselves a period there, which we see as a big, white chalk mark up at the top, and then there's a little chalk mark down the line and we've got a vertical time track here; and it's got a big blob of white chalk at the up part, and a little blob, and then below that a big blob, and then below that a little blob, and some more little blobs. All right. [laughter] Now, I'm not making fun of her cartooning here. But anyway, taking a look at this now, we see the time track plots linearly. Now, she's got herself plotted from a zero at the top to 1961 at the bottom. Well, all right. We'll take it that way because time tracks don't run in any direction. All right.

Now, we take that little tiny, last, bottom white blob, and that's a chronic somatic. The person has a chest wheeze, and every time you process them, they look at their chest to find out if they're still wheezing. And they know the auditing command worked because the wheeze is less, or they think the auditing command didn't work because the wheeze is more. This is how they know, you see? This is how they know. Well, isn't it interesting that this know would occur in connection with a chronic somatic?

Now, a person must have a hell of an avidity for knowingness if they have to find out if their back's still broke or their chest is still caved in or if their rib cage is squashed. What kind of knowingness is this? Well, it must have followed one God-awful confusion, man! If that's the acceptable level of knowingness, wow! What must have happened before that? So we take this pc, and we say to this pc, pointing to that last white blob there, "Well, what was going on in your life immediately before you noticed this difficulty with your chest?"

And your first, usual, immediate response, if this is a hot subject, is "Well, my chest has always hurt me." It'll be something intelligible like this.

They haven't answered the question at all. You say, "No, no, no. Just before you noticed this – before you noticed this – what happened in your life?"

And they say, "Well, um... I don't know."

That's right. There you got it hot. That's hot and heavy. And, boy, they never, they never spake more sooth than that. They were spaking sooth with all front teeth. They didn't know, that's for sure, or they wouldn't have this chest difficulty. All right. So we punch it a little harder – you see, it's the auditor compelling the pc's attention into that area – and we say, "Well, when did it turn on? What period of time was it when it turned on?"

"Well," he said, "well, it must have been – must have been the summer of '59 or something like that. I know I had it then."
You see, they haven't said anything "before" yet, you see? They know they had it in the summer of '59. You say, "Now, that's good. Now, just what happened just before the summer of '59?"

"Well, I had it in the spring of '59, too."

See, they haven't answered your question yet, you know? All right. But you see what's happening here? You're plowing their attention back toward an unconfrontable area. So you say, "Well, all right. What happened before that? Well, what was going on before you noticed this chest somatic and so forth?"

And they say, "Well. Oh, well, uh – yeah, well, it uh..." (And we notice this little upper white blob here, see?) They say, "Yeah, well, it turned off for a long time." Haven't answered your question yet. See, it's off from the first white blob to the second white blob, see? Well, it's off.

"Yeah. Well, I wasn't troubled with it then, and uh... I remember – oh, yes! Yes, that's right. I recall in '56, I had medical treatment for this." See, they've told you nothing about "before" yet. But they've got it stretched back in time. And then all of a sudden they'll come up and say, "Well, let's see, '56." (And we'll call that earlier blob there 1956.) They'll say, "Well, let's see."

You say, "What were you doing in '55?"

"Well, I... '55. That was when I was down at camp in Cornwall. No. No, no, no. Come to think about it, that was '52." And they're liable to come up with the adjudication that they don't know what happened from 1952 to 1956. This is a curious blank period. And they figure it all out, and they say, well, it must have been this and it must have been that, and it might have been this and might have been that. And then all of a sudden they say, "Well, the truth of the matter is, I was... Well, I'm not sure. I'm not sure. But do you know, I had this when I was a child?"

See, way back now. Way, way back. Boom!

"Yes, I had this when I was a child. They thought that I had consumption and so forth, and I... actually I hadn't remembered that, but I had a lot of consumption, and I remember I was living with my grandmother, and so forth. And they – they had me to the doctor a lot of times, and that sort of thing. And I just had overlooked this fact."

Now we're up at the first white blob up there, see?

You say, "Well, what happened just before you were living with your grandmother?"

"Well, I wouldn't know. I was awfully young. I was eleven."

"Well, yeah. Well... where were your parents at that time?"

"Well, let's see."

And brother, we've got another blank spot, and we've got a nice, big, juicy blank spot. Now, we keep plowing into this blank spot, and we finally find out that Mother and Father had agreed to separate just before this, and there had been a lot of domestic difficulties, and we think we've got it now, and we're trying to really pin it down – we think we've got it. And
they were trying to separate, and this was happening, and that was happening; it was all very clouded up, and it was all very this and that. And we're just about to get a touching short story about this whole thing, when suddenly the pc remembers that he burned down the house. [laughter]

And that will be the end of that chronic somatic. Just by assessment only. See? That's just by assessment. But your assessment is, doggedly, to find out what happened before they noticed this.

Now, perhaps it's a bad thing to say "for the first time" because this is always a lie. One of the stable data of auditing is always make your auditing question as truthful and as factual as possible. Don't make auditing questions that are nonfactual. So you say, "Well, what is the first time you remembered this?" or "What is the first time you noticed this?" Of course the pc cannot answer this because he's going to give you fifty more first times after he's given you the first time. So it's much cleverer to say, "What is a time that you noticed this? When did you notice this? What happened before you noticed this?" And then just keep chugging it in.

Now, it's not a repetitive command, and this is actually getting rid of chronic somatics by assessment. If you are very clever at assessing, you can just go on and assess and assess and assess, and you finally find out the confusion; and you pin the confusion down to such a degree that you've made the pc confront the confusion, the confusion will as-is. Right there. Bang! And everything else will blow after it, and that is it. You can do it by assessment only with an E-Meter. That requires a rather clever auditor to do the whole job by assessment only.

Now, here's an easier way to do it. We finally spot the area of confusion by assessment, and then we put together Security Checks to fit that area. We find out that this person had this when they were eleven: Well, it's some kind of childhood activity that is all messed up. Well, you can actually take the child's Security Check, and bend it around one way or the other, question by question, and add your own questions to it, and so on; and you're going to get yourself some interesting data that this pc has never seen before.

And you're going to blow out those zones of confusion, and you're going to find the dissipation of the hidden standard of the chronic somatic. That is a more standardized method of going about one of these things.

All right. Let's take another example. This girl finds that she has headaches. She finds she has lots of headaches. And in auditing, she's always sort of aware of this headache, and she knows the auditing process is working because the headache turns on or turns off, and if nothing affects the headache, she of course doesn't think the auditing process is working. That's her hidden standard. That's by which she finds out whether or not auditing is working. That is the definition of a hidden standard.

Well, naturally, your rudiments are out as long as the pc has this condition. Why? Well, the pc is viaing the auditing command.

Now, in all cases where a pc is not making progress on Routine 3, you can bet your bottom peseta that the pc has not and is not doing the auditing command. They might be doing the auditing command plus, plus, plus, see, or they might not be doing it at all.
I do remember back in Wichita, long, long ago, a pc coming around to me after a twenty-five hour intensive and bragging to me that they had succeeded in not answering an auditing command once, and they thought this was awfully clever of them. Yes sir, the pc was really bragging about it. What was the matter with the auditor that he didn't find it out?

Now, here is the more usual thing: The pc does the auditing command and applies it to a certain area of the mind or body in order to find out if it has affected something else. And they do the auditing command by applying the auditing command to something in the mind, and then they look over here to see what is going on and if anything happened. And they do this continually. They're not just doing the auditing command. They are doing something else. Now, they know they did the auditing command right or they know they did it wrong, or they know the command is right or wrong, in direct comparison to how much happens to alleviate this difficulty.

You are auditing a pc who has an attention fixed, not on the bank in general but on some particular, peculiar activity. And they're doing something peculiar with every auditing command. You feed them the auditing command, they do something peculiar with it. Even though they verbally answer it and so on, and apparently have executed it, they do something else with it.

And when a pc is not making progress, you can say his attention is stuck someplace. Well, that's a shortened form of saying the rudiments are out. One of the rudiments are out. The pc is not really in-session. The pc is on auto. The pc is not under the auditing control, the pc is under his own control. He's under his own control to this degree: You say something, then the pc takes over as auditor and executes the auditing command, and then gives the session back to you. And you ask the next question, and when you ask the question, then the pc takes the auditing command, goes on auto, audits the auditing command on himself and then gives the auditing session back to you. Have you got the idea? And the pc, during the entire period of execution of the auditing command, is not in-session. Any pc who hasn't gone Clear in 150 hours is doing it. Pc has got a hidden standard.

What is this hidden standard? Maybe he's got six hidden standards. Well, every one of those hidden standards is totally this stable datum stuck after the fact of the confusion. They all have the same anatomy. Pc takes the session away from you, does the auditing command, finds out whether or not it moves this electronic, then sees whether or not the electronic is affecting whether or not he's a boy or a girl. That's right. That was how we moved into this, with just that action on the part of a pc. We knew about this for a long time, but we've never really seen it in action to this flagrant degree.

This pc had been audited for about a thousand hours, and had applied every single auditing command ever given to the pc to the resolution of an electronic incident which the pc was convinced, if it were run out, he would turn from a man to a woman. Thousand hours – no progress. Well, why? The pc was never in-session.

So the rudiments are out. The basic rudiment that is out is present time problem of long duration, where you have a hidden standard.

All right. Very good. Now if we take ourselves a pc, and we audit along with Routine 3, we can find the pc's goal, we can find the pc's terminal; oh, yes, with some difficulty, but
we can find them in relatively short order, certainly under twenty-five hours of auditing, if we're really in there. We'll keep the most flagrant rudiments in, don't you see? But we haven't noticed this hidden standard yet. And then we assess the pc on the Prehav Scale, and we run the pc on the Prehav Scale, and we run the pc and we run the pc and we run the pc and nothing happens. Well, there's where it'll show up.

See, we can do the action of finding a goal, because the pc's attentions are very, very solidly on goals. We can certainly find the action of a terminal, we can find this terminal, because we actually haven't really asked the pc to do an auditing command. It's all between you and the meter, see? We can find the assessed level of the Prehav Scale very easily, but now we go into the repetitive auditing command and the pc goes on auto.

Why does the pc go on auto? Well, the pc's got a hidden standard. The pc is auditing himself on making his nose well. Pc is not running – *not at all* running the terminal of a railroad engineer. He's running a nose. And so he doesn't go Clear.

Now, very often, in worse cases, the pc will be very resistive toward an auditor's inquiring questions. The auditor says, "What are you doing? What did you do with that auditing command?" You've all of a sudden got a knock-down, drag-out fight on your hands. Pc does not like you inquiring into it. The first time you ever notice anything like that, you say to yourself, "This pc has a hidden standard. Let's find out what it is."

Now, although you can find the person's goal, terminal and level, you actually can't *run* the pc on that in the presence of hidden standards. It is a waste of time.

Now, there's one earlier action that can be taken with the pc, that the pc *will* do and that will produce results. But there is only one earlier action can be taken before a Routine 3 assessment, and that is a Security Check. This can be done without knowing the pc's terminal and will produce lasting, excellent results. There is no other process – now we have all the facts in over the years – will produce easy and lasting gains on a pc. No other process will produce easy, good, solid, lasting, positive gains on a pc. You have a Security Check and you've got the assessment and you've got the running of the assessment.

So, this leaves us with a Security Check as a very powerful auditing weapon, because it will operate whether you're running the goals terminal or not. The Security Check will operate, and those gains you make with a Security Check will be lasting gains.

Hence, we divide up auditors into: Class I – run any process on which they have a certainty. This will probably be some kind of a control process, by the way. It'll be some cousin to the CCHs, if the auditor is wise, because that at least works out the control factors of the pc, and you do make a sort of gain. You're running in order, and something is going to happen with this pc, and it doesn't come under the heading, however, of a fast, easy gain. It is not a fast, easy gain. It is a lasting gain, but it is a hard, long gain, and that's all you can say for it. That's the CCHs, SCS – all these various things. They are long, hard, arduous things to handle, and they do produce a lasting gain, but at what cost! So it doesn't come under the heading of a nice, easy, stable gain achieved by the auditor at all.

But Class I Auditors had better be employed, even though it is very hard to achieve a long, lasting proposition. No matter how arduously, they had better be put to work doing
some auditing, because any auditing is better than no auditing, and this type of gain will be quite beneficial in the long run, and so forth. And this argues that a Class I Auditor is doing something, as long as he's doing one of these types of processes.

All right. We move up to Class II Auditor, and a Class II Auditor can security check. All right. Security Checking produces a lasting gain, and it is very easy. It is very easy to do. It is very nice. It is very – very fast, and it is a lasting result. So we have the Class II Auditor doing Security Checks. And actually when we're talking about the hidden standard, and that sort of thing, we can envision that a Class II Auditor would have set up a pc on the basis of having gotten rid of all of his hidden standards. And that's what we look to a Class II Auditor to do – not just to sit there and prate off a Sec Check 3.

We're asking him to do something else. We're asking him to sec check in the direction of getting rid of all of the stuck points in this lifetime. We're asking him to get rid of the confusions of the first, second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth marriages. We're asking all of the… We're asking him to get rid of that crooked neck. We're asking him to get rid of the odd habit he has that every time you say something to him he goes drrvvvkh! It seems rather odd this person would do that, you know? Because you haven't asked him to smell a thing. In other words, these things all surrender to Security Checking. All of them, now, the lot. But what kind of Security Checking does it take? Well, it takes a standard Security Check. That is always a good thing to bang into a case. The first and foremost thing you do. That's a good thing – just go on and pick out the probable Security Check.

Let's take an old-time auditor, he's been knocking around and into God knows what. Well, the first Security Check we want to shove into him is the last two pages of a Sec 3, plus Sec Check 6. There's no reason to do the first many, many pages of 3 or do anything very fancy, because he's not going to get any benefit of something that he has overt on, and so on. So let's get that out of the road.

And now having done this, let us get clever and apply this data about the stable datum and the prior confusion. Now, this is different than the stable datum and the confusion – the idea that we get all of the stable… we get all the confusions off the case and we will of course knock out at once all of the person's activities, and so forth. No, isn't quite true. We have to knock them out selectively – has to be very selective.

So after you got the last two pages of a Form 3 and all of a 6 done, you should roll up your sleeves at about that point, and let's go for the hidden standards. Let's find out if there's anything by which this person measures gain or no gain.

"What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?" That's the clue question.

And you get these things, and sometimes these things are detached things. Sometime these things are "Well, my mother would have to get well." Well, he doesn't really mean – perhaps he does, but he really, probably, doesn't mean – that his mother would have to be sold on Scientology and brought to an auditor. No. The auditing command which he is doing, if applied to himself, would have to cure his mother. You see, he often means that, too. So this idea, this… he says, "Well, my mother would have to get well." Well, this is marvelous. It means his mother is a stuck – a stuck chronic somatic. [laughter]
Now, the way you would have handled this in the past – the way you would have handled this in the past is not the fastest way to handle it. You could have handled it in the past, and it would have worked out all right in the past, but that is not the fastest way to handle it. I'm just giving you a much faster method.

When did this occur that Mother became a stable datum? And what confusion preceded it? Ahhh. In other words, we don't run O/W on Mama, and we don't security check Mama, and we don't have very much to do with Mama. We want to find out what happened before Mama became a chronic somatic. Because Mama is a stable datum for a confusion before the fact of accepting Mama as a stable datum. There's some confusion prior. Remember, it's always prior.

Let's reorient your thinking on this. Now, the fellow says, "Well, uhhh... I just have to get over hating my father. That's what would have to happen. Yes, sir. To know Scientology worked, I'd have to get over hating my father."

"Well," you say, "that's good." So obviously you can do something about that. You do a Security Check about his father. That's obvious, isn't it? This is past thinking on it. And you get all of his overts against his father, and all of his withholds from his father, and you clean up Father. And what do you know? You could do it, too – I mean, you could have gotten a long way in this direction.

Ah-ha, there's a much faster method. Let's find out what happened before "hating Father" became his stable data in life. "Hating Father" must be an activity he can confront, as a retreat from earlier activities he can't confront. And they probably have nothing to do with his father. Hatred of Father was much more acceptable to him than the tremendous confusion he had with, who knows? Probably not Father. Who knows who it is? Lord knows.

So, what do you do? You assess. And you find the area of prior confusion to the hatred of Father. Now, at first the pc is going to tell you it's something that Father did, and it's something that had to do with Father. But remember, it can't have anything to do with Father if Father is the stuck somatic. Can't have anything to do with Father, you see, if Father is the stuck personnel. If Father is the broken leg on this case, it hasn't anything to do with Father, because he can confront Father. Well, if he can confront Father and he's spent all these years confronting Father and so forth – it hasn't got him well – why do you, in an auditing session, put in more hours confronting Father? Waste of time, see?

No, let's find out what happened before this occurred. So you'd want to know, "When did you notice that you hated your father, and what happened before that?"

First answer, well, inevitably, "My father did this, my father did that."

And you say, "Good, fine." Give him a cheery old acknowledgment and then find out what happened before that with other people. Oh, you find out his old man hasn't been anybody – man, his old man has been nobody in this fellow's life. There is some kind of a person on a broomstick that has been flying around in this person's belfry.

You know, as a child, why, this person would see – well, maybe it was his father's mother or something, you know? And the child would see her sitting there quietly knitting and rocking in the rocking chair or something, and he absolutely just couldn't resist, you see,
spilling the cat on her, or you know, or pulling up the ball of yarn, or somehow or another stealing all of the bread dough, or putting salt in the plum pudding – just anything, see, anything. And you'll find that these are overt, but they won't come through that way at all.

He will finally recover the character on the broomstick, see? Total occlusion. Recover this character on the broomstick, and you will try to do a Security Check on this, and "She beat me and she socked me and she used to hold me over the well and say she was going to drop me..." And he'll just go motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, see? Of course. Why? Because he can observe the inflow, but he can't observe his outflow.

Yeah, but what did he do? That's what's getting interesting here. What did he do? Did he steal her broom? [laughter] Because you'll find inevitably that this is what happened. So you make up some kind of a roster of the personnel involved prior to the stuck personnel. And you make a roster of the "missing persons bureau." And your little list is a "missing persons bureau." And boy, you're really going to find missing people. Pc doesn't even know they exist. There's going to be sections out of his life he don't know are gone.

And you're going to find those sections and find out who is in them and then write up a Security Check – any old kind of a Security Check – to find out what he did to them; these other people, not Father. Skip Father; he was a confrontable character. Why bother with Father? Just a waste of time. That's what the pc is complaining about.

Now, whatever the pc complains about, do something earlier. There is your stable datum. Whatever the pc complains about, you do something earlier. And don't pay any attention to handling the object about which he is complaining. You pay attention to his complaint. But if you continue to handle the object about which he's complaining, such as his big ears, why, you're not going to get anywhere. He's complaining about big ears. "Well, I'm seeing... Every time I..." You find out every time he answers an auditing command that he finds out if his ears shrunk.

"Oh, well, I have had big ears for some time," you see? That's your inevitable reply.

Now, if you get a reply of this character which is a non sequitur, you know you are on to a hot area of disturbance, because the pc's attention went onto it, and then flik! – came right up the track to the big ears. Your effort to put his attention on the area of confusion results in putting his area on the object. Whenever you try to put his area on the confusion, and then you only succeed in putting his area – attention on the object, you know you've got it made. You know you're looking at one God-awful area of occlusion.

You say to him, "When did you first notice that you had big ears? When did you notice that you had big ears? When did you notice this?"

"Oh, well, I have had big ears for some time," you see? That's your inevitable reply.

Now, if you get a reply of this character which is a non sequitur, you know you are on to a hot area of disturbance, because the pc's attention went onto it, and then flik! – came right up the track to the big ears. Your effort to put his attention on the area of confusion results in putting his area on the object. Whenever you try to put his area on the confusion, and then you only succeed in putting his area – attention on the object, you know you've got it made. You know you're looking at one God-awful area of occlusion.

You say to him, "When did you first notice that you had big ears? Now, what happened before you first noticed you had big ears?" Any such question.

And he says, "Well, I've just worried about it for years – my big ears."

Well, now, you see the mechanism at work? You asked him about a time before "big ears," and he answered "big ears." So it's obvious that his attention deflected from the area
you tried to put his attention on. You have located a hidden springboard. He doesn't know it's there, but you now do. He coasts right up the track to it. Every time you put that hull in the water it goes straight to that particular dock with a crash. It won't head out to sea. It won't go anyplace, you see? You just put it in the water, and it hits this dock. "Father" or "ears" or something, see? Bang! And there it is.

You say, "Well, now in your – in your early life, what went on there? What went on in your early life?"

Now, this would be just asking for a whole bunch of balderdash. Now, it'd take an awful lot of millions of words for the pc to tell you every single, horrible thing that's been done to him in his early life. There's no sense in having much of a synopsis on it. It's up to the auditor to continue to direct the pc's attention where he wants the pc's attention directed, not to listen to a recount – a blow-by-blow recount – of all the beatings the dock gave him. See, that's silly, because that's all he's going to tell you.

He hates his father – this is his hidden standard – he doesn't feel better yet about his father, so not feeling better yet about his father, he knows the auditing isn't working. And you say, "Well, tell me about your early life."

So he says, "Well, my father… and he used to take me out in the woodshed, and then he did this to me and he did that to me. And he did this and he did that, and my father this and my father that." Well, are you doing anything for this pc? No! No, you're not doing anything for him at all, because you're leaving his attention stuck on a refuge.

Any chronic somatic, any stuck personnel, anything of that nature is a refuge on which the pc can put his attention. And you are not doing your job as an auditor unless you get his attention eased over onto what makes him stick his attention on it. And you do that by a gradient scale, and the pc can get very restive if you jump your gradient too hard.

So you say, "All right. Big ears. Now let's see. What happened just before you noticed that, or when did you notice that you had big ears? Tell me a time you noticed you had big ears. What's some early period when you noticed that?"

And the pc says, "Well… uh, well… uh, well… uh, well – well, I was working in London for an attorney's firm. I used to notice it."

"Good." You say, "Is there any earlier time than that?"

"Oh, well… no. In the attorney's firm…"

Oh, well, hell, you got his attention stuck there. And you say, "No, earlier – earlier than the attorney's firm. What'd you do earlier than that?"

"Oh. Oh, well, what did I do earlier than that? Uh… I don't know! What did I do? Let's see now. I went to prep school, and then I went to college, and then – so on, and that was 1952. And I got out of there, and then '52 and then 1955… 1955, and I went to work. Yes, it must have been '55 I went to work – I remember that, yes. It was '55. Went to work for the attorney's firm in 1955. And I got out of college in 1952."

"Oh, good," you say, "well, what did you do between '52 and '55?"
"I just don't know. Now let's see, what did I do? No, I – I met a girl. Ah, yes, I remember now. I met a girl, and she… uh… yeah, I met this girl and she had a boyfriend. And we had an awful… No, that was '58. Let me see, No, no. I – I'll get it in a minute. It's 1952, 1955. Now, there's a period of three years. Now, let's see. After I got out of college, I must have gone home for a little while. And then I must have done this, and then I must have done that, and I must have done something or other – probably. Yeah, I'm sure I must have done something like this, because, you see, you just wouldn't ordinarily just go from college to an attorney's firm.

"Now, let me see. Oh, I know. I had an awful fight with a fellow. Yeah. Oh, that was pretty terrible. We met down in this bar, and he had some kind of a criticism of me one way or the other, and we had this hor – . No, that was '57. No, no. That wasn't '55, that was '57."

And that's the way he'll go on. You understand? And you say, "Well, what happened in this period of – anything that might have occurred between 1952 and 1955?"

"Oh, uhh-uh, ruh, ruh, ruh, ruh-ruh, ruh, ruh-r."

"Well, did you ever think about big ears before 1952?"

"No, no, no, no, no, I didn't think about that before 1952," and so forth.

"Well, did you – you think about big ears after 1955?"

"Well, yes. Oh, yes, oh, yes, all the time. Used to sit there at my desk with ink all over me, and I used to sometimes get it on my ears, and they used to call me 'ink ears' sometimes, and so on… That was probably it. Actually, the firm really hated me. And the senior partners…" this and that.

You say, "That's good. Thanks! Good! Good! Good! Fine! Thank you! Thanks. Good. All right, now. Good. Now, we want '52 to '55. Now, who did you know in that period?"

"Well, I must have known my father and mother." [laughter]

"All right. Well, who introduced you to get work at the attorney's firm?"

"Ah… must have been some connection with my father."

And you know, you're liable to find some damn-fool thing like a marriage? [laughter] You're liable to, man. You're liable to find anything. But you will find something, and it'll be a period there of total occlusion.

What you're trying to do is not necessarily solve the big mystery of it all. If you were very clever, you could do the whole thing by assessment. On the meter, one of the ways you do it by assessment is "Well, '54. Did you have a long vacation there after you left college? Was it two years? One year? Six months?"

"Oh, I went to work, something of the sort. I was doing something. I'm sure I was doing something. I must have been doing something. Over a period of three years a young man doesn't do anything, you see? And I went up… I'm sure. Yes. Yeah. I'm absolutely sure. No."

You finally dredge up a name, Agnes. Ohhhh, Agnes. Ahhhh. All right. Now, in essence, as much as you can find out about Agnes, you just do it on an interrogation basis and
assess "The worst confusion you ever had with Agnes. When is the worst time you ever had with Agnes?" and so forth. And this finally peters out and you find Agnes is just a red herring. She's hardly a girl at all, and in actual fact it was Isabel.

Isabel turns up along about this time, and now we have got a honey by the ear. And we find out that she used to stand there constantly, and say what she said, and she used to do this and do that, and she was the one who got him arrested. Arrested? [laughs, laughter] Where – where – where the hell did this come from? Don't you see? We don't find out, usually, anything about big ears. Agnes never said anything about big ears, nothing of this sort, but she went off with a boy who had big ears. And Isabel – Isabel, she went off with a boy who had big ears. Something stupid like this. So big ears got to be something in here. And in some of the wild, devious way that all of a sudden works out and becomes completely sensible, we find out how he wound up with a stable datum of big ears.

This person says, "Well, I have a ball of light and it is just back of my eyeballs, and when the ball of light glows, then I know the auditing question worked. And when it doesn't glow, it didn't work." You want to find out, "When did you notice this?"

And then you want to find out what happened before that. "Now, what happened before that?"

And the person said, "I… well, I haven't got the faintest idea. I'm… Let's see, now. What happened before that?"

And we run into some kind of a blank period. Then all of a sudden, marvel of marvels, we find out that between 1945 and 1948 the person was deeply immersed in the Temple of Black Magic, someplace or another, and all this seems to have dropped out of sight. And what they did, really, there, was "see the light." And he's been seeing the light ever since, but it was one awful confusion. Because after the police raided the joint, you see… It wasn't so much that, it was being sued for being the father of the child. That was what got him.

But all of this has been fantastically occluded, you see? And all of these stable data that the person has lead back to a prior unknown, and it's just the not-know followed by the know. It's the confusion followed by the stillness. The confusion, then the stillness.

All right. Now I'll give you something I've got some kind of a reality on. It works like this: You find the bird… This works out on a broader track basis. You find this pc standing on a rock in the middle of the sea waiting for somebody to pick him up. And he has this pain in his stomach, and he had that pain in his stomach for many lifetimes. Many, many lifetimes he's had the pain in his stomach.

And you say, "All right. Let's run this out." So we run him standing on the rock in the middle of the sea. And we – I guarantee you – we can run it and we can run it and we can run it and we can run it and we can run it, and he will still have a pain in his stomach and still be standing on a rock in the middle of the sea. And this is the old engram that wouldn't resolve.

And this is why finding the earlier on the chain resolved the later engrams – the engrams that wouldn't erase: Because, of course, in finding the earlier engram you accidentally went across the confusion, and you got the confusion knocked out. Well, there's nothing precedes that incident that's hardly worth recounting, except mutiny, shipwreck, sudden disaster,
halfdrowning seven times, and there's something kind of strange and spooky about the whole thing. And then we finally find out that he's standing on the rock without a body and hasn't noticed he's dead. And this finally resolves the whole thing.

Up to that time he knew all about it. But trying to get his attention immediately before the incident when this occurred will be one of the tougher jobs, because you say, "All right. How did you get on the rock?"

And he says, "I was just standing there. Well, I must have gotten there some way. Uh… oh, I get a picture now of the surf. I must have come to the rock through the surf."

Well, any fool could tell that, man. He didn't land there by helicopter, that's for sure. But he'll make these suppositional actions.

Now, a person trying to do this, all by himself, begins after a while to appreciate an auditor, because his attention is pinned in a certain category. And as it tries to go back to areas that are unknown to him, it of course deflects onto the chronic somatics. So he tries to put his attention back on this and then comes up into the chronic somatic, and then he's stuck with the chronic somatic; his attention is on it, so he starts auditing the chronic somatic, and he never does put his attention back on the earlier incident, see? So he leaves himself stuck with chronic somatics.

See, his attention goes back up, and he needs an auditor sitting there to tell him to put his attention back again. You know? "What happened before that? What's the worst kind of motion you possibly could experience on a ship?"

"Well, it wouldn't be a ship. It'd be a submarine. I don't know why I said that."

"Well, what's the worse kind of motion you could experience on a ship?"

"Well, being torpedoed by a submarine. Let's see. Or torpedoing a ship by submarine? Being torpedoed by a submarine. Let's see, torpedoing a ship or a ship torpedoing you? No, a ship wouldn't torpedo you, you see? And the ship… It's the worst kind of motion… worst kind of motion… Be standing on a rock waiting for a ship to come in."

That's exactly where the attention goes. Then he'll get all interested in the thing. "Worst kind of motion. Let's see. Well, what might have preceded that? Must be some kind of bad motion."

"What kind of a bad action could a person perform that that would pay for?" You know, asking him for a direct overt – just suppositional.

"Oh, oh, oh, well, you've really asked one now, you know? I get a picture of a foredeck of a galley. And all the galley slaves are there. And they're all chained and their blood is running down underneath the fetters. And the overseers walk up and down the ramp, and the whips go wham! you see, and so forth. And in a battle, in a battle, when they start throwing Greek fire in amongst the galley slaves… No, that was much earlier. That isn't the same period at all. I got that." [laughs] "That was much earlier. Much earlier."

And you say, "Well, how much earlier was that?"
"Well, that was another lifetime. That's a completely different lifetime. I don't know what I was doing in this thing. It just seems kind of blank, the whole thing seems sort of blank. There's this sailing ship, you see? And it's sailing along, and I think I actually stood on the rock, and I managed to coerce a ship to come in and wreck itself on the rocks. Or maybe… or maybe…"

And we finally find out that it wasn't very dramatic. He just got dead drunk as a Captain of a ship and ran it square aground on the rocks and killed off all the crew, and they all died in the jagged reef, and they were all screaming around him and so forth. But it wasn't so much that. He had stolen the ship and was guilty of barratry.

Oh, we're getting someplace now, yes. Actually, he had murdered the owner's agent the second day out of port. Now we're getting someplace. And the next thing you know, he isn't standing on the rock anymore. See what happens? You get the overt and that sort of thing off on the prior confusion and it blows. And that is the end of standing on the rock.

But the more you Q-and-A with the pc and let him stand there on the rock, the less you're going to get done. It get pretty obvious? The less you're going to get done.

Now, you can keep chasing a pc's attention back, back, back, back, back, back, back, and wind him up at the beginning of track, probably. Of course, that's a kind of a Q and A, too, because that's a method of not confronting. He puts his attention on an incident much earlier that he can confront, rather than confront the incident immediately before. We're much more interested in that span of time just before, that seems so mysterious, and that keeps landing him back on the rock. That's the period we're interested in. We're not necessarily interested in his whole career as a space commander. We're not interested in that period, because space commanders very seldom take ships to sea. All right. So what we're interested in is the period which we have encountered.

Now, you're going to find this technique very interesting in the handling of engrams, just to branch off on to something else. You're going to find this very, very interesting.

When you've got a person's hidden standards and he's been running well, and he's running his goals terminal on the Prehav Scale, and you get up to Class IV-type auditing and you're going to run some engrams, you find these are usually very easy engrams and you haven't got to resort to very much trickery to run them. Because the pc, with the rudiments in, he's in valence, he's already contacted these pictures many times as he runs up and down the track; and you find out they kind of run like hot butter. Take about a half an hour to run one of the things, an hour and a half. Three hours is the longest I've had so far. And they run very easily.

But let's suppose in some peculiar way that we didn't really get this thing wheeling, and the person seems to be stuck in it, and there's a hell of a "burp" someplace in this engram we're running, you see? And the person goes… every time they go through this area, they go "burp." And every time they go through the area, they go "burp." And we're having trouble running the engram, we should assume that something confusing happened just before that, and try to get that up rather than try to knock the burp out. Get the incident just before, and he will blow whatever is hanging.
Now, of course, the whole engram is hanging up, isn't it?

Now, how does a person get stuck on the track in the first place? Oh, let's ask a much more important question than that: How does a person get on a time track in the first place, and what are you doing on the time track in this universe? That's an interesting question. Why are you plodding along the time track with such orderliness? Could it be that there's a confusion at the beginning of track that you can't face? I find that a very fascinating question. I won't bother to give you any answers to that particularly. But what is time? Time very possibly could be retreat from a confusion we cared not to confront. So we retreated en masse and have been going ever since.

But that gives you, now, a basic rundown on the prior confusion – trying to find the prior confusion to find the stuck datum. A person's ability to confront confusions, improved, of course will blow a lot of chronic somatics. But I wouldn't count on it. I wouldn't count on just improving their ability to confront and then having it all work out magically. I would much rather that you just sawed into it from the word go and picked up these things and blew them selectively, one by one and very intelligently. Because a goals terminal run on the Prehav Scale will give them lots of confrontingness and it'll give them lots of changes and that sort of thing, and you're much more interested in that.

Trying to run a person, though, with a present time problem of long duration – one special kind of which is a hidden standard – trying to run a person on the Prehav Scale with five-, six-way brackets and that sort of thing is highly profitless, because the pc never does the auditing command.

When analyzing whether or not a case is running, look to find out whether or not the pc is materially advancing, the sensitivity is coming down and the needle is getting progressively looser.

All right. That all betokens advance of the case. Now, we go just a little bit further than that and we say, if the case has not gone Clear in 150 hours of Routine 3, which includes, of course, Security Checks and assessment and runs, we'd better say to ourselves right about there, this case has never done an auditing command. This case has done something else, too, or has done something else, or has not done it at all; and before that time – that would be the ne plus ultra of being kind of stupid to wait that long, now that we know this.

But if it did reach that time, then we would say, well, there's hidden standards here, and we would determine what they are. And determining what they are, we would get rid of them on this basis of a prior confusion or any refinement thereof. We'd blow these hidden standards. We'd straighten out these things. We return to a goals run. If the case still hung up, we would suspect another hidden standard. We would blow that and go on. So it might be a very good idea to blow all the hidden standards that you could blow on a case before you do very much worrying about the case getting on the way with a goals run.

In other words, by all means get their goal. By all means, get their terminal. By all means, assess a level on the Prehav Scale. By all means, give them some running on this sort of thing.
But on a Security Check angle, first, let's get off those last two pages of Form 3, and let's get off all of Form 6 on an old auditor. On new people, let's straighten up Security Check in general, let's get this pretty well ironed out, and then let's find out if the person has any hidden standards. And then let's undercut those by finding the prior confusions; let's fill in these blank spots, at least in this lifetime. Let's get them sailing so that they can actually do a straight auditing command. And then, doing that, you'll find you make very rapid progress with clearing.

All summer and all last spring, I've just been working on speed of clearing. That is all I've been working on. And this is another seven-league-boot stride in that particular direction.

Thank you.
MORAL CODES:
WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?

A lecture given on 4 October 1961

Okay. And this is the 4th – 4th of October.

By the way, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

If I can remember all this, I'll give you the whole rundown on overt-withhold and how it got that way and then you will be much smarter cookies. [part missing] I mean that. If I can remember all the put-together, how it goes together. Because, let me tell you, it's complicated – very, very complicated.

Told you some time ago, this is very apropos to a Class II Auditor; this is part of Class II Auditor skills. This should be known and known very well. This should be understood. And if you're ever going to make anything out of a Security Check, if you're ever going to get any advances with a Security Check, you'll have to know this sort of thing.

It is not enough to be able to sit there and say, "Well, have you ever raped anybody? No? Well, have you ever raped anybody? You haven't... Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Good." Keeping TR 0 in, of course. [laughter]

That has very little to do with Security Checking. Security Checking is not a repetitive command. You ask the question, you get the answer and you get off the withhold.

But what's a withhold? What is a withhold? Well, you just about to find out. And it's a good thing, too, because I'm saving your bacon in the nick of time. I come in here, I find Mary Sue tearing your scalps off on the subject of it, and what have you been up to? Of course, she must have found somebody auditing on this basis: "Well, have you ever done anything to a fellow staff member?"

"Well, yes. I heard that Joe went out with Bessie."

Oh, no! Now, your first order of business as an auditor is to get an answer to the auditing command. And will you tell me how that is an answer to an auditing command? "What have you done?" "I heard that..." He hasn't done anything! How can it possibly be a withhold?

I'd put another question: "Have you ever ruined people maliciously by gossip?"

*Clang, clang, clang!* "Yes." Correct, they have.
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Do you know people will make up withholds just to get other people in trouble? And you're going to sit there and let them do it? And you're going to hear people saying things—people that have heard things about people who heard things and they understood that something and they knew that so-and-so—and you let them get this off as a withhold?

Well, what auditing time are you wasting. Well, you're wasting your own time and you're wasting the pc's time. And basically you have demonstrated that you don't know what a withhold is, but that is excusable up to this moment. One hour and a half from now it begins to be a crime. See, it's not a crime for the next hour and a half, but an hour and a half from now, the cat will be out of the bag. Only in this particular instance, it is a rather big cat, about leopard size, that is leaping out of a rather big bag, because this is one of these jackpots that we hit every once in a while in Scientology.

You know, you pull the lever expecting to get out a couple of quarters, and florins, shillings, sixpences, so forth, cascade out on the floor for a half an hour. I mean, that's the sort of a thing which has just occurred here. And those of you who haven't been to Las Vegas can ask those who have what I meant.

What's a withhold? What's an overt act? It's important to know these things.

Mr. Doakes sits down in the auditing chair—because you, of course, being a pc, don't pay much attention to auditing—he sits there and he says to you, he says, "Well, I have robbed banks—uh—murdered women—uh—strangled babies—uh—embezzled it, yes. I—uh—ruined marriages, I did this and I did that," and you don't get a single knock on the needle.

Oh, you say, this person is not security checkable. Aha! But from this moment on you're going to see that there is no such thing as a non security checkable person. Because you're going to say that this pc you had is not capable of registering on the meter, because obviously these are tremendous things. They're social transgressions against your code of sociality to a point where, God almighty, he should be shot, put in a straitjacket, given a pill by a medical doctor—most horrible things happen to him. Why? Because, look, he's robbed banks and murdered women and so forth and you don't get a single knock on the E-Meter.

You say, "Well, the man is conscienceless. Therefore he has no withholds." Aha, and that's right—against your moral code, he has no withholds, because they were not transgressions to him.

Now, your task in doing a Security Check is to get off withholds. But what is a withhold? What is a withhold? Now, you could say grandly, "It is what the preclear is withholding." You could say, as we have been saying about an overt act, "What is an overt act? An overt act is what the thetan thinks is an overt act. Therefore, if I do not think I have committed an overt act as I strangle this person or that," you see, "then I have not committed an overt act," you see?

No, those are not adequate replies, and those are not adequate definitions, and those are not adequate answers, and they do not add up to useful, workable definitions in the field of auditing I think you will agree with me that you, yourself, have been puzzled about this.
How is it that one person gives you some kind of a stuff and it's not a withhold, and yet says, "Well, I – I looked down the road." you know, it's clang! You know, you got clang!

And you say, "What did you do? What is that?"

"Well, I looked down the road," and it cleared.

And you say, "Well, what kind of a withhold could this be?" you know? "There must be more to it." And of course you immediately exceed your function as an auditor, which is to clear the meter. If "looking down the road" cleared the meter, that was a withhold.

Now, what puzzles you is that you're fixed on a moral code, or lack of one, which is yours, circa now. And you consider that the pc that you are security checking only has withholds if they are transgressions against the moral code which you consider a moral code – now. And therefore you just make fantastic numbers of mistakes. See what I'm talking about?

All right. Now, let's take this criminal. Aha, this criminal. And we've got him on the meter, you know, and we say, "Well, have you ever –?" You know what a criminal should be security checked at: "Have you ever robbed a bank?" Clang! You see, you would think, boy, that's going to go clang! You know, because we know he's robbed a bank. He's actually been in Joliet, and Columbia University and other prisons [laughter]– obviously he has. And you get not even a twitch of the needle. And he looks at you blandly and says, "Yes, I have robbed banks."

Well, you see, what is astounding you at that point? There's only one thing that is making you astonished: is that he has said something that is a transgression against what you think is his moral code, you see? And therefore you go on security checking him against your moral code, and that isn't the code he lives by. And he is not free of withholds. He has tremendous numbers of withholds, but only against the moral code he lives by. Did you ever hear the moral code of a criminal? "Thou must not squeal to the cops." "Thou must not peach." You could write up a long one all about how "after you've robbed the bank you must equally share, except if somebody didn't help you rob the bank very much, and then you should cut his throat." "Not to kill a cop," could be against that moral code in some societies.

So that you ask the question from the bearing of your current moral code, and you say, "Have you ever killed a policeman?" And there's no fall. You're checking on the wrong moral code. You're checking a pc who has a different moral code.

The question should be, "Have you ever had an opportunity to kill a policeman and failed to do so?" Clang! See, it's against his moral code not to kill a cop. Other criminals wouldn't speak to him. Do you follow this?

In a prison, you'd have to security check along these lines: "Have you ever failed to keep a guard in the dark as to what was going on?" See? "Have you ever cooperated with prison authorities?" "Have you ever told the truth to any official?" "Have you ever spoken to a screw kindly?" [laughter] Because it's against the moral code of the prisoners and they have their own moral code.

You can say, "all PCs have withholds," but these withholds are not necessarily against your moral code. So we add to it: "all PCs have had moral codes against which they have
transgressed." And when you locate the moral code against which they have transgressed, you will then get off the withholds of the case and only then will you get off the withholds of the case – only then.

A withhold, then, is an unspoken, unannounced transgression against a moral code by which the person was bound.

Now, how many moral codes are there? How many moral codes have there been? I'd say circa right now, there is probably a different moral code for every group, each one, large or small, in every city, county, country, continent of Earth. There's probably five hundred of them for every language there is on this planet and there are fifty thousand languages on this planet.

I'll give you a moral code question to a Zulu: "Has anything ever been lying around loose that you didn't steal?" Clang! "Who didn't you tell that to?"

"I didn't tell my father. I wouldn't dare. He would beat me." Because it's moral for a Zulu to steal. Interesting, isn't it? So not stealing is his withhold, and you think his stealing would be his withhold. So you ask for a stealing withhold and you don't get any response and you should have been asking for a not-stealing withhold.

Therefore it is incumbent upon the auditor to have some idea of moral codes. What's a moral code? We'll get into that in a moment. But how many more moral codes do you think there have been? Now look, if circa right now there are possibly a hundred or five hundred of them for every language on Earth – let's be moderate about it – and there are fifty thousand languages on Earth, that gives you quite a few right here in present time, right? All right, let's go back on the track. How many moral codes do you think there have been on the whole track in the last two-hundred trillion years? How many moral codes do you think there have been? It is some unimaginable number. You could start up in the corner of this wall and start writing – after you put down one, then just start writing zeros in tiny microscopic writing clear from that side of the wall, clear to the other side of the wall; go back to the beginning, write it all the way across again and then when you've filled the whole wall down to the bottom, then you put it twenty-first power. That would be quite a number. That would be quite a number. Now, that is an awful lot of moral codes.

So, what's the anatomy of this? What is a moral code? It is that series of agreements to which a person has subscribed to guarantee the survival of a group. And that is what a moral code is. It's that series of agreements to which a person has subscribed to guarantee the survival of a group. That's what it is.

All right, I'll tell you an old short story. This is the most vignette sort of a thing. There was a couple of fellows and they heard there was a buried treasure. A galleon had gone up on a reef down in the South Pacific or down in the Caribbean. And they heard this galleon had gone up on a reef and that there were – just before it sank they threw a tremendous amount of gold into its bronze guns, hoping they could come back for it later and put the tampions on the guns. And the galleon sank and these great, belled cannon were still down there filled with gold. So a couple of men got together and they picked up a native boy and they – as a crew – and they sailed away and they dived and dived and dived and dived for this old galleon's cannon.
They had agreed a hundred percent what they would do with the gold. They had agreed completely what they would do with the gold. They would split it equally and the shares would remain on board the ship until they were taken to a certain point and at that point a banker and trucks would come down to pick it up and it would be transported properly to Switzerland. And they had agreed utterly and completely; they knew exactly what to do. And they had agreed also not to squander it and not go getting drunk and not go doing this and not go doing that, until it was all safely cared for and they were back in their own country. They'd agreed what to do about the bills of their trip. They had it all taped.

Well, they found a couple of cannon, but they reached their arms down the muzzles of the cannon and they couldn't find any tampion. And they went ashore after many days – their supplies were running out, everything was going to hell. And the supplies were running out and what were they going to do? They hadn't found any gold.

Well, they had an agreement for everything except failure. They had no agreement as to what they were going to do if they failed, so they began to wrangle about it after the fact. And they got more and more wrangling and more and more wrangling and finally one of them picked up a dirk and sank it in the other one and the other one simultaneously lopped off the other fellow's arm with a sword. And they had an awful time because they didn't have any agreement at all what to do in case of failure.

And about that time, as one of the fellows was dying, he looked back at the boat and these guns that they had already hauled up on deck, the backs had evidently fallen out of them, being rolled around by the native boy and the native boy was throwing handfuls of gold into the sea.

But they had no agreement on failure. And you'll find out that man has learned down the track, in weird ways, that where he has not agreed upon codes of conduct or what is proper in eventualities – he has agreed – where he has agreed, he survives, and where he has not agreed, he doesn't survive. And so, people, when they get together, always draw up a long, large series of agreements on what is moral (that is, what will be contributive to survival) and what is immoral (what will be destructive of survival).

Now, moral, by these definitions, are those things which are considered to be, at any given time, survival characteristics. A survival action is a moral action. And those things are considered immoral which are considered contrasurvival.

But remember, this is for any group in any special circumstance. And here you have a group of two men going out to find gold or a whole nation being formed after the conquest of the land from some other race. It doesn't matter what the size of the group is: They enter into certain agreements. Now, the longevity of the agreement doesn't have much to do with it. It could be an agreement for a day, an agreement for a month or an agreement for the next five hundred years.

There's a Constitution in the United States that is an agreement. It was an agreement made by thirteen states as to how they would conduct their affairs. Wherever that Constitution has been breached, the country is now in trouble. There mustn't be any income tax, the first one said. Well, they managed to muck that up and they managed to muck up another one and
another point and another point and another point. And each time they have busted up the agreement, why, they're in trouble.

Well, why are they in trouble? Well, that's because there aren't any other agreements than the basic agreement. You don't have modified agreements. If the agreement didn't exist in the first place, you can't keep patching it up and expect any great, lasting success. But what I have just said is to some degree a matter of opinion, because moral codes either leap full-armed from the brass tablets of Moses as he walks down from the rain and the mist saying, "Thou shalt not sell pork to thy neighbor. Sell it to a stranger if it is tainted."

You didn't know that was one of the Commandments, did you? But I've mentioned it before that it happens to be there. There are about 162 of the Ten Commandments. And they contain all sorts of interesting bric-a-brac. But that is just a moral code.

Now, perhaps that was fine, and everybody got along fine with these first 162 precepts or principles and so forth and then somebody came along with a pitch and put a big curve into the line and altered the agreements and redefined it all, you see? And after a while nobody knew what was moral, so it got to be a confusion. And then everybody tried to enforce what was moral and what wasn't moral, but nobody could make up his mind. And the confusion got greater and greater, and then people departed from the group and dispersed. And these people, dispersing, entered into other moral groups and new moral codes were formed, which they then followed, more or less.

And eventually those moral codes, of course, got diluted and messed up. And time marched on and what did we then find? All kinds of confusion would then enter in to what was moral and what wasn't moral. And the next thing you know, somebody would jump up and a group would get together and they would agree on a brand-new moral code, you see? And then that moral code would get all messed up somehow or another, and people would offend against it somehow and then that group would disintegrate – because, of course, its moral agreement disintegrates, why, it – the group disintegrates. And then that confusion is succeeded a little later on the track by these various group members, now members of other groups, forming up new moral codes which go into disintegration. You see?

So you've got a cycle there. And the cycle of action of civilizations is simply this cycle of action: It is an agreement on optimum conduct; a disintegration of agreement and optimum conduct; a disbanding of the group; a formation of a new group with the agreement on – new agreement on – optimum conduct; a disintegration of that agreement; the dispersal of the group; the formation of a new group. Do you see the cycle? Now, that's the cycle of civilization. And that's the cycle of action.

The create-survive-destroy, in this particular instance, is, of course, they create a series of agreements and conducts of what is right and what is wrong. They establish what is right and what is wrong, what is moral, what is immoral, what is survival, what is non-survival. They establish this thing. That is what is created. And then this disintegrates by transgressions. And these transgressions – unspoken, but nevertheless transgressions – by each group member gradually mount up to a disintegration.

And the person who transgresses the most, quite commonly can be the person who is up there screaming the loudest that the others must follow the moral code. You look at the
various Calvinist preachers and things of this character. Man, those fellows had a ball. Ten million withholds per preacher, you see, and they were screaming to the rooftops how everybody must follow the code. Of course, you get a disintegration after a point like that.

You see how this thing goes? So your "survive," of course, is as long as the codes or agreements continue in action. And then your "destroy" or your destructive confusion, of course, is what occurs when everybody has withholds, when everybody is going the other way to, token payment to the code but actually no adherence to it; everybody has withholds from everybody else concerning it. The group, of course, disintegrates on the basis that when you have overts, you have separation, individuation.

So the group disintegrates and you go into a new cycle now. It stays – sometimes they stay disintegrated for a year, sometimes for hundreds of years.

There are countries on this planet right now whose moral codes have disintegrated, who haven't yet formed a new one. Several Mediterranean countries have done this right this minute. They really don't have a new moral code; their old one is pretty doggone shot.

The white man, with "life, liberty and equality" as spread by Tom Jefferson and so forth, now, down in Africa, is experiencing the agony of having his moral codes, as natives, totally destroyed, completely. And everybody says, "Isn't this wonderful! Isn't this marvelous! Look, all we're doing for these natives," you see, and the natives are getting sicker and sicker and falling apart and they can't handle themselves or anything else. And everybody says, "Isn't it wonderful what we're doing. Look, we're giving them washing machines. Of course, they don't have any electric power in their house, but we're giving them washing machines! And look at the marvelous things we're doing here."

Well, the marvelous thing they're doing, of course, is disintegrating the moral code of the tribe or the tribal unit and bringing about a total disintegration of the individuals concerned with it.

Now, there is your general hue; there is the general state of affairs with regard to a cycle of action of civilization. Do you see how that went? You see how it goes?

All right. You in Scientology are involved right this minute in a certain mores. There is a certain moral code of one kind or another. Actually, it isn't completely formed yet. It is still in a state of formation. But one of the reasons why you find it difficult to process another Scientologist is not that his case is worse, but because you, when you flub, transgress against the moral code of "Thou shalt be a good auditor." That's it.

And because you are subscribing to a code of conduct that is survival, therefore, when you have overts against that code of conduct, it is the code of conduct by which you are auditing and progressing in life. So naturally, these things, then, take paramount importance in Security Checks. The last two pages of the Form 3, all of Form 6, when straightened out, will do more for a long-term Scientologist than anything else. Why? It's not that he's – why, he's been doing all these things in the name of helping people. "Well, yes," you say. "Well, he has a perfect right to go nattering around about, 'Well, Ron has changed his mind again!'" You know? You think he has a perfect right to.
Well, I personally believe he has a perfect right to, don't you see? I'm not upset by this in any way. I've been shellacked by experts, you know? And I can stand up to a lot more hurricane than somebody sitting back in a corner nattering slightly about something or other. "Oh, well, these bulletins aren't in order, you know? And Ron should have gotten these bulletins in order," you know?

All right. But it just so happens, by the principles of the thing, that the very fact that he is thinking them is a transgression against something he apparently has agreed to. All right, the transgression is such that it holds his case up.

It is the *current* moral code, then, which is the most important to the case. It is the code by which the person is now living which has dominance over all other codes. So we get a practicing Scientologist and so on and the first thing that we've got to do with him is straighten out his transgressions against the group agreement: "Thou shalt be a good auditor." "Thou shalt not flub." "Thou shalt pronounce thy commands properly." [laughter] Get the idea? And "Thou shan't get Scientology in trouble." You know? This kind of thing. Whatever these codes add up to, they are what they are, don't you see? They aren't so much what I say they are, they just are what they are. They're what you're forming up.

All right. Transgressions against those things, then, tend to make you feel like an outsider from the group of Scientologists, and to that degree you can receive no benefit from Scientology, don't you see? It's very simple.

It is not that the action is monstrous; it is the degree that the action removes the person from his group.

So that is the definition of a transgression. This has very little to do with our own moral code, only that we just, oddly enough, are suddenly – suddenly look and see what we're doing, you know? I mean, here we are, we're forming up a new series of agreements. They're not all completely formed yet, not by a long ways. But there they are. They're a new series of agreements. They're a way of life. There's "this is survival" and "that isn't survival." The fact that these things are – resolve life and take dominance and command over so many other moral codes and can actually run out now and change all other moral codes, of course makes this a fantastically powerful code by which we're operating.

I'm not now talking about the written Code of a Scientologist. I am talking about what you think a Scientologist should do and should not do – what you think he should do or not do, see? Not what I think he should do or not do. That is basically the moral code which is being formed up here.

Well, it's a very strong one because it has dominance over all other moral codes. You think it should be this way and it should be that way or it shouldn't be this way and it shouldn't be that way. And it all is added up to you and adjudicated on what you consider survival and what's not considered survival. And of course we're in a position where we're dominant other [over] all other activities. But let's not worry about that for a moment. That has very small bearing on this particular lecture.
What I'm talking about is, what is a moral code? Well, a moral code is a series of agreements to which members of the group have subscribed to promote their survival. Now, that is a moral code.

And their transgressions are the degree that they have separated themselves from free communication with the remainder of the group. That is a transgression: the degree that a person has separated himself from free communication with a group. And that's all a transgression is.

Now, you say, "Well, a transgression – after all, he murders a member of the group. That's certainly a wilder transgression than this…” Well, I don't know. He murders a member of the group and so they burn him at the stake or something of the sort or assign him to being skewered with E-Meter cans in the public square. Something goes on. It actually is not much of a transgression.

That is sort of a livingness and groups do get enturbulated one way or the other.

But get this one: Murdering a member of the group and hiding his body and never mentioning it to the rest of the group – oh, oh, oh, oh, oh. Now he is pretending to be part of the group while no longer being part of the group and it is out of that sort of thing that you get the disintegration.

So, he murdered a member of the group and everybody found out about it and they all knew him. They saw him do it, and they skewered him with E-Meter cans in the middle of the square and told him, "Go thou and never get audited again, you dog" And so he went out and picked up another body. And one day an auditor runs into it in session and runs it out, see?

But he actually has not been separated from the group. The only person who can separate one from a group is himself, and the only mechanism he can do it by is withholding. He withholds transgressions against the moral code of the group from the other members of the group and therefore he individuates from the group and the group therefore disintegrates. This should be very simple; this is very well taped.

Now, how does this all come about in the first place? What are – are there any other mechanisms back of this? Yes, there is the mechanism of co-action, the mechanism of co-action. The last time you were dancing with somebody you were indulging in a co-action. They were moving and you were moving and so forth. The last time you had a fight with somebody, you were in a co-action; yes, you were in violent disagreement with their actions and they were in violent disagreement with your action, but unfortunately, underneath all this, you were both fighting.

Now, I'll give you an example of a co-action of magnitude, if you will forgive the slight excursion into maritime affairs. I'll tell you anecdotes about the Phoenician navy pretty soon, but right now I can only tell you anecdotes about current ones that you would be interested in.

A ship is no good until it has braved some tremendous danger or indulged in combat. The crew is no good and the ship just isn't integrated. There's nothing to it.
You take these harbor launches that everybody goes home to the wife every night, and they come aboard, and so forth. Well, they fall apart. There is no group there to amount to anything.

But a ship, in essence, is a fairly isolated group and therefore gives us a good example.

And you recruit everybody up and you've got all the proper number of ratings and men and they're all at their proper stations and they're all in the proper slots and they've all been trained for their duties – and nothing works. It's so interesting. Nothing works. There is no more nightmarish nightmare than putting a ship in commission with a new crew. For the first month or two or three months even, you are in a position where you don't know whether the guns are going to fall off or the keel is going to suddenly wind up down the stack. You just don't know.

The supplies never seem to get aboard and the fuel never seems to flow freely to the engines or burners. Nothing seems to ever happen in the ship. It just – nothing happens! Except a sort of a confusion. Some kind of a weird confusion goes on.

And then one fine day this ship is out and it meets a great storm. And this storm is battering away at force 8, 9, 10 and huge, raging seas are racing on every side of it and every man is braced, and down in the engine room they're trying to keep the screws turning over somehow or another, and the water in the bilges are sloshing all around and somebody forgot to close a seacock. And the next thing you know, they're all being punished for their omissions.

And somehow or another they hold the ship together. Somehow or another they hold the ship together. And then the storm abates. And for some peculiar reason we now have a ship. This is a noticed fact. I mean, a lot of people who have gone to sea, and so forth, could tell you this fact.

It is true of a flight group. It is true of a military company. You never really see any organization hang together at all until it has been bruised, heavily and hard, and then you will see an organization hang together.

The reason business organizations is so hard to hold together as groups, and there are so many transgressions against their codes of operation, is centered totally upon the fact that they never get mauled. The boss gets mauled and the accountant gets mauled and somebody else gets mauled, but nobody ever takes the whole building and mauls it. There is no mutual danger to amount to anything.

One could be created. Instead of the manager taking it all on his back every time somebody writes him a nasty letter, if he got the staff together and read it to them and they had a chance to find out what was going on and discover what was under attack here or what wasn't under attack here, you might get a cohesed group and organization. Otherwise, no.

What is this? They have experienced the necessity to survive, and that is the whole summation of it. A group becomes a group when it has experienced mutually the necessity to survive. And that then makes a very strong group.
A ship going into action for the first time goes into it as a disintegrated series of agreements. It has no moral code, it has nothing. Why? Because nobody sees any necessity at all to survive. And then they take a rare shellacking. They've left a seacock open and they forgot to test out the ammunition hoist and a lot of other things weren't done on this ship. And all those sins start to catch them out. And they suddenly say, "We've got to survive around here and we had better put it into high gear." And when they come out the other end, they're all friends, oddly enough. They've gone through a mutual experience of some magnitude and they're friends. And their friendship for one another expresses it in itself – of a knitted group which has its own mores.

You'll find out that every ship which has been long together with itself under any kind of – well, just mediocre, the most mediocre – it isn't leadership that makes a ship, it's lack of interference by leadership that makes a ship. And you'll find out that these boys will have developed a whole civilization of their own. They have their own jokes. You'll be walking down the deck of a strange ship that is lying in some harbor someplace and somebody will say, all of a sudden – turn around and he'll say (he'll look at another little boat in the water or something like that) and he'll say, "Ten feet tall." And everybody – every member of the ship's company that is near him – will laugh like mad, you see?

"What – ten?" You're an outsider. You don't know what he was talking about.

Well, something has happened on the ship or somebody got razzledazzled into some peculiar way and it somehow or another centers around this joke, "ten feet tall," and everybody knows this joke, but the outsider doesn't. Well, that's as much a part of their civilization as: all the ship's members know that when you go down a certain companionway and open a certain watertight door, you'd better for sure get your fingers the hell out of the road because it inevitably slams back. They all know that, but you're a stranger and you don't know that, so you get your fingers caught. [laughter] But they have a whole technology, and it's just a group of men running one piece of machinery.

An oil rig, running out in the middle of Texas someplace or standing out on a Texas tower in the Gulf, something like this – the crews attached to that thing, after they've gone through certain experiences and so forth, cohere and become a group. And they have certain morals that are different. It runs different, place to place. But there's a certain pattern runs through it all. And the basic thing is you mustn't injure the survival of a fellow group member – common denominator of a transgression. And that's also, by the way, the common denominator of the code in the first place: You mustn't injure the survival of a certain group member.

Therefore, a manager has a tendency to be far more isolated from a group, or the leader of a group has a tendency to be far more isolated from the group, than group members. Why? Because he every now and then does injure the survival characteristics of a group member. No matter if he does it reluctantly, every now and then, on every side of him, he will find members of the group are absolutely insisting that Member X be expelled. Member X's transgressions, in the cumulative sense, have gotten so antipathetic to other group members that they find that it is impossible to survive with Member X around. And who do they turn it over to?
Well, now, the leader of the group is not particularly aware of the transgressions of Member X because he doesn't live the same life as the rest of the group. He's a little bit isolated, don't you see? So he does an independent overt without a motivator. He dismisses the group member. He says, "Thou shalt be shot. Thou shalt be turned out to starve," or something.

So he tends to get all manner of overts against group members. And then he seldom tells anybody else in the group what exactly happened to Member X, because he thinks it'd be too enturbulative. He never posts it on the bulletin board or something like this. "For the seventh consecutive time, Member X was found eating crackers in somebody else's bed and therefore is no longer amongst us, by popular demand." [laughter] He never does anything like this, you see? He operates sort of on a constant withhold. And he can actually drive himself straight out of his own group. It's quite interesting. Ah, you get this in the isolation of command and so forth.

Now, this is so true that man has at length accepted the idea of isolation of command as a normal course of human events. It's not necessarily normal at all. But you see, there is one of your breakdowns.

Now, leadership is one of the frailties of a group, while at the same time being one of its greatest strengths. So that you change the leadership of a group, you can change, to a marked degree, some of the characteristics of the group. But if you change the group over to a leader who then violates or changes all the mores of the group, ah, well, we've got lots of trouble now. We've got lots of trouble.

I have a case in point: There was a very successful company. You heard of Nick Carter and Diamond Dick and all the rest of these old pocketbooks – in their day, the comic books of the 1890s. Well, those were all published by a company known as Street & Smith. And it had become very, very wealthy over a long period of time, and it had its mores. Boy, did that place have mores.

It owned a whole square block – imagine it – in the middle of New York City, where a square foot is worth about a hundred thousand dollars. And it owned a whole, huge square-block building about four stories high that was the clammiest, most fallen-apart old building you ever heard of, and it had printing presses in it. And the building was so shaky that when these enormous presses started to roar, the whole building shook. You could hardly hold the inkwell on the desk, you know, up in the executive offices, and so forth.

And they had – they had just gone on for years. They had unpublished manuscripts of O. Henry. They had all kinds of things. I went into their vaults one day, and there were the originals of Ned Buntline, you know, and Annie Oakley and all of this kind of stuff. Fantastic.

And there were certain codes by which you couldn't speak to people and could speak to people and certain precedences by which you went to lunch and did this and did that. And there were promotion precedences in every place and it was a very hidebound old outfit. Well, after all, it had been in existence for the better part of a half a century.
And all of a sudden young Mr. Smith inherited it on the basis of death dues, you see? And he had a wife. And his wife believed that it was a nasty thing to publish things like that. Her friends wouldn't like it. But they would like such things as fancy women's magazines.

And so Mr. Smith Americanized himself to the degree of saluting the wife and saying, "Yes, sir." And at the time he took over – at the time he took over – there was a seven-million-dollar sinking fund in that company. Just – just the sinking fund! There were no strings attached to it. There were nothing. It just sat there and made money. Everything made money in all directions.

He took their high-power presses, which could spit out more dime novels and magazines than any other high-power press in America and sold it to his nearest competitor. And then they could spit out more magazines than Street & Smith. And when he got through, he owned Mademoiselle, all on the cuff. [laughter]

And the company was gone and the building was gone and everything was gone. And that is – it's things like that, you see, which give rise and credence and get loyalty devoted to such things as socialism, communism, things of this character. Because they recognize that the leader of a group is the most capable of destroying the group.

The group might survive all sorts of storms and financial crises and crashes, but all one – well, just one thing has to happen, you see? The leader of the group goes bad, marries the wrong girl, who decides that her friends won't speak to her quite well enough if she is connected with printing blood-and-thunder magazines, don't you see?

I don't know what happened to all of that, but the staff dispersed all over the place. And you would see these people afterwards, and they'd be sitting around in a sort of a degraded fashion, you know? They were old Street & Smith people. They were never anything else. They were not new popular-publications people, you see? They were old Street & Smith people, because it was one of the oldest publication groups in America.

Now, you can answer the question, "Why is it that the old soldier is always degraded?" Just hire an old soldier someday to mow the front lawn. You usually will have had it. They have a very bad employment reputation, old soldiers. Now, I'm talking about old soldiers: the sixteen-year man, the twenty-year man, the thirty-year man.

And you say at once, "Well, the army must have done something horrible to this fellow to bring about a total disintegration of his personality and therefore the army is very bad training and therefore the army is degrading and therefore the military is very bad." And you can get a whole nation believing the military is very bad because every product of the military which they see, after the fellow has spent ten, sixteen, twenty, thirty years in the military, is the guy is walking around in a fog, you know? He's walking around in a daze of some kind or another or he takes to drink or he's unreliable and he won't do his job. And they see this sort of thing, so they say the military must be very bad.

No, they're looking at another phenomenon. It is the phenomenon of a group member who is no longer part of the group. That's the phenomenon they're looking at. He's a perfectly good soldier, but he has no group. How can he go on being a perfectly good soldier? There's no mores. Any mores that he has – "Thou shalt not tell the sergeant," you know? "Thou shalt
sneak in after hours when thou dost not have a pass." "Thou shalt raise hell with the mess
sergeant." "Thou shalt scrounge anything that isn't nailed down, providing [laughter] – pro-
viding it doth not belong to thine own company." Tremendous mores, various kinds, you
know? "Thou shalt raise hell with second lieutenants but be respectful to captains." All these
kinds of things.

Well, this is the moral code by which he is living. And of course he's living by a moral
code and he has no group connected with it anymore; he is degraded.

Is he degraded, actually, because he had overts against the army and his moral code?
No. No. He is merely degraded because of this interesting phenomenon, which you must pay
some attention to: If a person is no longer a member of the group, he feels automatically that
he must have had overts against it and was driven out of it. Through no fault of his own, this
group has ceased to exist or he is no longer a member of it. Just the fact that he is no longer a
member of the group makes him automatically – flick – believe that he must have had overts
against the group.

You see, this is the reverse phenomenon. Now, you run into this every once in a while.
As a matter of fact, you run into it rather constantly. Because the punishment or the result
exists, people then believe the crime must have existed. Got the idea?

You'll see every once in a while some fellow whose wife has left him. And he will
then believe that he must have been mean to her or that he is not a good family man. Maybe it
had nothing to do with it whatsoever. Maybe there was a typhoid epidemic in the area and
then she died. But he gets this other sensation, you know? The other sensation is he's no
longer a part of the group, therefore he must have offended. And you'll find people nattering
and chattering about this.

One notable example, there was one girl I knew that – whose father died in an auto-
mobile accident exactly two thousand miles away and she sat around all the time trying to
figure out how she killed her father. How had she killed her father? Well, was it because she
didn't answer his telephone call when he put a telephone call through to her? Was it because
she didn't phone at the time of this? Was it because of this? Was it because of that? Was it
because she had gone to this other city in the first place? Now, if she hadn't gone to the other
city – and so forth.

Well, all of this nattering, and that whole thing which the psychiatrist – ooh, this just
drives the psychiatrist mad. He worries about this more than anything else. He sits up all night
sometimes worrying about this one. He will – if he finds this in a patient, he sits there and the
perspiration just drips all over his white, somewhat smudged-edged weskit. The person thinks
he killed his father. And he'll just do everything he can possibly do, you see, to try to con-
vince this patient that he didn't kill his father. And he doesn't know the mechanism connected
with it, and actually we didn't either until just now, in the last few days here.

Well, his father's gone, so therefore he must have offended against a group called
"son-father" or "daughter-father." See, that is a group. Daughter-father: must have offended
against it because he's no longer a member of the group. And you might say this is the com-
mon denominator of people's degraded feelings. They are no longer a member of the group.
So you will very often be processing somebody who feels that he had tremendous overts – this is not in the majority – but you'll feel this is somebody who had tremendous overts against a group, and you won't be able to find them. And you won't even be able to locate them on the meter, which is what I mean. No, the group is gone and he – it's not any longer there, and he's no longer with the group, so he figures it out, you see, that having suffered the final punishment for transgressing against the group, then he must have transgressed against the group. And what's worrying him is to try to figure out how he transgressed against the group rather than simply face the fact that he's no longer a member of the group. You got the idea?

An awful lot of people finished up World War II, or the Korean War, feeling degraded because they were separated from their military units. Well, they were separated from their military units. Well, if they'd gone through a lot of cosurvival motion, see – if they'd gone through a lot of motion with other fellows in an effort to survive – then it cohesed the group. And of course, how did they leave the group? Well, they just left the group by being demobbed, that's all. (Naval terminology: they were "separated from service.")

Well, that was some action of some character in some personnel division someplace. And the fellow afterwards wonders if he shouldn't have been nicer to the squadron, you know, and he shouldn't have been nicer to the company or if he shouldn't have been better to those people and what did he do? And he'll sit around and grieve, actually, about the horrible things that he did do to these fellows. Well, he's integrating the whole thing against the fact that because he's no longer a member of the group, then he must have transgressed against the group. You see?

In other words, he does an identification of the punishment with the action. See, it's – only the action is necessary.

Now, what actions are actually necessary to cohere a group? Co-action in the direction of survival. If you have co-action in the direction of survival, with two or more people, you inevitably have a mores. It's tiny and it's not very explicit, but it's a mores. And it has to do with two people who went against many survival, ah... antisurvival forces. They coacted against antipathetic forces, so therefore they are a group.

And now one of the people dies or departs and we have the other person then believing he must have transgressed against the other person. And sure enough, he does have transgressions and you'll find out he's very, very happy to find out and get off his withholds and transgressions against the other thing and it will blow at that time. But it's blowing for another reason. The reason you think it is blowing is because you've gotten off these little, petty, two-bit withholds, you know? No, no, he was very happy to have found he really did merit no longer being a member of the group. You got the difference?

See, he figures, "Well, it was justified. They were right, throwing me out, because look, I did have some withholds, see? I did have some of these withheld transgressions. So therefore, obviously, there it is." See, happy as a clam, you know?

So he's willing to be separated from the group. Up to that time it's unknown, it's unexplained. Did he have transgressions against the group or didn't he have transgressions against the group? And the only evidence he has – he's no longer a member of the group, so he must
have transgressed against the group. That's what the equation is. If the fellow is no longer a member of the group then he must have had action against the group.

You'll find out that the fellow who has a dogfight over France with a German pilot, let's say, and they go round and round and round and round and they have this hell of a dogfight and so forth, and they finally break it off and go home – do you know, there's always a little bit of an oddity between the two of them, so on. You know, they – every once in a while after a war, a couple of pilots who have had aerial duels and so forth, will meet. And they meet like old pals, man. That is the group. But you see, just to that degree, they formed a group.

Well, what kind of a group was it? It was a group of tremendous co-action – contra-survival. But each one is trying so forcefully to survive that their action is in agreement. It's an agreed-upon action: a dance of death in the sky. They're both firing at each other, aren't they? They're both flying airplanes, aren't they? They're both trying to survive, aren't they? They're both in the same sky, aren't they? They're both in the same time period, aren't they?

Well, they know they aren't a group. Each one knows the other is an enemy and they know this positively and violently, that they are not a group. And so they can never explain why the dogfight hangs up. Of course, there are withholds against their own groups in there. If one didn't shoot the other one down, it's actually a sort of a transgression against his own group, just to that degree.

But if he has a dogfight, fails to shake – shoot the other one down and then goes home and never mentions it, now he's actually got a transgression against his own group. You get the degree of complexity with which this mounts up. Well, it mounts up on this basis, this basis: agreement. What is agreement? It's two people making the same postulate stick. Two or more people making the same postulate stick – that's what we mean by an agreement. Two or more people making the same postulate stick – an agreement.

Well now, what if they go into mutual action and their mutual action is in the direction of survival? Oh, they've got the same agreements that they're trying to make stick and now they're going through similar actions by which they're trying to make survival possible? Now, what have they got now? Ah, they've got co-action and they have a confusion of one with another. They don't quite differentiate their own action, so they misown other actions in their immediate vicinity.

Fifteen men pulling on a rope trying to pull a seaplane out of the sea: Afterwards you say, "How much of each one's motion was responsible for the seaplane coming out of the sea? Exactly how many ergs of your motion was part of the recovery of the seaplane?"

Well, you try to break it down like that, he takes the easy course, you see? And he says, "Well, we did it. We pulled it out of the sea." He doesn't differentiate how much each one did pull it out of the sea. He just says broadly, "We pulled it out of the sea." In other words, it was fifteen men contributing unequally, some more, some less, to a line and they would contribute unequally if they were just at different positions on the line, because the lines get bent and twisted around things and people who are closer to bollards, you see, can't pull as well as people who are far from them. You get the idea? So, it's an incalculable mathematical problem. How many ergs did each one contribute?
Well, they all solved the problem by saying, "We did it." Oh, and they're very happy about this -- "We did it. Our motion."

Now, you take some fellow who has been running an engine for an awful long time. He's pulling water or something up a hill into a reservoir, you see? And he runs this engine and he sees the pumps running, the water going up the hill and so on. And he runs the engine and he runs the engine and he runs the engine. Well, why, after a while, when you talk to him, does he go kind of "gurgle, gurgle," you see? Or like these engineers that I had and so on, they start their motors. They start their motors before they begin to talk. They say, "Wrawr, wrawr, wrawr," and then they get to firing off and they give you the sentence. It's quite interesting.

I don't think anybody would believe that. But I've got Peter as a witness. He's talked to them over the phone. It's quite marvelous. They start their motors and then they talk.

See, they "co-action." In other words, their action of running the motor is undifferentiated by them with the action of the motor. So their action running the body and the motor's action in running the pump -- these are mutual actions. So you get co-action.

Now, you can go into this on havigness of motors and you can go into it on causes of things and you can go into it in other ways, but you actually separate it best by just getting the fellow to get the idea of a mutual action with the motor. And all of a sudden he -- up to that time he's been totally identified. His action was the motor's actions and the motor's actions were his actions and so they had actions. They had actions. And if the motor conked out and all of a sudden its coil went bad, why, he goes home and has a stomachache or something like this, you know? Their mutual action is too tied in.

And that is the source of an overt. Now, let's get around to what we're talking about here. That is an overt act -- or, that is the source of overt acts. You have mutual action with something else -- and you call it a group member, a mores, a moral code -- anything you want to call it -- you see that, but it's mutual action. And then you do something cruel to that with which you have mutual action and of course you experience the somatic. And it's just as easy as that. It isn't any deeper than that. That is an overt act-motivator sequence and that is its exact mechanics and that's all there is to it.

Now, you wonder why I've been talking about mores and groups and group action and survival and all that sort of thing. Well, it just adds up to that fact. After you've had a tremendous amount of group co-action, you then embark upon a cruel action to what you have co-action with and you'll get the somatic. You must have had a cruel impulse toward co-action before you can get the somatic you administer to somebody else.

You take somebody with whom we have co-action and one day, for some reason or other best known to somebody else, you accidentally break his arm. You go around afterwards nursing your own. Why? Because your arm is his arm. And that's how that crosses and that's what an overt act-motivator sequence is and those are all the mechanics there are to it. There aren't any fancier mechanics than that.
There isn't any mechanic such as, "Well, you should be punished because you have offended against another member of the group." No, that is the group dramatizing the fact I just gave you.

Religionists come along, Religionists come along. And these religionists, they tell you, "Well, do unto others as thou shalt turn thy other pig" I don't think that's one of the commandments, but it's something like that. They get this thing reversed.

In other words, they are forcing into existence something that already exists. See, they're saying, "Well now, you get mean, you gyp your fellow group member, and you're really going to suffer. You'll suffer in the long run." Yeah, great. "Eighteen paternosters and three pieces of bread; that's what it's going to cost you or you'll suffer from here on, you see?" They get paid for it.

But actually, there is nothing there to be paid for. A person who makes an overt act against something with which he has mutual action, of course, is incapable of differentiating what is his action and what is the other action. Fifteen men on a rope, one of them trips and butts the other one in the back and then he has a somatic in his own back, you see, because he didn't know whether the force was his or the force was theirs, but he engaged in a cruel action.

Now, all overt-motivator sequences become very pronounced when cruel actions are maliciously engaged upon while withholding. One is really a member of the group, one is really coacting with the group, but one engages on a cruel action toward another member of the group and then tries to back out. Why does he try to withhold? He tries to withhold because he doesn't want the effect of the co-action. See, he tries to individuate from the group when he does a cruel act because he knows that if he does a cruel act to something he has co-action with, then, of course, he's going to get it in the neck. So he tries to back out.

In other words, he disowns the co-action because he's trying to get rid of the motivator he will inevitably get. So he shoots a fellow group member and having shot the fellow group member, he then seeks to withhold the fact that he has shot a fellow group member so as not to be liable to the somatics of co-action, which experience has taught him will always occur.

And we're just down to the basic fundamentals of nondifferentiation and identification, that is all. He identifies every group member's action with his own action, so therefore if he is mean to a group member, he of course is liable to get it, so he tries to escape the penalty of what is woven straight into group action amongst all thetans and seeks to back out. And this will ordinarily coax him into withholding, too. So, withhold is part of the backout.

Now, if you ask him to recognize his co-action with that group member prior to his overt act, the overt act of course will blow. That's the mechanics of it, you see? You've got to get the prior action. Now, of course, the more commotion and the more action and the more withholds and the more nonsense preceded his overt act, the more the overt act is going to hang up and the more he's going to try to withhold it. Do you follow that plainly? That's quite easy.
In other words, he can only suffer from his overt because of former action – former co-action. He can only suffer from his overt because of former co-action. And that co-action is the most aberrative when it is mutual survival – mutual survival. And, of course, that means a disturbed, confused area. And it also – you will spot earlier and earlier overts against fellow group members as you're doing this, which is earlier and earlier efforts to back out.

Well, of course, he is involved in mutual survival, mutual action. He is involved with other people with mutual survival. And because he is involved with this mutual action, every time he has tried to back out of mutual action, he, of course, had sought to deny the mutuality of the action. And he thinks he can get off the overt-motivator sequence inevitability by denying it, you see? If he just denies it enough, then he's no longer part of that scene. So he individuates, you see, gradually out.

And you have to knock out his individuation totally before he can walk out. That is what is the most peculiar phenomenon about it all, you see? The action he takes to escape punishment is the action which then settles in the punishment. This is all very mechanical. There is nothing much to it. You'll see this thing unfold. You'll see this thing unfold left and right. It becomes very – well, you audit a pc and you ask him for a prior confusion. Well, you could ask him for a prior survival and you'd get about the same answer.

You're asking him for a former co-action. And of course you will find, every time you find a former co-action, it opens up the track a little bit more, so he finds a former withhold. And then you look earlier than that withhold, and of course you've found a former co-action again – usually a confusion, because it's a survival action against odds, a battle of some kind or another with these two people facing the world or these ten people or this race, you see – and you find him backing out a little bit more.

And then you get a little more co-action off the case by asking him what some earlier confusion was and of course he remembers another withhold, another effort to individuate from the group. And these uncover just to the degree that you uncover prior confusions or prior survivals.

It's quite patent. In other words, you've got to get the co-motion – if you want to use that word – the co-motion which preceded the withhold. That doesn't mean the overt act that preceded the withhold so much as it means the co-disturbance which preceded his effort to individuate. And of course you'll get the withhold and the motivator, just right now. You get it right now. You ask for the co-action, and of course, that blows the mutual action he was involved in with another group member, and having blown that, you then can release the other. And it – and then he no longer withholds this fact about what he was trying to do to the group, so he's no longer trying to disintegrate from the group, so he can move on the time track.

Every time he has a withhold, he parks himself on the time track, you see? And he can keep parking himself and parking himself on the time track till the whole time track looks like just one big now. And that one big now is the reactive mind. And that's all there is to the reactive mind; it's the combined withholds which he has stacked up, which have all become part of now. But they're efforts to individuate from groups.
Well now, he really never has succeeded in individuating from any group he has ever belonged to. Isn't that fascinating? It doesn't matter whether he talked to a shepherd back in the old days and they were talking there and all of a sudden a wolf came "rompthing" over, operatically, and the flock scattered. And so the shepherd picked up a cudgel and went after the wolf. And he was just a gentleman passing by the way, but he picked up his sword and he went after the wolf, too. And they both got ahold of the wolf and they chased him over the hills and far away and made nothing out of the wolf. And then they came back and gathered up the sheep and they shook each other by the hand and he went on his way.

All right. He made a group, didn't he? He made a group and they had an agreement. The mores of the group is: "Protect sheep. Kill wolves." That was their morals. That is what they were supposed to do.

Now, all right. He went along for a few years and one day a shepherd drove all the sheep through his rose garden and so he went out and put a sword through the shepherd. And he got it right in his chest. And, "Doctor, Doctor, I have this horrible pain in my chest. I just can't understand what this horrible pain in my chest is."

The doctor said, "Well, we – we look – we look upon that as advanced, galloping consumption. That's what that is. And you take this horrible black potion here, and it'll get you over it." And about eight, nine thousand bottles of black potion later, why, they bury him. [laughter]

He formed a group with a shepherd and then he killed a shepherd. Wasn't even the same shepherd. Well, what's he done? He's done an identification of shepherds, in the first place. And then he's done an identification of motion with a shepherd earlier. You follow this? So he gets an overt act-motivator sequence.

But nobody has ever left any groups. The magicians: Well, there have been magicians ever since there's been track. But magicians, from time to time, have expressed this in saying – they haven't come close to this at all. As a matter of fact, it's not a stable datum of magic. But they say, "A magician who starts in on one religion should not change his religion just because he's practicing magic." That's one of the rules of the game in magic. Mustn't change your religion. They know it's bad luck. They know people go to pieces on it.

Well, all they found out, just to that degree, is the fellow had subscribed to a religious group of some kind or another, and now if he goes and shifts his religion, why, he's going to get an overt-motivator sequence of some kind or other, he isn't going to be able to explain to anybody and there he's had it – which is quite interesting.

This opens up an interesting door for Scientology, because if everybody is – if no one has ever left any group he ever belonged to, against which he had a transgression or an overt, why, that means that all new groups being formed are formed by transgressors. [laughter] And then that follows, then, that if Scientologists could get off of that particular mechanism, they would form the first true group that has existed since the beginning of the universe. Isn't that interesting? Interesting vista suddenly opens up in that particular direction.

That's all rather beside the point at this particular moment. We're just talking about the mechanics of this thing. But that's true, that would happen.
Now, what, what is a moral code? A moral code would be agreements – a series of agreements – which had been cemented by mutual action aimed toward survival. And a transgression is an action against a person or being or thing with which one has a moral code or an understanding or a co-action.

Notice that we're trotting out *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health's Survival*, in caps. Notice it's right back with us again. Because it is the action by which beings sought to survive that then brings about co-action on the part of those beings; which brings about, then, the development of a series of agreements; which then brings about the possibility of a transgression. And the transgression, withheld, is an effort to act against the co-action of the group without suffering the consequences. But the co-action, followed by a withhold, then parks the person right there.

You see, because that's not an action. Let me call to your attention that a withhold is a no-action after the fact of action. You break the cookie jar and then you don't tell your mother. And you're processing this person and he's going along the track and there he is all of a sudden and he's standing there in the kitchen. He's not looking at anything. He's not looking at anything.

Have you noticed the number of pictures which pcs have where they're not doing anything. Have you noticed this? They're not killing anybody, they're not breaking any bones, they're not robbing any cookie jars, they're not doing anything, see? There they were, just innocently standing there, just an innocent bystander.

They'll have a picture, suddenly, of a street; and there's absolutely nothing happening on this street. They'll have a picture of a kitchen; there's nothing happening in the kitchen. They will have a picture of a pot and there's nothing happening with regard to the pot at all.

Well, what are these things? These are the points of withhold where a person has withheld his transgression against the group. And the transgression may lie minutes, hours or days before the picture. You just ask for the commotion which went on before that and he'll give it to you and you find the withhold, then the fact that he withheld it against the mores of the group and the picture will spring, just like that. Very tight, close mechanism. There's nothing much to it at all.

So, you look for the prior confusion. The rule of the prior confusion comes out of this. So if the person is parked anyplace, he, of course, has a withhold at the point he is parked, but it is immediately preceded by a co-action or co-motion, for sure, and then an overt against that co-action and co-motion. And then the withhold. So it follows down consecutively in terms of time: 12 o'clock, co-action, co-motion, as a part of the group; 1 o'clock, overt against this group; 2 o'clock, parked – see, withhold against the group, the effort to move out of the group. I'm just giving you 12, 1 and 2 so you can see what I mean by consecutively in time.

So, we have childhood, co-action with a family; teenage, overt against the family; young adulthood, complete upset with the family and awfully parked; withhold, won't talk to the rest of the family. You get the idea, see?

Well now, this goes as far as this: One can withhold one's self – and you mustn't overlook this in processing. That fellow who thinks he should have been drafted and join the army
and who didn't then join the army, will be found to be in possession of a withhold which is inarticulate unless you know this particular fact: He is withholding a body, you don't just withhold thoughts. You just don't withhold deeds. You can withhold a body. You can also withhold stolen goods. You can also withhold objects of various kinds or another, which really aren't stolen, but they're withheld.

But withholding self is the commonest one, because wherever a person has engaged in a dogfight, such as I spoke about a few minutes ago, he all the time was trying to bring about the death of the other person while withholding himself from death, which makes a disagreed unreality about the whole thing. There's no agreement there of any kind whatsoever.

If you ask somebody, "Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you." "Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you," he'll wind up in all kinds of dogfights and all kinds of activities of one kind or another where he was trying to do something. It's not a good method of spotting overts, but that would find a hell of a lot of overts. You'd find a lot of overts.

You say, "Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you." "Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you." And the guy would be parked right in a whole series of overts. They wouldn't necessarily resolve, because that isn't where he's stuck. He's stuck just a little bit later, in each particular case, because – if he's stuck at all – because withholding your body from a dogfight is a moral action. That is a moral action. It's immoral to depart from your squadron. But to do something which is against the survival of the squadron and withhold that is far more aberrative. Far more aberrative.

So, the transgressions against the group – well, that's all this thing adds up to. That's all there is to it. That's all there is to an overt act-motivator sequence, that is all there is to taking one apart and that is how everybody is stuck.

Now, I'll give you – I've given you a Class II Auditor skill, which is simply, "Locate the prior confusion." Now, when you locate the prior confusion, of course, you're going to locate some prior co-motion – motion with – and you will fall at once into an overt, and then you'll fall into the withhold.

And you keep saying "prior confusion" and you'll just go bing-bing! See? You can force the pc's attention into the prior confusion, they come up to the overt and they'll hit the withhold – zoomp, boomp, bang! It's just a one, two, three, because that's the way it goes. Because they're held on the track by the prior confusion, apparently held on the track by the prior confusion, but only because they have a withhold later.

So it takes all three steps to park somebody on the track. It takes a prior co-action, then it takes an overt and then it takes a withhold. And when you've got those three things, you get a person stuck on the track and that's all there is to it. And that makes up the reactive bank. And that is the anatomy of the reactive mind.

First there is co-action, then there are overts and then there are withholds. And then that compositely gives us, eventually, a total jam of time. And that total jam of time, totally buried, becomes the reactive mind and that is the reactive mind. And that's all there is to the anatomy of the reactive mind. That's the lot.
Now, when you clear somebody, you, of course, clear those identities which the person has more or less teamed up with and those identities and their now-I'm-supposed-to's and their particular withholds and withholding these identities and helping the survival of the identity, then overts with or against the identity and then withholds with or from the identity. And that is the goals terminal that you are running and that's the anatomy of the goals terminal, when you get right down to it. When you run the Pre Hav Scale, you run all the sides of this thing off.

Every engram a person has, has these sticks that has this sequence in it. This you will find every place. This is the pattern which is stamped all over the universe.

Now, I would be less than kind if I didn't give you a very broad, general process that anybody could run rather easily, but there is one which knocks this rather heavily. There is one which is rather amusing. There is a rather amusing experimental process about this – is you find something the person has identified with something and you simply tell him to think of a mutual action with the one and then a mutual action with the other and of course these two identifications will spring apart.

I'm giving you an idea. You find out, quite by accident or by being smart or something of the sort – you find out that the pc has horses and beds totally identified. So you say, "All right. Think of a co-action, or a mutual action with a horse. Good. Think of a mutual action with a bed. Thank you. Think of a mutual action with a horse. Good. Think of a mutual action with a bed. Thank you." And all of a sudden these two identifications will spring apart.

Don't get bugged off into this, because all of a sudden, fifteen or twenty other subjects will emerge out of that particular zone. Well, don't get him to thinking about those, too. Just keep him with horses and beds. Oh, he'll be thinking about horses, women, beds. That's the first thing that'll appear on the thing. Well, if you Qed-and-Aed with him, you'd say, "Well, think of a horse. Think of a woman. Think of a bed. Think of a mutual action with a woman. Think of a mutual action with a bed." That's been suggested to him, don't you see, by the stuff that's coming up. Well, don't Q-and-A with it because the next thing you know, he'd think in connection with beds, laundresses, for some reason or other, you see? If you Qed-and-Aed you'd say, "Think of a mutual action with a horse. Think of a mutual action with a woman. Think of a mutual action with a bed. Think of a mutual action with laundresses," see? And this will keep on. And you could get about seven or eight hundred of these things, and seven or eight hundred pieces of the auditing command. It'd be seven hundred or eight hundred parts to the auditing command if you just kept this up. So you better not do that. You just better say, "Think of mutual action with a horse. Think of mutual action with a bed," and go on that way, and he will just give you more stuff that is tearing off of the bank, because, of course, you've found a point of direct cross.

That is not a very practical activity, but it's an interesting activity.

Here is one, however, which is very practical and is a broad, one-command process and nothing else but. And that process is: "Tell me a group you are no longer part of," or any phrase – phrasing thereof.

Thank you.
SEC-CHECKING:
TYPES OF WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 5 October 1961

Thank you.

Okay. This is the 5th of October, 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill. And I'm going to talk to you today about Security Checking. And boy, do you need a talk about Security Checking. Because what you don't know about Security Checking would fill volumes.

Now, of course, I am a very bad authority on Security Checking from a subjective point of view because you realize that if anybody went into my crimes, it would just be too grim. No auditor would be able to stand up to that. We realize that, you see? These crimes are so innumerable because they cover such a long period of time. That's the main thing.

So I'm not talking to you from the viewpoint of sinlessness. Now, you must get your point of view oriented there.

If I were talking to you from the point of view of total sinlessness – this is an optimum state which religiously people get into. They somehow or another lay the right pennies on the right altar and at that moment they become totally sinless. Then they can condemn everyone. And this gives them the right to condemn everyone, you see? And they can't approach this subject objectively. And unlike various people of the past who have said, "Repent ye. Repent ye. Ye kingdom of heaven is at ye hand," something of that sort, people who do have sins, you see, find it much easier to talk about the subject. They have some reality on the subject. And let me assure you that from my point of view, if I had it all to do all over again, I would probably do the same things. [laughter]

So I don't want to give you the false impression that I give you any lecture on the subject of Security Checking from the basis that my security, unlike yours, has been pure for 200 trillion years. That would make a very great unreality. No, amongst us boys and us girls, what we have all been up to, only could not bear the light of day because we think it couldn't bear the light of day.

Now, it's funny that every group that has sought to enforce sinlessness on one and all, with the stake, vast punishment, condemnation, assignment to hell – that is the, that was the primary mechanism: They give you a ticket straight to hell.

Doesn't work sometimes, by the way. There was a rash of murders – I've told you this story before, I'm sure – but there was a rash of murders up in the Eskimo tribes. And the
Royal Northwest Mounted Police went up there to get their man and they found out that there had been a missionary in the area. And the missionary had told all the Eskimos what was right and what was wrong and had convinced them, of course, that if they murdered anyone, they would go straight to hell and burn forever. And the idea of being warm enough for any length of time... [laughter]

So you see, lecturing from the high platform of sinlessness, you very often run into the creation of more sin than you get rid of. And what's interesting is that any group which wishes to blow itself to flinders simply has to engage upon an activity of making everybody guilty of their sins. It'll hang together for a little while and everybody will be miserable while it does, but it'll eventually blow up.

Why? Because it now gives people a complete map on how to accumulate withholds. The group mores defines what is a withhold. It says you must not be guilty of such sins and such sins and such sins and therefore and thereby blows itself to pieces, of course, because it says everybody that has committed these sins should withhold them, even though they are saying at the same time: "You must confess them." But they make confession, you see, rather rigorous.

Now, we have to understand this at the outset of Security Checking. Thou, the auditor, are not sinless. That's what we have to understand about it. And thou art not an enforcer of a public mores while thou art being an auditor. Thou art simply a Security Checker, period. You got it? You're not the avenging angels of the Mormon Church or something like this, see, while you're security checking. You're simply a person who is skilled in certain technology to attain a better frame of mind and actually a much greater honesty and decency on the part of somebody else.

You have the weapon in your hands with which to attain a greater decency, a greater state of health, a greater efficiency, a greater ability, higher ability for ARC – you've got the weapon in your hands with which to do this. There is the E-Meter and there is the Security Check, and there is you and your technology.

So you are going to be able to accomplish what groups have been trying to accomplish for a long time. You are going to be able to make an honest man or an honest woman. You have the weapon with which to do this. That's very important for you to realize, because all of these other mechanisms – such as, "make the person guilty," "show the person the right way," you see, "and the error of his ways," and frowning upon him and punishing him in some fashion or other because he's just gotten off a withhold – are mechanisms of older groups by which they sought to enforce their mores. Because they had no way to make honest people that was positive and lasting, then they used these very poor mechanisms of: "Make them good and guilty, punish them, show them what will happen to them if they do that again." All of these other things are added in. But what are those?

Those are the security mechanisms of yesteryear. Those are yesterday's tools. So you don't combine Scientology with other therapies. And that is all that you would be doing if you were trying to make somebody guilty and so forth, and doing something else with a Security Check rather than just getting off withholds.
So let us get down to a simplicity. You, the auditor, may have successfully waded through innumerable Sec Checks and be in good shape and so forth. That doesn't necessarily mean that "thou hast been without sin all the days of thy life." That hasn't anything to do with it, you see? It simply means that technically you've gotten up on this step. You were lucky. You came 200 trillion years along the track with red hands and black heads, and finally got out anyhow.

Well, that's beside the point. This point is important because if you, the auditor, are still worried about your own withholds or if you are trying to put up the presence of being – because you are a Scientologist and an auditor, and maybe a Release or something like that – if you're trying to put up the attitude, you see, that you yourself are sinless, then you will sometimes Q-and-A and avoid the other fellow's withholds.

In other words, you let the public sell you the idea that because you are a Scientologist, you should never have any sins. You get the idea? What have they done in essence? They have managed to bottle you up just like putting a cork in a bottle. Now you don't ever dare get off any withholds, you think, maybe, you see?

You can get into all kinds of odd cul-de-sacs, because we are still crossed up with the older therapy of condemnation and punishment and that was unworkable.

Let me point out that there are several people in prisons in the world. There are lots of people still doing penance in religious groups in the world. And if we add this up and recognize it clearly, we won't put ourselves in the same category. The old processes haven't worked. So don't let them work on you in reverse.

Don't ever get into a state where, because you are in a district or an area where you are holding the fort and keeping the torches burning, you never dare get off any withholds. You've permitted yourself to be sent on the road to hell. Do you see that? And your Security Checking would deteriorate. Inevitably your Security Checking would deteriorate. You would be afraid to ask people questions. You would start tacit consent. You'd start mutual avoidance of certain subjects. You get what I'm talking about, don't you?

The most serious barrier that an auditor has to overcome in Security Checking is not necessarily his own case, but a courage in asking – to ask the questions. You know, that's kind of a raw, mean, brassy sort of a thing to do.

You sit down. Here's this nice young girl. Everybody knows she's a virgin. Everybody knows this. And you're in very good ARC with her and everything is going to go along fine. And then you say to her, crassly and meanly, "Have you ever committed any carnal sins of any character or another? Have you ever been to bed in the wrong place at the wrong time with the wrong man?" [laughter]

And put it mildly, this is a startling question. But since I've started security checking, I haven't found any virgins. [laughter]

Well now, it requires a certain amount of brass, it requires a certain amount of nerve, to sit there and ask all these fantastic questions, you know? "Have you ever – robbed, murdered, burned, slain, gutted, lied?" you see? And it sounds like you must be sitting there running off a catalog of the penal codes of French Guyana or something, you know? And here
you go! And well, that's rough enough, if all of your withholds are off, that's rough enough. You sit down – perfectly inoffensive person – and you all of a sudden start asking him this sort of thing, you know?

Well, if you've got a whole bunch of withholds that you yourself are very afraid somebody is going to get next to, you will back straight off of the whole subject of Security Checking. And that is the only thing I see in the future of Scientology that could happen, is all auditors become "without sin" – they have never had any sin and because they are Releasors or Scientologists or something, you see, then they never dare get off their withholds because the students in the Academy might hear about it. And all sorts of catastrophic actions might occur. And their reputation is utterly smashed and ruined, you see? So therefore, the best thing to do, you know, is just kind of avoid the whole subject. And that's what they'll finish up doing, too – avoiding the whole subject. They won't have that additional élan necessary to ask this poor, little innocent girl, "Have you ever raped your baby brother?" you see? You know, it's just something that they would not bring themselves to be able to do, providing they themselves were actually withholding withholds. Do you see the point I'm trying to make with you here?

So you could get a broad and general disintegration if you permitted the public at large to insist that because a person was a skilled Scientologist and in good case shapes, he had never done anything wrong. You see how that could be added up on you?

Now, you'll find some Instructor in an Academy here and there, and he's thinking to himself "Uuughh! If the students ever heard about this – ." And you think somebody in the HGC and he's saying, "We-ell, I don't kno-ow. I don't kno-ow. I don't know. Last year – here's this whole subject of Security Checking coming up again and if they found out last year that after I audited that girl, why, that happened – ."

And he sits there and he starts sweating over this thing: "What would the D of P think? What would other auditors think? What would the organization think?" so on. And the next thing you know, he's sitting in session and the question comes up. He has to make the decision whether to security check this person or go on running the level. Oh, he will go on running the level every time. He'll avoid Security Checking.

That person who is avoiding Security Checking in his own life will avoid Security Checking of other people. And you can just mark your – mark it down that if you find somebody who is ducking Security Checks in all direction, you have somebody who will not security check.

You would be amazed how your Security Checking improves to the degree that you yourself have gotten through the Security Checks. It is absolutely fabulous. You can almost tell whether an auditor has withholds to the degree of skill that he security checks. And the worse his Security Checking is, the more certain you become that he has withholds. That's an interesting coordination, isn't it? And yet it's a visible one.

So that going up the line and on the long haul in Scientology, you actually could get to a point where the public insists that those people who are carrying along – because Scientology is getting more and more important – more and more important. You could actually get people running an operation on you. They would start running this old therapy, you see? Be-
cause you're the leading auditor in an area, or something of the sort, you therefore must never have done anything in your whole life. Doesn't follow. But what it operates as is an "ought to be." And you could surrender to this "ought to be" and therefore never permit yourself to be security checked because somebody might talk.

Do you realize that that action alone would slow down the whole forward impulse of Scientology by putting in lousy case shape every important auditor and person in Scientology? It could be done. And that is the Achilles' heel of Scientology. That is it. That we become so important that we must therefore – it follows in some peculiar way – be without sin, without mishap, without ever taking our finger off our number in life, and without ever forgiving it if somebody has. If we ever got into that state, we'd be finished. We'd be finished.

But we don't have to get into that state because we've got the tools which keeps a group together without the whip. See, the whip has become a useless and antiquated object. Like the electric shock machine, it can be dedicated to the museums of tomorrow.

Now, someday we're going to take one of these prisons here and set it up with dummies just as a showpiece of what man used to do. That's the only use you'll have for it.

You know, I think I ought to at this moment probably make you all members of a very secret society. [laughter] Speaking of withholds, there is a very secret society. It doesn't do much withholding, but it is very secret, mostly because nobody recognizes it as an actual society. They all think it's a joke, see?

The society's – is the SPG. And the SPG. And I'm now going to make you all members of the SPG. It's the Society for the Prevention of Government. [laughter] Interesting society. All you have to do to be a member of it is say you are.

You know, I don't think a single revolutionary charge of any kind whatsoever could be filed against a member of this organization. Because everybody prevents government to some degree, you see? It'd just be to what degree are we preventing government? The only thing governments get upset about is the overthrow of government by force, which means, of course, the setting up of another government on top of an existing government. We're – aren't interested in doing that. We're just interested in preventing government.

But anyway, the mechanisms by which man has been governed had in it the idea that man was evil and therefore had to be held in line by evil practices. And if man was evil, then he had to be held in line with evil. And they never noticed that the evil in the world stemmed totally from holding man in line. That was the fascinating part of it.

You have to have been a member of a police force to recognize that the police create crime. They do it quite unintentionally, but they do create crime. They get a game called "cops and robbers" going. In this game – every criminal busily plays this game. If there wasn't that much to it, why, there they'd be.

Well, for instance, there's some young fellow was walking down the street one day and he suddenly read his name in the newspapers and reported to the police. And for the next six or eight days he was sitting under the hot lights and they were questioning him and throwing him into cells and being mean to him and so forth. Actually, he hadn't done a thing. He hadn't even been there. He hadn't even been present. And they turned him loose after a while.
He's very relieved to have been turned loose. What do you think his ideas are going to be on the subject of police now?

Now, we start building it up from there. A society without ARC is a society which inevitably will have crime. Man is good, but he is only good to the degree that he's in ARC with existence. And when you throw him out of ARC with sections of society or whole governments at one fell swoop, he gives the appearance of being very bad. Actually, all he's trying to do is survive and protect himself and keep the thing from going all to hell. He has his own peculiar notions about how he does this and the primary mechanism he uses is withhold. That's how he thinks he can hold everything together – by withholding everything. The primary mechanism.

So the police are dedicated to making everybody withhold till the mores of the criminal mainly consists of: "You must not talk to the police." Well, that's quite interesting. "You mustn't talk to the forces of law and order." Ah, well, that's interesting. Well, that necessarily forces somebody further out of communication with law and order.

And if you think criminals are without government, you're mistaken. They have their own government. And a very wild, gruesome government it is, too.

But the society is forced apart to the degree that people are made guilty.

Now, why does a man wind up as a murderer? Well, he has long since resigned from the human race – long since. If you want to prevent a murder, you don't hang murderers. You make it unnecessary to resign from the human race. That's easy.

I'll give you a murder where the law was definitely at fault. Washington, DC. A taxi-cab driver – if I remember the story right – had a wife and this wife kept going off with another man. And he had a hard time of it because he tried to take the matter to court, he tried to get a divorce, he tried to quiet it down, he tried to hold the home together – he took every measure he could possibly take, but of course there was no law that would back him up. You see, he didn't have any evidence and he didn't have vast sums of money, you see, to buy detectives to accumulate this and that, you know? And there was nobody he could go to. And he got more and more and more seething about this, because he was basically out of communication, and he finally killed both of them.

Well, what was interesting to me about this particular case is that for two years this fellow had some sort of a grievance and there was no agency in society to remedy any part of that grievance; there was nothing he could do about it. So he finally did the last desperate jump. Now, of course, he himself had various withholds, but were these withholds actual or unintentional? And now we get to a very interesting subject: the unintentional withhold.

This is where you get your new ARC break process, by the way, in the rudiments – is the unintentional withhold. So it's quite important, this unintentional withhold. I mentioned to you yesterday that a person very often finds himself in a position and then considers he's guilty because he's in that position. He finds himself outside the group, so therefore he feels he must have done something to be expelled from the group, which is quite remarkable.
Well, this unintentional withhold is the same thing The person is not able to tell anybody. Now, it might be that there is nobody there to tell it to. He's not able to tell anybody. It's not that he wouldn't tell anybody if he could, but he can't tell anybody because there isn't anybody to tell it to or nobody will listen. And you'll find these all over insane asylums. You'll find people sitting around with unintentional withholds because nobody will listen to them.

They say, "Well, these bugs, they just keep crawling all over me," and the psychiatrist and everybody says, "Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. We know, we know, we know. Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes." And the person just knows he isn't reaching anybody and he just gets more and more fixed and obsessed with this idea of these bugs crawling over him, because it's an unintentional withhold. He doesn't intend to withhold it, but he finds himself in the position of doing so because nobody will listen.

So you must take into account this as a factor. It is a very important factor or I wouldn't have put it in your rudiments processes. "What weren't you able to tell an auditor?" Well, that makes a withhold. Well, you weren't unwilling to tell the auditor, you see? You were trying desperately to tell the auditor, but the auditor never listened.

And when you run this ARC break process, you are really knocking out unintentional withholds. And the results that you get from that particular ARC break process are quite similar to the results of a Security Check. But in this we're addressing some other subject. The Security Check is addressed to the more or less intentional withhold. But that ARC break process is addressed to an unintentional withhold. It is a withhold.

Now, there's many a criminal has walked in and said, "I've just murdered my wife," and the desk sergeant has swatted a couple of more flies and paid no attention to him. And he's walked outside and he's gone up to the cop on the beat and he said, "I just murdered my wife," and so forth. And nobody paid any attention to him and nobody ever found the wife. And he was perfectly willing to take the penalties of society, but nobody believed him. And you get the most peculiar kind of withhold there is. And you mustn't overlook this as a withhold in Security Checking. The unintentional withhold.

So that is, you might say, about the lowest rung of withholds. It's unintentional. He didn't mean to withhold it, but nobody will listen.

All right. Now we get the intentional withhold which is a withhold because he would be punished if he admitted it. And we get a different type of withhold although it has the same mechanism, produces the same actions.

And then there is another withhold: He must withhold it because it will damage his beingness – in other words, his reputation. Those are reputational withholds. He's got an idea of what people think his beingness should be and he's upholding his beingness by not admitting to certain withholds because other people might get another notion of him than the notion which he is trying to broadcast. So therefore he mustn't have reputational rumors and gossips and things of this sort of character. So therefore and thereby it's a reputational withhold. He hasn't really done anything. It's well, actually, his family came from the lower marshlands of the Thames or something, down in the mudflats of Southampton or something, you know?
And he just – well, ha-ha, ha-ha – he just wouldn't rather this be known, you know? His family, by advertisement, always came from upper Berkshire. It's quite interesting.

Now, familial connections aren't the least of it, you see? People are always trying to represent themselves as a little bit better. Well, that's fine. There's nothing wrong with that, but it results in a bunch of reputational withholds.

Now, between the last two categories there's a borderline category of things which, if they were out, people would think much less of him – you know, that kind of thing. He really wouldn't be punished, he isn't worried about it on account of beingness, he's just thinking, well, people wouldn't talk to him or something like that if they knew this sort of thing.

Well, if you'll notice, all these things add up to cut communication. And a group is based basically on communication. So a group falls apart to the degree that there is no communication and these are the three broad categories: the unintentional withhold, the withhold for fear of punishment and the withhold in its various grades that protect beingness. And these three things, of course, are all shattering to groups. They knock a group apart in a hurry, but in fact, up to a certain point, appear to cohere a group.

I don't know if you've ever been on Fifth Avenue or upper Fifth Avenue or in Hollywood or something like that and listened to what went on in lieu of reputation. It runs on something on the order of fifteen or twenty lies a minute when they're talking, you see? It's almost impossible to keep up with. And there's the most fantastic unreality about those particular groups. They are very unreal. And you get near those people, you see, and around in those groups, and you think, "Oooooooooo, I don't know," you know? It's a – . You don't quite know what's going on. You're just not quite sure what is – what is wrong there. But there just is something wrong. Well, what is wrong is that it's a group with totally cut communication lines.

Well, how can you have a group with a totally cut communication lines? Well, I guess they're the only people who will listen to each other's lies, so they stay together. Something on this order.

Now, a Security Check, or any method by which you are overcoming withholds, is dedicated to the restoration of communication. And it happens that if communication is totally restored, you see – if man knew what he was doing when he made people withhold slightly – with communications totally restored in any past group of which the fellow is no longer part, he will no longer be hung up in that group.

See, if you just restore his communication – it's just the ability to communicate; that's all you're restoring – why, you'll get this phenomenon of him no longer being parked on the track with that group. And that's the only thing you're basically doing. And those things which exist in present time, of course, prevent him from becoming a part of any group to which he is attached and so give him a basic isolation.

And of course the basic group with which you are working is not necessarily the group called Scientologists. The basic group with which you – which in itself is a powerful enough group and it has enough group to it by far – but the group in which you are doing the withhold is a group called a session: auditor and pc, you see? Now, that is a group.
And when the individual is too individuated and when he develops an unintentional withhold in that group, or the auditor conducts himself in such a way as to bring about punishment because of a withhold or a crime, or the auditor demands specious reactions from the pc, the auditor has shot the group.

It is a group. It's a group of two. Auditing is a third dynamic activity – even though sometimes it deteriorates into a second. And now and then deteriorates into a first. You burn your finger, and there's nobody around and you stand there and run it out.

Now, there, all three of these things must be pretty well patched up before you get a good group called a session. You've got to have the unintentional withholds off; that's for sure. Just try – you know the only thing that can deteriorate a profile in twenty-five hours is ARC breaks.

Now, if you're interpreting profiles – you find a profile and here it is, there it is, and the profile has dropped. Now, it is true that profiles move and they are pictures of valences and they do come on at the bottom and go to the top – all of that is also true. But the particularity we're speaking of now is where the person didn't do well and dropped: you can assume the pc was being operated with an ARC break.

Now, the basis of an ARC break is being made to have an unintentional withhold from that immediate group. And that, actually, apparently, from the immediate empirical results which one observes, is more serious than an actual withhold, intentional. An unintentional withhold in an auditing session reflects more seriously on the auditing group and on the results of processing than an intentional withhold. This is very interesting.

And now we move into another category. I'd hardly dignify the person with the title of "auditor" who pulled this one, but we have an enforced withhold on the basis of improved state. And you'll find this happens every once in a while. Some person who is pretending to audit gets no results whatsoever and then he shakes his finger in the pc's face and seeks to convince the pc that the pc has been much bettered by it all and is now Clear or something. And the pc thinks he had better not say anything to the contrary of this and you've got that third grade of withhold. You've got something there which is protecting beingness.

You see, he's now got a withhold. His withhold is he really didn't get any improvement and yet the auditor has forced him to admit that he got improvement. But actually what he's withholding is the fact that he didn't get any improvement, and if he said he didn't get any improvement, this would hurt his new status.

We just finish auditing the fellow, and you take him out in front of the PE and you say, "He's Clear." So now the fellow doesn't dare break down and say he's aberrated as hell and so you get one of these reputational withholds.

So all three kinds of withholds can occur in an auditing session. The unintentional, the intentional and the reputational. These three things can all occur as a result of an auditing session.

You very, very seldom find the third one occurring, because very few auditors are that bad. But you sometimes find a pc who is trying to propitiate and who is trying to tell the auditor that he feels much better now while his head is falling off, because he doesn't want to
make the auditor feel bad. You know the mechanism. So they don't want to make the auditor feel bad, so they say they feel better and they don't. Well, now they're sort of protecting their beingness in some fashion or other by a projection. They're protecting the auditor's beingness by not feeling any worse.

You'll find all of these mechanisms can be present in an auditing session. So where you get the idea of Security Checking -- and very odd, we very often develop a word in one field, you see, in one field of endeavor; and then we, because we have an agreement on that word, we develop a special term which is thereafter more or less meaningless to one and all. We all know what a Security Check is. A Security Check is something you do in processing to make the pc better.

Well now, how did that happen? Well, basically a Security Check was developed in order to weed out personnel and keep randomness from occurring in Central Organizations. And then Area Secretaries and Association Secretaries began to find that this made people much better, and the Area Secretary would be busy spending morning, noon and night and all the weekend trying to catch up with his Security Checking -- because sometimes they took, for one Security Check, twenty hours. So we get down to the *reductio ad absurdum* that Smokey told me about the other day: somebody actually turned in a whole bunch of overts on a written questionnaire against the Area Secretary in order to get another Security Check. [laughter] So I would say that at that point the idea of creating security with a Security Check was a -- not a very useful nor workable activity.

And yet we have this word. And I've two or three times halfheartedly started to change it over to the idea of processing check, and started to call it a processing check and so forth. But it still remains a Security Check.

Now we do have a Security Check, which is Form 7. There is an actual Security Check now in existence. So what do we call this Security Check? And I find myself, in writing a bulletin, getting into the interesting state of -- I write: "Now, you should security check -- the Area Secs should security check -- ." And then, well, how do I say this? So, the best way to say it is underscore security. So you have a Security Check and you have a Security Check.

So anyway, well let it ride, let it ride. It won't pull anything down if it stays that way.

So here we have -- here we have this thing called a Security Check. Well, basically, it's trying to establish a group which can engage in assistance. And no assistance can occur if there is no group there on the auditor to pc. So you have right in your rudiments there a method of getting around this. And you are asking the pc for all of his unintentional withholds when you say, "Is there something that you haven't been able to tell an auditor?" And you are really running a Security Check right at that point.

Well, of course the basic reply to it is, "What didn't an auditor do?" which would be the games-condition response that occurred at that moment. So these two questions go together rather powerfully. One of them is asking for an unintentional withhold and the other is asking for an auditor in a games condition. And they go *bing, bing, bing, bing*. And I think you find that since I dreamed up these new rudiments and tested them out, that you're doing much better.
I'll make a remark in passing about those new rudiments. There is an assessment that has to be done for the present time problem. I never bothered to remark on it. I thought you'd latch that as you went by.

It says, "What is unknown about that," or some such wording, "problem with blank?" Now, you can't run a condition as the blank.

The pc says, "Uh well, I'm terribly worried, I'm terribly worried about the airiness of everything."

Well now, the auditor then can't put the thing together as, "What is unknown about that problem with the airiness of everything?" You'll find this is nonfunctional.

What you've got to do is do a little assessment and get him to state the problem more exactly. And you do the assessment on the meter. And you try to find the terminal that is airy or the terminal that is everything. And you shake that down and you do a little bit of a terminal assessment and he suddenly comes up and he says, "Well, the airiness of the room," or something of that sort, or "The airiness of my car. It hasn't any hood anymore." [laughs]

And you would run it, if you had to, by that time. You see, you only run those things which you can't get rid of with two-way comm or assessment. You realize that, don't you? That running is the way you take care of the things that didn't blow. So you always be prepared to have an ARC break, a present time problem or anything else blow before you had to run it. You just start doing an assessment on one of these undifferentiated problems and you'll find it doesn't react anymore.

And you repeat the question, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" And, you see, you had some enormous surges on the meter and so forth. And you say, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" before you settle down to run the thing and you can't even get a quiver on it, see? You've blown it by assessment.

All right. Now, the pc who has a present time problem that the auditor will not take up is being given a withhold. So there is another source of withholds that cross at the present time problem level. But at the same time, the pc will very often try to withhold present time problems because he's afraid the auditor will take them up and waste session time. Because auditing is very valuable. All PCs consider auditing time very, very, very, very, very valuable. There just isn't enough auditing. That's it.

And this gets so catastrophic that a pc will force auditing where it shouldn't occur in some direction: He wants the auditing that is necessary to resolve his case, not the auditing which is just fooling around with those fool rudiments, you see – and will actually sometimes attempt to withhold a present time problem for fear that the auditor will take it up.

All right. Now, the action of running a Security Check is a relatively simple action. It requires a high degree of familiarity with the meter so that you aren't fumbling with the meter. It requires a very definite, positive knowledge of the E-Meter. It requires, in addition to that, a knowledge of whether or not the needle is reacting on the question or on the parts of the question. You have to know how to compartment a question. You have to know how to make the E-Meter tell the truth. And that is sort of high-school E-metering
People who didn't know much about E-Meters – I think there was somebody in – I think it was almost into Canada (someplace in the United States; they were just about as far – as close to not being in the United States as they could be) got the idea that everybody had been PDHed throughout the United States by everybody else. And this became ridiculous in the extreme. And they were going all over telling everybody how everybody was PDHing everybody and they were just having a marvelous time. And they were getting out magazines about the subject, and so on.

And the most awful quiet ensued. There was a quiet where you could have heard an engram drop, you know? [laughter] Because after I explained compartmentation in an article in *Ability* magazine, well, you know, we never heard another word. It is the most profound silence. It is a sort of a negative silence. It has texture.

Well, that's because of this: That whole nonsense took place because somebody couldn't really handle an E-Meter; they didn't know how to compartment questions. So if you ask anybody if he had ever been the **victim** of **pain**-**drug**-**hypnosis**, well, of course you were going to get a fall, a fall, a fall and a fall, because you get falls on just the word **victim**. you get falls on just the word **pain**, you get falls on just the word **drug**, and you will occasionally get falls on just the word **hypnosis**. And if a person has withholds on somebody else, you will get a fall on that other person's name – if you got withholds and overt's on some particular line. So there's a source of five falls in one question.

"Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis from President Eisenhower?" [laughter] Five falls. You see, it's falling on the words of the question. It isn't falling on the question. And the way you do that is you take the question apart. You knock out – just say the word: "Victim." And you get a fall. You say, "What was that?"

"Well, victim."

Well, what – what not?

"Well," you say, "what about victim?"

"Well, I always hate to be a victim."

"Well, what the heck. Have you ever made any victims? Have you ever accused anybody of being a victim?"

"Oh yes, my wife. She's being a victim all the time, all the time. Always a victim. Yes, yes, yes, yes, always a victim. And she says so, what's more."

"Oh, is that so? 'Victim.'" No reaction. Ah, we got that word cooled. "All right. Pain." *Clang!* goes the needle, you see? And you say, "Well, what about pain?"

"Oh, I've always been afraid of pain."

"Well, what about the word **pain**?"

"Well, oh, the word **pain**. Oh-ho-ho. Oh, you mean the word **pain**."

"Yeah. Well, how about the word **pain**?" No reaction.
"Okay. Drug Have you ever taken drugs? You ever give anybody drugs? Are you afraid of drugs? Anything wrong with drugs? Have you ever given anybody any drugs illegally?" Clang! "When did that happen?"

"Oh, well. My mother was very sick and I forged a prescription."

"Oh, is that so? Oh, how interesting. All right. Now, when was that?"

"Oh, such and such a time."

"All right. Thank you very much. Drug." No reaction. See?

"President Eisenhower." Clang, clang, clang, clang, clang. "What about President Eisenhower?"

"Oh, nothing. I was part of a ban-the-bomb march, and we said we'd dance on his grave. Yeah. That's what that was. Yeah."

"Is that all there is to that?"

"Well, yes. I've been violently opposed to that particular activity."

"Oh, yeah. All right. How many – how often have you done that?"

"Oh, lots of times. Lots of times."

"All right. How about President Eisenhower? Okay." No fall.

"Now, have you ever been the victim of pain-drug-hypnosis from President Eisenhower?" Now, if the person has, you will now get a fall on the question. And if you want to be absolutely sure, go back all through all the words again and compartment them.

Now, there is more to it than this on compartmentation. I noticed the other day one of the boys didn't have it quite straight. And that is, you compartment the phrases in addition to the words. You take the words and get the charge off them. And then you take the phrases and read the phrases out and see if each phrase is clean.

And then when you read the whole question, let me assure you that if there is a fall, it is true. There is no withhold or charge on it unless it is true. And there won't be a single needle quiver. And that is the proper way of compartmenting a Security Check question. And you'll find you very often have to compartment them quite painfully. Otherwise, you'll make some fantastic error.

Now, the first and foremost method of preventing yourself from making an error is to forget all about two needle phenomena. One of the needle phenomena you should forget about is the latent read. Just ignore all latent reads. Have nothing to do with a latent read. If the read occurred more than half a second after you finished the question read, ignore it. Just ignore it. Just drop it. Because it'll be on somebody else or is on another Security Check question. It isn't on the same question or it didn't happen to them.

Now, that's how come you sometimes wind up getting off other people's withholds. Other people's withholds will give you a latent read. So you are buying latent reads. You ask somebody, "Well, did you ever drown a cat?"

"Well, my Aunt Mamie drowned a cat once."
This would be the response. Now, that would be a latent read. You would get that as a latent read. And every time you pick up a latent read on a Security Check question, you can expect that you haven't got a withhold, you've got a red herring. And you can go chasing all over the bank looking for this red herring. And you waste more time on latent reads than any other single action in auditing.

That read, if the person has a withhold on it, let me assure you the question does not wear out. If the person is still holding onto a withhold on that question and it's not on one of the words of the question, it's not on one of the phrases of the question – nothing of that sort – but is on the question: the more you ask it and the more he withholds, the more instant the read. It gets so that he just realizes you're going to ask the question again, you get the read. There isn't a tenth of a second lag.

You read the question – pang – it's acting. You read the question – bang! – it's acting. Read the question – bang! – it's acting.

You see, the reactive mind is an instantaneous mind. All time is now. And if it's a really reactive mind, of course, the closer it is to reactivity, the more rapid and instant the read will be. And it's as simple as that. It is very simple. And if it is not reactive, the read will be latent. It will wait before it falls. It'll wait for half a second. It'll wait for a second.

And an auditor who sits there and asks the question: "Have you ever drowned a cat?" watching the E-Meter, and then gets a reaction, and then says, "What was that?" is going to find Aunt Mamie drowning a cat. And it was something the pc didn't do and it was something the pc never has withheld. You can just count on that.

One of the tricks of reading, one of the bad tricks of reading on latent reads – is to look at the meter, then look at the question, then read the question, then look at the pc, then look at the meter. You'll catch more latent reads that way and boy, will you miss more instant reads. You will just miss them left and right. Why? Because your eye isn't on the E-Meter at the moment you ended the question. And your eye must be on the meter needle the instant that you end that question. Otherwise, you're going to miss the twitch. So what you do is – the sequence is always: question, look at the meter and speak the question and then look at the pc. Paper, meter, pc.

Paper: You see that the question is about rape. You don't care whether the question is exact or not. That is to say, "Have you ever raped anybody?" You can ask that in a thousand different ways. "Have you ever contemplated rape?" "Have you ever had ideas of rape?" "Do you – have you ever remembered anything odd about rape?" "Has something odd to you – " like this. And you're going to get down to some kind of a withhold if there is one. So you look at the question and then you look at the meter and you say the question and then you can look at the pc all you care to. And you won't get into this nonsense about latent reads.

The way I see auditors doing this is they look at the paper and they read the question and then they look over at the E-Meter and then they wait and they wait and they wait and they wait and they wait and they wait. And the question is, what the hell are they waiting for? Because it would have occurred in a tenth of a second. If you're going to follow it through, it would have occurred in a tenth of a second. And that's the way you security check. Man, you can really tear down the line if you do that. Yeah. You can really rip up
a Security Check. Whammity, whammity, whammity, wham. Pc doesn't even have to speak.
You look at the paper: "Have you ever raped anybody?" Nothing. That's all.

Now, if you want to go at this a little more academically, you never look at the meter at all until the pc says "no." The Security Check can be totally without the meter right up to the point where he says "no," at which time you repeat the question looking at the meter. And that makes for very good sessioning. When you find you're doing this easily, oh man, it just goes on and on and on.

Why are you looking at the meter if you're not trying to catch him out? See? You're trying to find out if something is reactive. That's why you're looking at the meter. Well, if the guy is going to tell you his withholds, why are you looking at the meter? That's what it amounts to.

You say, "Well, have you ever robbed a bank?"

And the pc says, "Well, if you put it that way, yes. – I uugh-uh – yes, I robbed a bank," and so forth.

And you say, "When was that?" and so on, so on, so on, so on, so on. You can go a little further. "Who've you been withholding it from?"

"Oh, I've been withholding it from everybody," and so forth. "My fellow bank robbers. I didn't want them to know that – ," so forth, and then, etc., yap-yap, and so on. They got it all – they got it squared around. Good.

And you say, "All right. Now, you ever robbed any other banks?"

"Well yes, I did," and so forth. "And that was pretty bad," and so forth, and etc.

And you say, "Okay. Well, have you ever robbed a bank?"

Pc says, "Aside from those, no."

You say, "Good. Have you ever robbed a bank? Yes, what's that? What's that next one?"

"Oh well, that's just that little old bank down in Joliet." [laughter] "That'd hardly count." Got the idea?

Then you finally ask him again, "All right. Have you ever robbed any other banks?"

"No."

You look back at the meter, you say, "Well, have you ever robbed any other banks?" Meter's quiet. Go on to the next question.

You never look at the meter until he says no. You'll find out that really holds them in-session, man. That's very good sessioning when you can do it this way.

Now, the only bug that occurs when you do this is that you're repeating the question and apparently calling him a liar slightly. But you'll find out this isn't very damaging. He's already told you no, and so you confirm it.
Now, leaving a question hot is another very damaging action on an E-Meter. That's a very damaging thing to a session. Oh, that is something you mustn't do – leave a question with reaction on it. Don't ever go to the next question as long as a question is reacting. And don't ever go on to the next question unless you're absolutely sure that the question you are on has no further instant actions in it. Remember, we care nothing about the latent action.

There's no instant action left in a question, you can go on. And if there is, don't you dare! Because if anything is calculated to throw a pc out of session from there on out, man, let me tell you, it is leaving a question hot.

You know, there's been considerable randomity occurred because of this occasionally. HGC pc, and end of session comes along and – . One girl ran all over town telling everybody how Scientologists were all frauds and they were bums and how they were all trying to rape her and shoot her and so forth. And she actually blew the HGC and wrote letters to everybody that night before they could finally get hold of her. And finally they trailed her down and – they heard the rumors going around and they wondered what all this was about, so they traced them back down and they found this one girl. And they got her down and the question was something like "Have you ever committed adultery?" And boy, it was just falling off the pin. It wasn't an instant read. It was just – it was blowing up before the auditor could open his mouth, you know? Bang! Bang! And they got these fantastic withholds off of her, and that was it.

"Oh," she said, "I guess I committed an awful series of overts," and she hurriedly did a volte-vis and tried to straighten up everything she'd been doing.

But look at that. Isn't that interesting? It just – one question, and I think it was an end-of-intensive question. And the auditor just foolishly said, "Well, it's the end of the intensive, and that's it." Never flattened the question. I haven't got that particular particularity, but I do know that the rest of it did happen. They had about ten people running all around trying to round up what all this was about. It was just an unflat Security Check question. And you just mustn't leave questions unflat. Sure, take them up in the next session. You've got to, sometimes, because one question can go five hours – has done so.

The fellow is the father of eight children. And you ask him the question, "Have you ever spanked a child?" And he already feels awfully guilty about this and he's left his family and this is a great point of disturbance with him and the punishment of children is a very hot subject and so forth. And, man, you can just go on and on and on and on with this particular subject.

He's just getting off withholds and getting off withholds and getting off withholds. No one cares how long it takes to clear a question as long as the auditor is working on the clearance of a question, not getting off somebody else's withholds through the pc, not trying to find out what the pc thought or heard or did about somebody else. We're interested in the pc's withholds. And as long as the auditor is getting actual withholds off the pc on instant reads, continue with the question.

The only way you can waste auditing time on the thing is to just wait there for the latent read and then take that latent read. The read occurs two and a half – three seconds after you've read the question. You read the question ... fall. You say, "What was that?" You
knucklehead. You're immediately going to get something like this: "Well, I just thought it was getting awfully late." That's true. That's what it fell on. Didn't have anything to do with the question. Or, "Oh well, yes. That made me think of a book I read once that I wasn't supposed to read."

Look, this is a question about stealing, see? "Have you ever stolen anything?" See? Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait – clang! "Well, what was that?", you say on the latent read.

"Oh well, that was a book, I guess. I – I was thinking about this book."

"What about this book?"

"Well, I read this book. Well, it would – it talked about stealing."

"Oh well, what about that?"

Well look, knucklehead, nothing about that, you see? I mean, it – there just isn't anything. It doesn't have anything to do with it except the pc's mind was out of gear for the moment. It's like finding the gear wheels disengaged, you see? And you sit there and wait, and eventually the pc is going to think about something, isn't he? And if you wait long enough, you'll always get a reaction, even if it's just on the ARC break of "Why are you so damn quiet?" [laughter]

It's factual, and it follows through. Serious withholds or withholds that should be gotten off the case or have anything to do with a case and all the things that the person himself hath done, are as a result of an instant read. And you must follow through on that particular basis.

All right. The next thing that you should pay attention to, besides clearing every question as it goes on down the line – the next thing you should pay attention to, is selecting the type of Security Check. This is very important.

There is no sense in security checking somebody on something he has nothing to do with. That is rather frightful. Let's say that we have a special Security Check on the subject of boilermakers, see? So we get this girl who is a milliner. And we run a Security Check on boilermakers on this milliner. And we say, "Well, she's got clean hands because she didn't have a single fall." Well, that's for sure.

Similarly, it is equally an error to take a generalized Security Check when you know very well your pc has a particularized professional or action area. If this pc is living by some particular framework of mores – . Well, let's say you're security checking a person who professionally, this life, right now, is a bank teller. Well, all right. That might go along all right and so forth. But you just never seem to get around to writing up some additional questions to give him as a Security Check. And of course, you'll miss it every time. You just give him the generalized form of the check, and it only hits banks on about three questions. Now, you yourself have to be able to project your imagination and initiative with regard to that situation.

You'd say, "What would be the withholds of a bank teller? What would they be?"

And of course, it turns up at once what they would be. We're liable to find something like this: He has to stand in back of this cage all the time and he hates people. And the word
of the bank is that you must be pleasant to all the customers as you take in the money. And you must stand there with a smile on your face, you see, and take in the money and pay out the money. And you just can't figure out what's wrong with this guy's job, see? He's unhappy and he isn't doing well and nothing is going on and so we give him a general Security Check and it goes on and on, but it never takes into account what the man does in life. You get the idea? Now that is a floob. That is – comes under the classification of a boob.

We do put one together around what we think a bank teller might possibly have as withholds and then we find all sorts of very interesting things. He has held a deposit for twenty minutes so one of his customers, you see, wouldn't be overdrawn. Interesting thing. Nothing very much, but it was something to him, because, man, are you supposed to have those deposits right into the drawer and they're supposed to pass down the endless belt and go into the machines and so forth, and so on.

And he actually has, on his own initiative, which is just – that's pretty adventurous – has actually put his fist into the machinery of the bank and he has held it for twenty minutes. And that is a withhold to him.

And then you find maybe he's standing there with all kinds – every time a customer comes up he has a game that he plays on something on the order of an unkind thought. And he just has nothing but long streams of unkind thoughts. Every time somebody comes up – bzzzzzzzz, got this long thing.

And you ask him the right question – you say, bank teller. Well all right, bank teller – he must have customers. And you say, "Well, have you ever had an unkind thought about a bank customer?" And you're liable to run into an avalanche. And it'd just sit on that case till the end of time unless you yourself security checked against the reality of the pc. That you must always do. Whatever else you do with Security Checks, also security check against the reality of the pc. And that takes into account the moral codes by which he lives.

Now, you security check a Catholic some time or you security check a Baptist and you'd have two different Security Checks. They'd be different. You security check an Afrikaner and security check a Zulu. You're going to have two different Security Checks, man. And they're almost vis-à-vis different Security Checks. Almost everything one thinks is right, the other thinks is wrong.

Who's to say who's right or who's wrong? That hasn't anything to do with it, which is why I gave you a little bit about the moral note at the beginning of it. The rights and wrongnesses of things are what groups have determined on in order to perpetuate survival. And that's the rightnesses and wrongnesses of things. It's what is survival to the group, not whether you are enforcing the mores of a group because you are so sinless. So you have to actually be able to security check both sides of the fence.

Now, security checking a cop would be quite different than security checking a criminal, of course. Security checking a soldier would be quite different than security checking a chambermaid. It would be different.

So if you omit specialized Security Checking and putting together a list of questions that concern the activities of the person – if you omit this entirely, you've booped.

Your job is not to run a repetitive question at all, but to get off withholds. The auditing consists of getting off withholds.

Well, how do you get off withholds on the subject of rape? Well, some fellow says, "Well now, I just don't want to answer any questions about that at all. No, I just don't think you'd better be asking me any question. Let's go on to the next one. We'll still be friends. But we'd better go on to the next question." [laughter]

Well, how are you going to get around that? You can still ask the question, "What have you got against rape?"

"Oh," he'll say, "well, it isn't what I have against rape, it's what other people have against rape."

"Well, who has things against rape?"

"Well! My mother and my father and the public and the preacher and the parson and the state," and so forth.

"Well, when did all these come down on you on the subject of rape?"

"Well, that was when I got in the newspapers on the subject." [laughter]

"Oh, when was that?"

That is what is known by pulling a withhold from the back door.

Now, the next thing you must remember is that a withhold is generally a withhold of an overt act against the mores of a group. Now, actually, the enforcement of the mores of the group to make other people withhold is the overt act of withholds. Trying to make – you get the idea? You're enforcing the mores of the group against another person to make them withhold.

It's the overt act of making people withhold, see? So you err whenever you don't ask the "make guilty" question.

You can take every Security Check you've got and simply add an additional question below each level on: "Well, have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?"

You get this girl. She keeps telling you, "I have been raped. It isn't that I am withholding raping somebody; I have been raped." And the question is still hot.

And you say, "How in the name of common sense am I ever going to clear this question? How am I going to clear this question? How could I possibly clear the question? Because she just says – and of course she's an offended member – no, she hasn't raped anybody. She's been raped." Well, if you Q-and-A and just go off and say, "Well, we're not security checking now. She has a bad engram and we might as well run this engram and find out all about all of this rape and when she was raped and so forth," are you still security checking or are you doing something else? You're doing something else. You are auditing processes, you
are running engrams, but you're doing something else. You're not security checking so you don't stop security checking and start doing something else. You go on security checking. In other words, gets off the withholds. But of course, the overt act of a withhold is making somebody else withhold. And of course, the moment you ask the question, "Well, whom have you made guilty of rape?"

"Oh, well" – you get a nice big meter reaction, and "Him, of course, and him and him and them and them and them and them and them and them and them," and so forth.

"Well, have you made anybody else guilty of rape?"
"Yes. Well, them and them and them."
"All right. Anybody else you made guilty of rape?"
"Uh, well, no."
"Anybody else you made guilty of rape? What was that?"
"Well, it's just – I'm just restimulated by the whole thing."
"Well, have you – have you ever raped anybody?"
"Yes."

In other words, the "make guilties" all lay on top of an actual fact. She been raped all right, but Shakespeare's statement "Methinks the lady protest too much" can be Hobson-Jobsoned over: "Methinks the pc protest too much."

And whenever the pc protests too much, you are looking at the boiling broth. And you might as well pick the pot up and look under it, because you're going to find fire.

"You shouldn't be asking me that question. It is insulting." Oh, man. Why don't they run up a signal halyard and fly fifteen flags from it, you know; get blinking lights going in your face? Because that is the one question that is hot. And of course a person who has fantastic motivators which just keep rocking and rocking and rocking. The person says "Well, I haven't ever raped anybody; I have been raped. And that is why it is falling."

No, remember your original question was, "Have you ever raped anybody?" and you got an instant read. And the facts of the case are that the pc has, but the pc has tried to make other people guilty to such an extent that this lies on the top of it as the overt from the withhold motivator. Do you see? So there's what you got.

So you ask the "made guilty" questions any way you want to phrase it. "Have you ever protested against?" "Have you ever accused?" Do you see? This type of questioning for each subject matter of a Security Check will be found to be very, very beneficial in freeing up a whole security question; because, of course, it is making other people withhold and when you get the overt off, then the pc gives up his withhold. It's not actually, you see, an additional question. It is another way of asking the same question.

And then you come back and you always leave a Security Check question that has fell [fallen] – you always leave it with the same wording that you asked it in the first place that
produced the fall. Never miss that. And that is usually, for your ease, the way it is written on the paper.

You've been asking all sorts of things about rape. You said, "Well, have you ever made anybody guilty of rape? Have you ever – rape?" and so forth and so on. And "All right. Have you ever had unkind thoughts about rapists? What have you done? Have you ever wished you were raped?" Doesn't matter, whatever you were asking, you see? What produced the reaction – the reason you're asking these questions – is: "Have you ever been raped?" And the question you're trying to clear is the one that produced the reaction. So you always repeat that question in the same wording to see if there's any additional reaction before you leave it. And then you're sure that that question is clean. No matter how many other variations you ask – and you should ask variations in order to get the thing cleaned up – you go back to the same question again before you leave it.

In other words, always go out by the same door you entered. Don't go ducking out the side door. You've cleared up have they ever made anybody guilty of rape, see? So you say, "Well, that's it. Well go on to the next question."

Oh, you missed and you will leave a question hot if you do that.

All right. I've tried to cover here some of the elements of Security Checking.

You can tailor up Security Checks any way you want to. You can always add to a Security Check. You can always add to a Security Check.

You may never subtract from one. The reason why we lay that injunction down is that somebody who has a withhold on a subject who runs into it on a list will then not be tempted to avoid it.

And you would be fascinated at some of the Security Check questions being made up by people who have buttons on the subject. You never quite read as much of an avoidance as you get when you do that. You take somebody who's sitting down here in Dartmoor Scrubs and have him write a Security Check up on the subject of criminals, and you get a three-question check.

But you ask him to write – he has never been a soldier – and you ask him to write a Security Check question on the subject of soldiers and he writes you eighteen pages. It's quite interesting.

But people subtract from Security Checks where they have withholds. So you lay down this injunction; you say: "Always give the standard Security Check; add anything to it you please. Write up any special check you care to, as long as you give a standard check, too."

And then that keeps anybody from ever indulging in tacit consent and avoiding a question because "We know, of course, that this person has never stolen anything from the organization. Of course we know that, so we just won't ask that question." And sometimes a person does this in all innocence. It just seems to him like the question would not produce any particular result. That's all there is to it. And then somebody asks him the question and it goes hotter than a pistol.
And he says, "But I never have! I just never have." And you go tracing it down, and he has. He actually doesn't remember having done so. But the meter knows.

And the one final injunction on this is, please believe the instant read of the meter. A person who is telling you a lie, a person who has a withhold, gets an instant read on the question. And if they're getting a read, a needle reaction, there is a withhold. And never buy anything else.

I have seen a slug of hours of duration with the needle continuing to react and the pc saying "No" and almost in tears over it, because the pc cannot remember, the pc cannot differentiate it, the pc cannot tell what that withhold is. It just doesn't seem to elude anybody. And for the auditor to leave it is a serious error, because at the end of those hours, so help me Pete, it was found, and it did clear.

Now, I've had people with some pretty nasty withholds on the meter. And I've never failed to have the meter react when the question was charged so long as it was against the moral code of the person I was checking. That was the important point. And it's quite interesting to watch it. It will not wear out. The question will not wear it out. That is what is fascinating. You can ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it. And it won't wear out. It'll just produce, if anything, a little faster reaction. Until the withhold is given up, the action occurs.

So don't ever think your meter is busted. Make sure that your meter isn't before you start the session. That's the time to make sure the meter is all right, not in the middle of the session, thinking, "Well, it's just reacting. This rock slam must be because some dust has gotten into it." No, the rock slam is coming from a withhold if you're on a Security Check. Okay?

Male voice: Right...

All right. Well, I hope this clarifies a few points for you on the subject of Security Checking 'cause you're going to find this is a very, very important subject. It's going to be with us for a very, very long time. It's one of the basic skills of the auditor and is the first thing that an auditor should know how to do very, very well. He should know how to security check well. Because you can do anything under the sun, moon and stars with a Security Check. You can do anything with it. And the better you are at handling the basics and fundamentals of Security Checks, then the better you will be at making them work.

Thank you.
PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

A lecture given on 10 October 1961

What is the date here? The 10th of…?

Audience: Tenth of October.

Tenth of October 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, supposing, supposing just for fun, supposing that Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing that was a fact. And supposing this was all perfectly true. And when you got processed, why, all of these problems would resolve, everything would straighten out, and there was no vast difficulty of any kind. And this was the answer. And man hadn't had the answer before, but now we've got the answer. Now supposing all that were absolutely true. Now, just a moment now; supposing that were all true, completely true, and that was totally factual and that was it. Got that?

Now just supposing that were all perfectly true: What would your problem have been before you came into it? What would your problem have been before you came into it? Just before you came into Dianetics and Scientology, what would have been your personal problem in existence? Can you answer that question? Hm-hm. Is this a new look? Have you just suddenly realized something? Hm? Have you? Have you just suddenly realized that there was a problem there immediately before you came into Dianetics and Scientology?

Do you get a somatic at the same time? No?

All right. Now let's sort it out again. Was that really the problem you had? Was that really the problem you had? Has that problem been carrying along since?

Audience: Yes. [amusement in audience]

All right. Now I've just been giving you the approach you should use on a PE. That is the approach you should use on a PE.

Supposing Dianetics and Scientology were everything that they were supposed to be – and you can go on, of course, ad infinitum, and add it all up. And there's one old bulletin I wrote about a year ago, or something like that, that give all of its firsts. What is Scientology? And that gives a tremendous number of firsts that Scientology had – for the first time this, for the first time that. Supposing all this were true? And then you ask the people after you had carried on this way for about a half an hour and described Scientology to them completely,
and give them the broadest possible description of it, then ask them what would their problem be that would make them come to this?

Now, of course, you're old-timers. You've been processed a long time. Most of these things are dead and gone and long buried, but not with a group you'll get on PE. It will take their heads off. And that should be the first lecture given on a PE course. I got that taped. Take it from me. That is a piece of technology, not a piece of propaganda nor administration.

Why? What exactly are you doing? What exactly are you doing? You're giving them a stable datum. You're punching it in. You're making a conditional stable datum. And then if you carried it on that this was a very desirable stable datum, if it were true and if it existed – you keep adding that in – this is a very desirable stable datum, you, of course, have restimulated that basic problem of continued, long-time worry and agony up to a point where it's ready to blow their heads off. And then you ask them, "What was your problem? Why did you come to Scientology? What problem do you have that has driven you to this?"

Now, every other group in the history of man would at once conceal this tremendous mechanism, because it would hold a group together endlessly just because they're pressured in. If they never gave them the answer, if they never had anything out of it, they would be pushed together by the duress. They would be told all the time that this was it, and this was the exact thing, and so forth, and there they were, and it would restimulate that problem if processing or something of that sort was not adequate to relieve it. But we are rich in technology, and we have a little more nerve than that, so you could actually ask them the first crack out of the box.

A lot of them there for the first time, you could ask them just bang! "What is the problem that would cause you to accept this? What problem do you have in your personal life that would bring you to us?" Well, of course, you've keyed it in, only they haven't noticed it being keyed in. And when you ask them, of course, the problem is just staring them in the face.

And on a certain percentage of these people, you will produce a fundamental and startling change in case. Just like that! Bang! You'll turn on somatics on them in many instances, but they will be happy to have them, because they'll say, "Oh, is that what that is? Oh, is that what this is all about?" And they will have a personal recognition.

Now you can go on and describe to them what processing is, how problems are relieved, that sort of thing, and go ahead just from that point of view.

You could send them into a co-audit or into the HGC. And it would be better, actually, to send them to the HGC than into a co-audit. It's always better, in spite of the fact that they can fool around for a long time in a co-audit – unless you've got a co-audit running that is going to do something about problems. And if we're going to use that kind of an approach, then we had better doctor up the co-audit so it takes care of that exact situation.

We're not dealing with what the co-audit would do about this. We're dealing, actually, with what a Class II Auditor would do about this – a Class II Auditor.

We have a new series of classifications. A Class I Auditor is simply an auditor who runs anything, and that Class I exists for just two purposes. First and foremost, it lets an old-timer, who has a stable datum that a process will work, actually do auditing for you without
training, so as to give him an opportunity to get trained while he audits. That is an administrative problem in HGCs, and is an administrative problem in any clinic or any center. You have that basic administrative problem. You have people around, and instead of training them for nineteen weeks, or something like this, before they do a speck of auditing for you, you give them something on which they have reality and let them go ahead, because they will win with it, and they will get some wins, and it'll be a passable show. And this gives you an opportunity at the same time to train these auditors up to a Class II. And we're talking now about, really, Class II. I've just given you the key question, disguised as a PE question, that will take apart any case, providing you go at it right. And there is a new rundown, which you will see very shortly. It's just like a Preclear Assessment Sheet. And it has two new sections on the end of the Preclear Assessment Sheet.

Now, you know that anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet – anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet. You can sit there and ask these questions and fill out these forms, and you can get the data from the pc and there it is. Do you agree with me that that's a fairly easy thing to do?

_Audience: Hm-mm. Yeah._

All right. Now, what if you had a process which added a section on top of that, which asked them simply some more similar questions and got you a list of things; and then you had a new section on top of that which you just filled in as you process the exact processes given in that new section? That would be a very easy thing to handle.

There's your O section, and that asks a certain series of things and asks for a certain series of circumstances, and you get – you just write down this new series of circumstances from the pc, and then when you've got those, you read them off to the pc and notice the needle reaction of the E-Meter for each one. And you take your steepest or most reactive needle reaction. You don't do it by elimination. You just read it off and you say, "Well, it fell off the pin or wobbled more than otherwise."

You just take that one, and then with that datum which you've gotten out of the O section, we move over into the P section. And in that section we take that one datum and we just do this, and then we write down we have done that; and we do this, and we have written down we do that; and then we process this exact process for a while, and then we write down that the tone arm isn't moving anymore on this process; and then we do this, and then we do the next, and we write down each time we've done one of these things and we come down to the end of it.

Now, that is one P section. And the P sections are interchangeable – I mean, they're additional. So we take the same form that we've got now, including the O section, and we do this assessment again down through the O section, and we get the biggest read we get this time. And we move over and do a whole new P section. And we finish that whole new P section, and so forth, we lay that aside, we go back to the O section, and we go down the whole list of the O section, and then we write down what was the steepest reaction now; we take that one and we move over into the P section, and we do it down the same form of the P section. We just keep doing this. That is a Class II action, and that is a very easy one to do.
It includes the rudiments' Problems Process, and it includes a Security Check on the people in the prior confusion.

Now, I'll give you the modus operandi by which this is done.

O section simply asks for changes in the person's life. It asks for them specifically: Times their life changed, and it makes a list of each one of these things – whether that life changed because of death or graduation or anything else, we don't care. We just write down this particular point of change.

And now, because the pc has not noticed the most significant points of change – if he has, it's all right, but if he hasn't, it's all right – we've got a series of new questions: "When did you take up a certain diet?" "When did you join a certain religious group?" "When did you decide you had better go back to Church and go back to Church?" You get all this type of question. We fill out a whole bunch of these questions. And they're all what? They're all major change points in a person's life.

Here's the sleeper: Each one of these change points must be eventually taken up in the P section, because the P section asks, after the assessment is done, for the problem which they had immediately before the change – and you knock their heads off. That is the prior problem combined with the prior confusion. And the two things are deadly.

You find each time they had a problem just before that change, and that the change was a solution to the problem. And therefore, the problem has been hung up ever since because they solved it. That is the sleeper. And of course, just before that problem, there was a hell of a confusion. So you're going to take up the problem. Now let's see how this would be done. O section – we ask them this long list of changes. It's just very simple. It's "When did your life change?" you see?

"Good. Prep school. When was that?"

"Well, I guess that was in uh… oh, well, that was in 1942 – no, that was in 1932. No, that was in 1952. Uh… that was in um… it's sometime in the past."

Well, you don't ask the auditor to date it particularly. All you want is an approximate date. That's why I'm giving you this lecture, is to give you the gen on how to run one of these forms, and I'll tell you why in a minute.

The date can be very, very approximate. It can be ten years ago or anything. We don't care, see? And we'll say, "All right. When was another change in your life?"

"Well, when my mother uh… ran off with the iceman. That… that was a big change in my life." Or whatever it was, see?

Well, so we write down, you know, Mother ran off with the iceman. "About when was that?"

"Well, I guess that must have been about, uh… fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty – I don't know. Twenty-five, six, eight, fifteen. No, I was a small child at the time. Uh… no, I was a
small child at the time, and I'm so-and-so now, and so on. And I must have been about... I was either five or fifteen or something like that."

Because all of these things, you're asking for stuff that is floating on the time track, so you don't care about the accurate date. You just get him to make a statement on it. You just get him to make a statement. You put down, well, it was twenty years ago, something like that, see?

And you keep getting these changes. Now, these other changes have missed him usually, but every time he took up a diet, a fad, changed his clothes, all of a sudden changed his methods of living in some fashion, you get all those as changes in his life, too. And you actually will have, by the time you finish an O section, most of the changes in the life. Now, of course, it's going to occur, later on he's going to remember new changes in his life. And it's a moot question whether you bother to add these new changes on or not. You'll wind up with a lot of changes, and they'll be the most significant changes in the fellow's life, and you'll hit it.

This, you see, is not a very precision activity, is it? You got to ask questions and you got to get the answers to the questions. The truth of the matter is, no pc is going to kick the bucket because you miss.

In other words, this is a very safe activity. So this is a safe activity, and that would be a very happy day for the Director of Processing in any organization, to have a safe activity.

See, that compares tremendously different than Routine 3. Routine 3 is not a safe activity at all. You get the wrong goal and the wrong terminal, and you run it and you've had it. Oh, you can patch the case up and hang it back together again with sticky plaster, but this is a very precision activity, Routine 3. Well, we're talking about Routine 2, so we've got an imprecise activity. What I have discovered, actually, just as a side comment here, is an imprecise activity that will change the living daylights out of a case and not exaggerating now. You run this and you'll see. And it can be done rather imprecisely, and it can be done rather skimpily, and they can forget to flatten things, and they can do other goofs, and they can have the rudiments out, and other things can happen, you see, and they're still going to get results. So that's a good thing to have around, isn't it?

All right. You see, you've defeated me down here. [laughter]

Now, anyway, here's... this long list of changes. Now just reading off these changes: "All right. Your mother ran away with the iceman, and so forth. And later on... and you joined the Holy Rollers of God Help us, and..." this and that. And you just read each one of these changes you've written down. And you've written it down in his language and he can spot it. That's the thing. It's just a communication that he can spot. And you read your needle reaction; you put your needle reaction down. But you're doing the P section, you see, by the time you do this.

And you get the needle reaction. And then it's number so. And you'll find all these changes are all numbered over here. It's easy. So it's number so-and-so. And you write that
down in the P section, and you put a descriptive note on it if you want to, to make it very plain. And now we spring the big question.

And it's written right there in the P section on about the third line, something like that. And it says, "Now say to the pc, 'What problem did you have immediately before that change?'" Now, you think I'm being sarcastic, but I am not being sarcastic. I'm showing you that this is an easy one to get across. And I'm trying to ease your mind, because you will be administering people doing this one, you see? And I'm trying to give you an easy mind on doing it.

And they're going to have worries. And I'm just telling you, now don't have these worries. I'll tell you the only – about the only two things they can do wrong in the test. We will take those things up, and they're rather minor.

All right. So we say now, "What was your problem?" And we get him to state the problem. Now, this is the first thing that can go wrong, is that he states a fact and the auditor writes it down as a problem. He's got to state a problem, so you've got to keep him stating it if he persists in stating facts instead of problems.

Now, the difference between a fact and a problem is simply this: A problem has how or what or which. It has a question, it has a mystery connected with it. It is not a fait accompli. A fait accompli, a fact, is this: "My head hurt." See, that's not a problem; it's a fact.

So you ask now... you ask that change, and you say, "What problem did you have immediately before this?"

And he says, "My head hurt."

"Good." You say, "All right. Now how would that... how would you state that as a problem?"

And he says, "Well, my head hurt pretty bad."

And you say, "Well, did you have a problem about it?" You see?

And he said, "Well, also my head uh... sometimes didn't hurt."

And you say, "Yes, well, good. But did you have a problem around this?" And it finally drives home to him that you're asking for a problem.

And he says, "Well, yes. Sometimes it hurt and sometimes it... oh, well, a problem. Yes. Well, it's 'when my head was going to hurt.' Yeah."

And you actually have to work at this point until you get the person to state the problem – as a problem, not as a fact. And you're going to find some auditors that are under training in Class II that will have a rough time doing this, because you'll get the slips back and they will be saying on them "My head hurt." What is the problem? And then the fellow has run an hour and a half of processing on this fact, you see? And he couldn't fit it in, because it isn't... so on. And it's very all... very complicated. And he couldn't run the right process. He didn't do anybody any harm, but he didn't get very far either. You want a problem, not a fact.

All right. Now having gotten that, it says right on the next line that what you ask is simply your problem process. It gives you the wording of the rudiment for problems. Of
course, you're running what? You're running a present time problem of long duration. Naturally, you're into it with a crash.

Now, your next point is that you're just going to run that till the tone arm quiets down. Now, that doesn't say how long. Supposing they leave it unflat. Oh, it doesn't matter. It'd be nice to get a nice, neat, workmanlike job done on it, where "unknown" was run against the problem until the tone arm no longer moved for twenty minutes. That would be nice, but it is not vital.

Now, it ceases to be vital after the somatic that turns up with it has disappeared. It ceases to be vital. But if a person just backed off of it while the somatic was in high gear, there possibly might be a little repercussion.

When we first gave, oh, I don't know, let's see... "Is this a withhold from Scientologists or is it an overt to say so?" You know, you come against that all the time. Would it be an overt to say it, or is it a withhold if you don't?

We gave Mike Pernetta the gen on how you flattened a level, and we said you ran it until the tone arm didn't move, you see? He got the tone arm into motion and then left it. And that was his interpretation of it, and he did that on three consecutive levels on a pc I'm looking at right this minute. I had his head and dried his ears, but it didn't do any good. This is what he had done.

So you see, that can be badly interpreted even by a relatively good auditor. That tone arm motion, on just an old point like that, you know, everybody knows "Well, you run it till the motion goes out of the tone arm and it finished," and so forth. And you'll get somebody that'll turn it square around and say, "Oh, you get the tone arm so it's moving, and then you knock it off."

I know this sounds utter idiocy, but I'm telling you something that has happened. So you have to do a little police work on that point. And that is the other point you have to be a little bit shy about. Just make sure that the problem gets flattened, the tone arm motion disappears, on that rudiment command.

Now, you're not running that rudiment against the needle, as you ordinarily would, because this has directed us to do what: This has found for us the present time problem of long duration which will produce hidden standards. And I've just shortcut the route into hidden standards here with a large, wide knife. So it's a present time problem of long duration that you're running, so therefore you'd better run it by the tone arm.

So you run the tone arm motion out of that. Now how long is that going to take? Well, at a conservative estimate, I would say that it was two to five hours of auditing. I would say it was something on that order, two to five hours of auditing.

Now you say, "Well, what happens to Model Session while you're doing all this?" and so forth. Well, we assume that some kind of a session was set up at the time they started the assessment. We assume this, and we assume that the next day that they start auditing, that they're going to do a Model Session and move into it. But what if they hit a present time problem?
Well, you're running a present time problem, so you are running a rudiment. So a nice, precise job of auditing would include running the pc on this particular rundown with Model Session in full play. Yes, that would be a nice, neat job of auditing. But let me tell you something. It doesn't much matter if the whole rudiments and Model Session are omitted. That's a nice, sloppy process, isn't it? [laughter] I designed a real sloppy one here. That's real good. You can make lots of mistakes with it.

All right. Now what happens when he's got the tone arm motion off of this problem? Now, he asks, it says right there, the sixty-dollar question: "What was the confusion in your life immediately before that?" "What confusion was in your life?" And it does an assessment of the people in the confusion. You write down then all the names of the people connected with the confusion in his life, see? And the idea of listing and asking for another person in the confusion of the life will keep putting the person back into the confusion, and stop him skidding forward, and you will wind up with a list of personnel. And now you security check this personnel.

Now this, of course, perhaps could require a little bit of acumen and alertness, because you've got to sort of make up a Security Check. But at the same time, there are other Security Checks, and so on, and there will exist a Security Check that matches up to almost any person, you see? You know, the idea "What have you done to him?" and "What have you withheld from him?" is about all it is.

Now you could put in at this point – run overt-withhold on that person and get some result out of the thing. You actually could do just that. You could run O/W rather than security check, but it is much slower, and it doesn't get you anywhere near as far as it should, and it is running against a terminal for which they have not been assessed. And so it has a point of danger to it. It is better to security check the terminals. Now, that question is going to come up, and you're going to be asked why you just don't run O/W on each one of these terminals. Well, it's because you're using a terminal process on a terminal that has not been assessed on the goals line. And if the terminal is not on the goals line, it can beef up the case. The only thing you can do is security check it. That won't beef up the case, and all you want to get off are the withholds, and you don't want the overts at all. Simple, huh?

All right. This is the kind of a list you've got: "Now, what was the confusion immediately before that?"

"Oh, my God, I'd forgotten all about it, but there was an automobile accident, and this and that happened, and so forth. And uh… my father was very upset, and there was a terrible confusion. And uh… uh… actually, I had to pay for the car and I borrowed some money from my uncle George, and then they all… oh, that's just terrible."

You say, "All right. That's fine. That's the confusion area. Now, who did you say, now – your father?" and you write that down, you see? The people in the confusion – it provides a long list there for the people in the confusion. You write down, "Well, the people in the car. These were so-and-so and so-and-so. And there's your father. And this was so-and-so and so-and-so. And this was… and your mother was part of this, and your sister and…"

"Oh, yes," he says, "and my… my… my boss. He was part of this, too. Yeah." So you write down boss, you see?
And you just take this list... Now, if you were doing a very workmanlike job, of course, you would assess that list. But again, it isn't important. You could just take them in order of rotation, and you just get the withholds off on each one of these people with this type of question: "What were you withholding from your father at that time?" You see? "Good. Well now, had you done something else that you didn't dare tell your father about?" You see? "What didn't your father find out about that?" You see? "What hasn't your father ever found out about that?" You know, just keep plugging this type thing to get the withholds off.

Now we get the withholds off of Father, and that seems pretty good; and then we get the withholds off of the next person, and that seems pretty good; and we get the withholds off the next people, and that seems pretty good. And it isn't done thoroughly, it doesn't have to be done thoroughly. It's going to resolve the confusion. Why? You got the problem off the top of it already. And you can just take a sort of a lick and a promise at the thing – now, it'd be nice if it were done thoroughly, and it would produce a much better case gain, and all of this, and you would for sure have this thing out of the road if it were well – done well, but you understand that if it were done at all, why, it's successful – you'll have success on every hand just doing it at all, don't you see? So that could be kind of sloppy, too. You try to get them to do it well, but they do it sloppy and they still win. All right. So you go down the end of this list, and that is the end of that P section. And you put that over here, and that is that.

Now you take up the next item assessed off of the O section. Now you assess the major changes in the person's life – you've got a new P section form, see – you assess the major changes in the person's life from the old O section that you had, and you write down the one which you now find produces the biggest needle action. And you go through the same routine on it: Find out the problem that preceded it, run the rudiments process on that problem, find the prior confusion to that thing, get a list of personnel involved in that prior confusion, get the withholds off from those people.

This is kind of a, kind of a different Security Check, in that it's withholds from those people specifically. It's the not-knows, actually, that he's run on that personnel. And you got that nicely cleaned up, and then you, of course – that's the end of that P section.

And you get a new P section form, and you go back to the old O section and you do a new assessment. And you just run the whole thing down till you can't get any needle motion anymore on that old O section.

And at that point, we could say at that point, with a considerable amount of truth – when we have finished up this activity – we could say that the person was a Release. We could say it just like that. And we could also say, with some security, that the person had no hidden standards and would do auditing commands.

All right. Now you could go ahead with general Security Checks. You could go ahead with checking against any lingering chronic somatics, using Model Session, getting the rudiments in and that sort of thing, and you could finish up the activities that a Class II Auditor could do. You could do all of them. But you know these things are going to be fairly functional, because you've gotten the hidden standards out of the road. You've gotten the basic problems of a lifetime, the hidden standards have been swept away by this particular packaged activity.
Then you'd go ahead, now, and you would assess for goal – you turn him over to a Class III activity. The pc would have to be turned over. After all the Security Checks anybody could dream up, or any Security Check published anyplace had been given, why, that would be as far as you could take him at Class II. But you've gotten quite a ways. You've got Security Checks done. You've got hidden standards off. You've got chronic problems of long duration off the case. And that seems to me like that would really be setting one up, wouldn't it? And the case would have an enormous reality! Let me tell you, some enormous reality can greet this particular activity, because this is a sneak way of finding the present time problem of long duration, which I've just dreamed up for you and squared around, and you'll find it very functional and very workable.

Now, a case that had had this done to it, coming into a goals terminal assessment and a goals terminal run, of course, would run like hot butter, because the only thing that's getting in your road in clearing is the hidden standard and the withhold. That's all. The present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards – let me say that – and the withholds that you get off in Security Checks: those are the only things standing in the road of people going Clear. And if you could handle all of those, why, bang! that would be very profitable. And it isn't just turning somebody over to an auditor, because you haven't any auditors that can do anything else. It actually is very profitable to set a case up.

Now, this would be a much more profitable way of running 1A, and it supplants 1A in full. This is how you get the problems off a case. You find out this is more workable, and it will work on people who have not had their goals and terminals found – even better than 1A. Short. It's very fast. Produces a high level of reality in the pc. Produces a tremendous amount of interest. The interest goes way up on this particular activity.

Well now, just look at the assessment alone. Let's go back over the points of improvement now. Look at the assessment. You mean to say that somebody is going to sit there and actually have spotted for him all the changes in his life without getting a case gain? He'd cognite. He'd cognite on some things, because these things will start turning up, you know? And after he thinks he's given you all the major changes, you ask him when he went on a diet, or something screwball like that, or when he started eating special food, you know, and he...

"Special food? Yes. Well, you know, uh… well… I've just been doing it for so many years. Actually, I'm not any vegetarian or anything like that, but the doctors put me on uh… a diet, and I actually haven't ever much exceeded it since. It's no salt and uh… so on. It's a very mild thing. But come to think about it, yes, I am on a diet, and uh… Well, good heavens, when was that? Must have been about '50 or 1935. No. I wasn't born yet in 1935." And all of a sudden, a new area of track opens up. So this type of assessment just keeps opening up track – in this lifetime, you see; opening up track in this lifetime – just the assessment all by itself.

Now, you've already asked him earlier than this, on the straight Preclear Assessment Form, for his operations, and for everything, and you've noticed that that sometimes opens up track on PCs. Well, an assessment of the major changes of a person's track, that certainly
does. And now we take these things apart, because every one of them sat on top of a problem. And don't be surprised.

Now, here are the limitations of all of this, and things you shouldn't be surprised about in doing this particular rundown.

Don't be surprised at all if it always turns out to be the same problem before each change. And if it again turns out to be the same problem, what do you do? Now, you will be asked this. You will be asked this pleadingly and burningly. "This is the second assessment we did. We've already got the personnel all 'hidden confused' out, and we got the thing flat with the rudiments process – and it was flat. And we had an awful time because he kept going back into a space-opera engram. And we kept him out of that." (Knucklehead.) "Um… and we guided him as well as we could, and all of a sudden we find this 'left school,' 'left prep school,' and he comes up with the same problem, and it's still alive on the meter! Now how about that?"

Well, your proper answer to that is, "What came up on form of the P section? What came up on that form?"

"Well, this problem – same problem. Uh… he had the same problem just before he left prep school."

"All right. Now what is the next line on the P form?"

"Well – oh, well, I see what you mean. All right."

So he goes back and he runs the rudiments process on the same problem again. Of course, it has changed aspect and shifted over into a greater or lesser intensity of some kind or another. And he'll run that thing down. He'll find the area of prior confusion. And of course, the whole of the fellow's schooling opens up this time. And that had all been closed in. And so on. And he has a win. Everybody has a win, you see? But it'll worry people because the same problem will turn up, as it will often do. And it'll now turn up live all over again because it's got a new aspect.

Of course, the joke about this is, is he's had this same problem for the last hundred trillion, you see? So, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. You just get some more running on the same problem, and then get the application of that problem to this life by getting off the area of prior confusion, don't you see? And you're just unbaling the case and unbaling it and – naturally, and so forth. But it'll worry people. You mark my words.

Now, sometimes the person is dispersed off the main problem and nothing happens with this; nothing will happen, I guarantee you, for the first four sections that you fill out. The first four P sections that are filled out, there's nothing – nothing really happening. The person is just plugging along and… Find the areas of prior confusion. The problems are wildly different. And on the fifth one, you get the problem. And it almost blows their head off. You get the idea?

So that may happen in the first one you do, and it may happen in the fourth one you do, and it may happen in the tenth one you do. It's going to happen. Sooner or later he will
move onto this, because the other problems are simply baling off the center-line problem. And he'll recognize that all problems are this problem, and so forth, and he will run it.

Well, after you've addressed this problem for quite a while, this problem will move out into another perimeter and he will feel freer and more in communication in this lifetime. And more important than that, you will have keyed out his hidden standards.

Now, let me warn you about something: Until you have the goal and terminal of the pc, all you can do with a case is key it out. That's all you can do with a case until you have his goal and his terminal and start running them. You say, "Well, then it's unfair to the case." Ah, well, but this is a double sort of a package. You can have his goal and terminal without getting off his hidden standards and problems of long duration, and they won't run.

So, you could find his goal and terminal, and then go back and do this problems straighten-out – I've been calling it a – Problems Intensives. You could straighten out all of his problems and hidden standards, and so forth, and then go back and run the thing; or you could do the Problems Intensive and then assess him and then go back and do all the thing. But you're going to have to, in any case that's going to hang up – and that is something on the order of 90 percent of the cases you'll audit – you're going to have to do something like this to get the present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards off the case, anyhow. So it doesn't matter whether you do it before the goal and terminal are found; you will certainly have to do it after the goal and terminal are found if you do that first, you see? So it doesn't matter which side of the thing you do it on. It really doesn't matter very much, except that the pc cognites faster if he knows what his goal and terminal are. He gets a little bit more zip out of this particular activity. That's about all you can say about it.

If you haven't got the pc's goal and terminal, and you aren't running Prehav levels on the pc, all you're doing is keying things out. You are keying things out.

Now, the funny part of it is that when he gets his goal and when he moves over into his terminal and when you go on down the terminal line, the Prehav runs, and he collides with engrams as he goes down the thing, this headache that he thought desperately was turned on by having left prep school, this difficulty he has had with women, and all of that sort of thing, are suddenly found to be resident when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. There they sit. And it's there in full, and the somatics come back on in full, but this time they run out. A somatic is where it is on the track, and it's no place else.

But you've put him in shape to be able to function without the somatic for a while, don't you see? And then when he runs into it, it runs out rather easily. Otherwise, you're always running him in the engram when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. See, that's the silliness of it all.

You can't get anywhere if you don't key it out, because he's in 7,762 engrams, various kinds, and your goals preparation keys out the hidden standards and fixes these things up and gets this life so it's functioning, and so forth. And then you've got a pc who can stay in session. And then you can run him on down the track and really find where they are. Otherwise, you're only going to run into locks anyhow, and you're going to do a key-out and a key-out and a key-out as you run with the Prehav Scale, and so forth, see? You're going to do key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, then all of a sudden he goes into the engram.
And on a Class IV proposition, don't be too surprised to have somebody almost Clear, or actually reading Clear, that moves over then into a Class IV activity. And the reason they came into Dianetics and Scientology is because they had terrible pains in their appendectomy, and... the pain is not in their appendix, it's in their appendectomy. And all of a sudden, they find out this has nothing whatsoever to do with an appendectomy. Actually, it wasn't that type of thing, but earlier on the track they used to install meters in people at about that period of time, and so on, and somebody's screwdriver slipped. Something real goofy. And it comes off – right where the somatic went in, the somatic will come off. Somatics are where they are, and they are no place else.

So this is a key-out activity so that you can run a pc. Of course, he gets very happy about all this and straightens out his life to a remarkable degree, and you are making case gains, and they are stable case gains. No doubt about that, because it'd take him another lifetime to get him keyed in this nicely again, see? But if you just left him at this point, that is what would happen. Next life, why, he'd just stack them all in again, because you haven't got them out at source. Got the idea? So this is the value of it. It actually sets a person up to be audited, and incidentally makes them much happier with life, and also gives them a reality on Scientology.

Now, the reason you are handling hidden standards should not be hidden from you. You are handling a hidden standard not because the individual has his attention stuck someplace, you are not running a hidden standard because the individual via auditing commands through it, although that is one of the things that it does; you are running a hidden standard only for this reason: it is an oracle. Every hidden standard is an oracle. The pc has got an oracle.

Now it may look to you this way: The pc every session takes off his glasses and looks around the room to see if his eyesight is better.

"Well," you say to yourself, "well, that is a test he is making to find out whether or not his auditing is progressing." And that's what you think is going on, but that is not what is going on at all. His eyesight somatic knows, and it's the only data there is. That is all the data there is. Observation and experience have no bearing on his knowingness. Airplane crashes in the front yard: He sees if his eyesight is worse. If his eyesight is worse, he knows that the airplane crashed in the yard. If his eyesight isn't worse, he knows it isn't there.

The fact that the airplane crashed in the yard hasn't anything to do with his knowingness. It does not much influence his knowingness. This you have to get straight. A hidden standard is his present time problem of highly specialized import, but is in highly specialized use. And when you first collide with a hidden standard, when you first begin to study a hidden standard, you think of it rather loosely. You think of it as, well, it's just a specialized present time problem of some kind or another. And the pc is viaing his auditing commands through this thing and he hasn't therefore got his attention on the session, and therefore anything that would disturb the pc during a session would be a hidden standard. And actually, then, aren't the pc's hidden standards all expressed in his goals for the session? And therefore, isn't it true that a person who is trying to find out if he is brighter or not after a session is over would be operating from a hidden standard? And therefore, isn't it true that every-
thing the pc ever gains is basically a hidden standard? And isn't it true, then, that everything,
every change the pc notices in his case would be because of a hidden standard? You see, you
can get the hidden standard is no longer hidden, man. It's "any change is a hidden standard."

Well, that's not its definition. That is not what a hidden standard is, by a long way.
And you at right this present instant are labeling things "hidden standards" which are simply,
oh, little bit of a present time problem of long duration, or a goal for the session, or it's some-
thing else and it hasn't any real influence on the auditing, see? A hidden standard is a pretty
vicious proposition. It is not a tiny, light proposition at all.

The fellow does it every command or every session. And if he does it every command,
every session, it's constant – then it knows. Then you must assume this about the hidden stan-
dard: The hidden standard is, it knows and he doesn't. So he has to consult it to find out. But
because you're not auditing him out of session, you don't notice that he does this all the time
in life. Ear burns, it's not true. Ear doesn't burn, true.

What a way to adjudicate a piece of music. Now, most music critics are pretty badly
spun in, but here'll be a music critic: All right. He listens to the medulla oblongata in E-flat
minor, and he listens to this.

I was listening to some music critics the other day on BBC. They were criticizing jazz,
and I thought this was very amusing, because they were all sitting there, and every once in a
while they'd talk about "being sent," [laughter] and so forth. And "it didn't do something," one
of the fellows said. You know? "It didn't do something," and he touches his chest, you know?
And these people weren't judging music at all. They were reading their own somatics. [laugh-
ter] The poor composer. If the composer knew this, he would pay less attention.

Well, let's take a music critic and actually he listens to a symphony orchestra or some-
thing tearing off a long chunk of the "Overture of 1812." And afterwards he says, "Well, actu-
ally, it was not a bad performance but it lacked impact." What does he mean? Now, you go
back over his criticism and you'll find out that every time things are pretty bad, they lack im-
 pact.

And if you, the auditor, were to ask him what impact, he would say, "Well, here, of
course." And then if you searched a little bit further, you would find out that when he heard a
piece of music, he knew it was good if he got a pressure on his chest, and if it was bad, he
didn't get a pressure on his chest, so therefore he knew it was bad.

And this tells us (hideous thing) that this person actually never really hears the music.
He is paying attention to a circuit which gives him a pressure or doesn't give him a pressure
on his chest. Now, you're going to teach this person?

All the composers in the world could hire all the symphony orchestras in the world to
play all kinds of music to him, loud and soft and so forth. He would not notice any of this
music. Something else is listening to the music and reacting. And if it doesn't react, he knows
the music is no good. That's why you get these wild criticisms on art.

You know, some kid has stumbled over a paint pot in a kindergarten and spilled it on a
piece of canvas, and somebody has come along and put it up in an exhibition. And you have a
number of critics, then, all of a sudden raving about the beauty of form and rhythm and im-
The impact of this particular painting, don't you see? It was when they walked by it, did it restimulate an engram or didn't it? Had nothing to do with the painting. And so you get off into wild schools of bad draftsmanship, bad music; you get sudden popularity of somebody who goes flat on every note. You know, she always wears green dresses when she sings, and this adds up to certain producers getting a restimulation from green dresses. You know? And so here's this great singer. And then they put her on TV, you see, and the eggs pour out of the television screen like mad, and she gets no Hooper rating, and they say, "What happened?"

Well, you see, her impact wasn't singing, it was a green dress. And television is in black and white. You see, it's as screwy as this. Just as crazy as that. It's just as far offbeat.

All I'm trying to punch home is that the person's knowingness is not a result of experience; the person's knowingness is as a result of circuit. And now you're going to prove to him that Scientology works? And Mamie Glutz is going to get well? And everybody is going to get happy? And everybody is going to live better lives, and they're going to make more money, and that sort of thing. And this character goes on, and he knows it isn't working. Why? Well, you see, it lacks impact. Well, what impact? The impact that moves in and out against his chest, of course. You see how this could work?

Now, I'm not berating anybody who has a hidden standard, particularly, because it's too easy to knock these things out. But recognize what they are. They're consultation mediums with which one knows.

And I think it'd be a highly risky thing if, flying an airplane, you knew you were on the right course if you had a pain in your right hip, and didn't have to pay a bit of attention to the instruments. I would say that…

This is the lower mockery of the great pilot who has a homing in… pigeon built in and actually can fly a straight course and wind up in the – with tremendous accuracy, and so forth. But he does that because he's a great pilot, not because he's got a circuit.

You see, anything a circuit can do, a thetan can do. [laughter] And do better. Any knowingness which can be imparted to the person is the mechanism of Throgmagog, which was handed out in *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*. You can set up an independent intelligence alongside of you that tells you right from wrong.

Now, most criminals are the product of circuits. It isn't true that people who have circuits are criminals, but a criminal is a specialized part of this. Now let's look at what a criminal does: A criminal knows right from wrong because a circuit is active or inactive. In other words, because something is restimulated or not restimulated, he knows right from wrong. And therefore he knows the cops are crazy, because they don't agree with his circuit.

They say, "You shouldn't have stolen the car." Well, he's got a little green light that lights up, and when he's doing right, why, the green light lights up, and when he's doing wrong, why, the red light lights up. And it happens inside of his skull, and when he passed this car the green light lit up, so he knew he should get in the car and drive off and that that was a right and proper action.

And the cops pick him up, and the cops tell him that wasn't a right and proper action. Well, man, they're crazy, if they're observed at all. And he is very puzzled as to why he's in
court. You never saw more baffled people than criminals. I've studied this breed of cat and found it a very interesting breed of cat, because it's a type of intelligence which isn't generally credited with being insane. But it isn't there. And they are very baffled.

They say, "People pretend that you can tell right from wrong. Ha-ha-ha. Talk about silly. Nobody can tell." That's the extreme one, see? Or, "Yes, of course I can tell right from wrong. When I'm doing right, I feel well, and when I'm doing wrong, I get a terror sensation in my stomach. And as long as I only do things that make me feel well, that is right, such as murder babies and steal jewelry. And if I do those things, that's fine. But if I become... if I get a job, this terror sensation turns on, so it's wrong to work." And if you went into it closely with one of these characters and had a conversation of that depth and that searching type of questioning, you would learn some of the most fantastic things you ever heard of.

Well, to some slight degree, anybody with a hidden standard, you see, is no blood brother to this criminal – that's just a lie – but he's doing this to some degree.

So the auditor says, "Are you in-session?"

And the pc looks inside to find out if the little white bulb is burning. And the white bulb is burning, so he says, "Yes, I'm in-session."

"Now, did you get any result from the processing"

Now he looks at the little white bulb, and it's not on, so he didn't get any result from processing.

But what during the auditing did he do? He would do the command on a sort of a via. It'd come from the auditor, and then he put the command over here, and something over here gives him the command and then he follows the command. He's on a self-audit. It knows, he doesn't.

Now this is the way people get that way: First, they're a thetan as themselves, actually, and then they become so invalidated, or they invalidate people so much that they get overwhelmed with their own invalidations, and they pick up a valence. Now, everybody's got a valence – everybody's got one of these things. Even people with hidden standards have valences and you can find them.

But the steps are two more than this. There are two more steps of overwhelm. The next step to the valence overwhelm is the somatic overwhelm. While being the valence, he got a hell of a somatic. Now, an impact is easily substituted for knowingness. Impact, knowingness – these can integrate in a mind as the same thing. Impact and punishment can also integrate. They don't necessarily integrate as knowingness, they sometimes only integrate as punishment.

So the fellow is walking down the street, and something is thrown out of an airplane and a wrench hits him on side of the head, and after he gets out of the hospital he has a definite sensation that he must have done something. Well, the only thing he was doing was walking down the street. But he got a definite sensation he must have done something. Now the truth of the matter is, he doesn't even have to go back and pick up his own overts, but he must have had them to make the thing hit him, but he doesn't even have to go back and pick up the
overts to feel that he must have done something. The fact that he was hit meant that he was being punished.

So the punishment must have had a crime that goes with it, and he's got a terrible problem: What has he done? What has he done that caused him to be punished? And he doesn't know. Well, of course, the answer is very often he hasn't done anything. But he can't separate this thing out.

Now, an impact, then, can go into that category, and people with guilt complexes – which is a small section, by the way, of mind. You say everybody has a guilt complex, it's like saying everybody has an inferiority complex. It hasn't any level of truth, you know, at all. It's just taking a small class of cases. There are a small class of cases have guilt complex. There are a small class of cases have inferiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have superiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have complexes that tell them they can never do anything wrong. There's... You know, there's classes of cases. But this is not a broad generality at all, that everybody is guilty or that aberrations comes from guilt. That's a hangover from old psychotherapies. Sometimes they ride along and you've given them credence at sometime or another, and it takes a shake of the head to get rid of them.

Well, now, an impact can interpret as knowingness. Because the person's been hit, he feels he now knows something. You'll sometimes have a person coming out of an operation telling you he knows something. Well, the odd part of it is, two things can happen: He can come out of an operation knowing something, or he can come out of an operation feeling that he knows something. In the second case, he doesn't know anything.

For instance, if you take a thetan, you operate on his body and he blows out of his head, and during the operation he finds himself outside, he will wind up later on knowing that he can exteriorize. That's a perfectly valid piece of information. Because this other thing happens so often, that gets invalidated. Lots of patients wake up out of the ether and then now they know something. Only they don't know what they know, see, and the more they search for it, the less they find out. They don't know what they know, but they know they know something. Got the idea?

Well, a circuitry can get set up in more or less that fashion. The person himself has been invalidated – his own knowingness, as a valence, is invalidated – and so he's got an impact knowingness that he keeps around, which is part of an engram. The engram is actually on his goals-terminal chain – that's where it comes from – but it is not reachable or attainable because it's right in the middle, and you can't audit him down to the goals-terminal chain because he's got this thing in the road. But it's on the chain, and you can't audit him through it or past it, but you can't audit him because of it, and yet unless you audit him he's not going to get rid of it. This is the kind of a problem one of these circuits sets up.

So here he is – here he is with this thing, and it actually – his own knowingness has been terribly invalidated. As a circuit, then, he can go on being validated in his knowingness, but he has to be careful because this thing knows more than he does, and it's a somatic of some kind. It's a pressure ridge. It's a sensation. It can be almost any one of these things. It's a difference of light. It's an occlusion. It's a singing in the head. It's bubbling in the beer, you know? Doesn't matter what it is, it just is. And he's going to have bad luck tomorrow.
Well, actually, all of Roman superstition, and everything else, stem out of this circuitry. Rome had a circuit called the auguries. And they used to shoot down birds and gut them, and they'd examine the entrails and then they'd know whether or not tomorrow was going to be a lucky day. Well, that's a circuit. You'll find in superstitious peoples that have very little and have been knocked around very badly, you have just absolute huge catalogs of superstitions. You've got some superstitions yourself, and so forth. Well, this is just a hangover on the third dynamic. That's a sort of a third dynamic circuit.

They were looking at the moon one night on some planet way back when, and it was half-full. And they get a restim on the thing every time they look at the moon half-full. And it was half-full this particular night, and a couple of spaceships came in and blew up the planet. So they know that a half-full moon is dangerous. And this kind of gets established somehow or another. So you have to be careful when the moon is half-full. What are you saying? Well, the moon knows more than you do, because you couldn't find out what happened. But the moon obviously knows what happened because it's a symbol of what is happening so now the moon knows, and you can set up a whole moon circuit. Quite interesting.

The circuit knows, the pc doesn't; the circuit can observe, the pc doesn't; the circuit can give auditing commands and the auditor can't. All kinds of these things happen.

Now this moves out into a secondary state, which is the fourth state up the line, and it becomes an audible, dictational circuit. It's worst off. It's where the ideas come from. It dictates to a person. It speaks. It gives him his orders aloud. All kinds of wild things go on with regard to it. But the person never does anything unless he's told by this particular mechanism. Well, what is this? This is the total, final result of a valence that has been overwhelmed by a somatic, which has been overwhelmed in itself by some other thinkingness, and you've got just continuous, consecutive overwhelms.

Now, of course, there can be many cases after this where these conditions are consecutively and continuously overwhelmed, but they will all be of the same character. They will not be more personalities; they will be circuits, from the acceptance of the first valence on out. And that's something to know. You haven't got an endless number of valences on the pc, but you can have a near-endless number – it will seem to you sometimes – you can have a near-endless number of hidden standards. You can have a lot of them on a case, if they're real hidden standards.

Now, what is the test of a real hidden standard? It's whether or not the pc consults with something each command or each session. "Consults" is the clue. Now you see, he could look around to find out if his eyes changed. But does he always look around to find if his eyes changed?

Now, the change in his eyes is not particularly the hidden standard. The hidden standard lurks in the vicinity of that. And it moves on and off his eyes. The day is bright. The day is dull. This is the way life goes. It's going to be a good day because the day is bright. It's going to be a bad day because the light is dull. There's going to be something going on like that to make that a real hidden standard. And then it becomes a consultational circuit.

Now, that is a rather mild form of one. That is not particularly a very bad hidden standard; possibly a person could even be audited through it without much trouble.
But now let's take this one. This is how bad a hidden standard can get: Pcc sits down in the auditing chair, and the hidden standard says to him – says to him – "Uh... well, that auditor is going to do you in today." So he relays all the commands through the hidden standard, because the hidden standard will give him the safe commands. So he can do some commands and he can't do other commands, because the hidden standard will only relay the safe commands. And oh, wow. You haven't got a pc under control. You haven't got a pc there. You're not auditing a pc. See, this is all vastly removed from the thing.

But these hidden standards key in with problems and areas of prior confusion. And that is what kicks in a hidden standard. It comes in because of a problem of magnitude or an area of prior confusion. Now, I've put in the "or" there just in case sometime or another the guy got a problem without a prior confusion. But the usual course of human events is that the individual went through a lot of trouble and a lot of confusion, and he couldn't quite figure any part of it out, and it left him hung with a problem.

Now, he's an active cuss – any thetan is a fairly active thetan – and he will up and solve it every time. He solves that problem by changing his life in some way. Now, this can get so bad that the effect I talked to you about the other day, the effect whereby, because something happened, the individual felt – and I've mentioned in this lecture – because something occurred, then the individual must have done something. He didn't do anything, but something occurred.

So some of these changes in his life are going to be red herrings. That is to say, there was a change in his life, so he figured he must have had a problem ahead of it. A person could have a change in his life without having a problem before it.

He's got a couple of very active parents that go flying around to every place, and so on, and they change his location rather continuously, but one day they stopped moving around. And he finally finds himself sitting someplace, and it was a change in his life because he was now in one place. And you ask him for a problem before this, and he'll almost beat his brains out trying to dream up what problem he had that caused this to occur. Well, actually, he didn't do anything to cause it at all.

In other words, the change in that particular case is other-determined than by the person. So there can be other-determined changes, and they, however, do not assess by an E-Meter reaction. So, therefore, assessment becomes necessary in doing the O section of this type of Problems Intensive I was telling you about – necessary to assess – because it eliminates those changes which occurred without a problem having preceded them.

All right. So there's the one, two, three of the hidden standard. The hidden standard develops out of problems of long duration. Individual solves the problem with a hidden standard, has solved the problem at some time or another with a hidden standard, and says, "Well, I just won't think anymore. I will let this think for me."

Now, I should say just one brief note on, where does a circuit come from? Well, frankly, you'll find circuits first mentioned in *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*, so they're not very hard to find. They're quite obvious. They're quite visible. You could go around looking and asking people about circuits. You'll find plenty of circuits. You'll find
talking circuits and pressing circuits and color circuits and all kinds of things. They're how-do-you-know things. This is circuitry as different than valences.

Valence answers the question "who to be" or "how to be right with a beingness" – "how can you be right with a beingness?" A circuit answers it entirely differently. That is, "Without changing the beingness, how do you know whether you're right or not?" They are two different aspects. A circuit furnishes information. A valence furnishes beingness.

Now a circuit, from furnishing information, can step upstairs to furnishing orders. And then it can step upstairs to furnishing orders and commands which are below the level of consciousness. But they always express themselves to some slight degree in terms of a somatic. One knows they're there if the somatic occurs.

Most people live in haunted houses. There are a lot of people around will tell you there are other thetans inhabiting their body. These are just circuits. You will occasionally run into somebody that after he got a bad shock, why, just thousands of voices turned in on his body in all directions, or a dozen, or six, or something. And they all spoke to him, and so forth and so on. You'll run into an experience of that character in somebody else.

A circuit can be… is very easy to set up, and you actually think and use circuits all the time. A circuit isn't a bad thing. It's only when it goes out of a person's self-determinism, is no longer in the individual's control, that a circuit becomes a bad thing.

A person is totally knocked in the head as far as a circuit is concerned.

He has no longer any life or reason of his own. Only the circuit has life and reason. And when a circuit is in this particular condition or state of ascendancy, it, of course, furnishes a hidden standard. It's right or wrong according to the appearance of the circuit, or according to its behavior. It tells the individual right from wrong, and the individual himself never differentiates, never experiences, has no criteria, and so on. That is a circuit in operation. And this circuitry is set up by a thetan very easily, and is set up by him every time he turns around, and is one of the easiest things that he does and there is no reason he should stop doing it.

We're only talking about the obsessive, out-of-control circuit. Circuits are very often completely reasonable, that a person sets up. But he's still totally in control of the circuit. He set it up and he knows it, see? And it's gone. He doesn't set it up forever.

Well, you look at… look at a motorcycle, and you say to yourself, "What's wrong with the motorcycle?" You see? And you sort of set up a computer that is like a motorcycle engine or something, you see? And you say, "Gosh, there it is, and it goes this way," and you kind of mock it all up. "And it goes this way," and so on. You go to bed that night, you no longer got the motorcycle engine in front of you, you see?

And… Tesla, this great character Nikola Tesla, who invented alternating current and tremendous numbers of other things, set up the alternating current motor and let it run in his head. It wasn't in his head, of course; he probably had it out somewhere. I wouldn't want an alternating current in my head – motor in my head, see. Because if he set it up right, of course, it was greasy. But anyhow, he set up an alternating current motor and he let it run for two years just to find what parts of it would wear. That's right.
So that was kind of a long time to let a circuit run, wasn't it?

Well, it was to tell him something, wasn't it? So he set up a mock-up in order to find out from it, and there's nothing wrong with this. This does not mean that Nikola Tesla, as a result, had a hidden standard. He didn't have any hidden standard. He knew he set it up and he knew he took it down, and he knew when he set it up and he knew when he took it down.

But you'll find circuits are not in this degree of control when they're obsessive, you see? Now the person doesn't know when he set them up, he doesn't know why he set them up, he doesn't know why he's listening to them, he doesn't know where they came from. All he knows is that he has a total slavish obedience to them. See, that is the difference.

You can set up circuits that'll answer mathematical problems for you. You can do all kinds of wild things with your mind, you see? There's nothing wrong with doing this, you see, as long as you're doing it. If you're doing them, why, you can't hurt yourself any. But when you start burying them, and when you say, "I'm no longer responsible for that thing," and when you say, "This thing will now from hereinafter and aforesaid tell me which side of all electrical circuits will go this way and that way"... The individual looks at a house and he hears a buzz-buzz-buzz. This is eight lifetimes later, see? Buzz-buzz-buzz, he hears in this house, and he knows there's something wrong with its currents.

You get an electrician sometime and you say, "Well, how did you know the house was old?"

"Well, I get this sensation," or something. "I knew the wiring was off," or something like this.

And you talk with him, "Well, how did you know that?"

"Well, I don't know, but I always get this sensation right under my left rib, you see, and so on. And I can kind of hear a buzz-buzz, and so forth. It's very easy to tell." That's a knowingness circuitry on the subject of electricity, you see, which he doesn't know anything about. He just told you so.

A thetan, you see, is totally capable of this operation – of permeating the whole house and finding every short circuit in it. And says, "Zzzzzzit! Well, that was one. Zzzzzzit! There's another one. Zzzzzzzzit! There's another one." See? "Oh, well, guess we'll have to re-wire that." Thetan is totally capable of doing this, so, therefore, it's one of his skills.

The basic on this is setting something up on automatic and taking no responsibility for it at all. And out of that you get trouble. You always will get some trouble. And it becomes a hidden standard, and so on. But to have set one up and put it on total irresponsibility and let it run totally automatically, the individual had one God-awful problem just before he did it.

And just before he had that awful problem, he was in a fantastic amount of confusion. And just before he got into that fantastic amount of confusion, he had plenty of withholds from all of the people connected with the confusion. And those conditions must have occurred. And all of those conditions need to be present to unravel a circuit – to have a circuit set up this way – and you've got to pay attention to all of those things to unravel a circuit.
All right. So how would an individual get into this sort of state? All right. Life would be pretty active, and he would start withholding from everybody he was in contact with, about everything, or about some special thing, or something like that. He isn't free to communicate in any way. He's withholding from here and he's withholding from there, and he does an overt here, and he's got a withhold there, and he does another overt someplace else, and things start running a little bit wrong. Naturally, he's out of communication with it. You're answering the first requisite of a circuit: going out of communication.

You see, the individual who has a circuit that tells him about house wiring never has to permeate the house. Well, he never has to communicate with the house. All he has to do is communicate with the circuit. The circuit does all the communicating for him, you see, and he doesn't have to do anything about it. All right.

So he had all these withholds and all these overts against all these people, and life became pretty confused, and it got more and more confused. And it finally wound up to where this confusion added up to a distinct problem. Whether he could state it or not is beside the point, whether he's aware of it analytically at that stage of the game or not, but it got to be one awful problem. And it's a statable problem. *Blang!* it went, and then he had a problem on his hand. And then, of course, he solved the problem.

Now, if you got enough withholds and overts, you'll blow. You get enough overts and withholds against any one person, or any one thing, or any one area, you'll blow out of that area or off that course of existence – if there's enough.

All right. So the individual had this awful problem, and he blew. He blew that particular life channel that he was on. And of course, this brought about a change. And the only tag that is uniformly left in view for the problem, the confusion, the people, and the withholds and the lot, is the change. "When did your life change?" So, of course, by tracking that back, you can find the problem. You get the problem more or less handled, you find the people. You get the people security checked out – this individual security checked out about the people – he comes off of the nervousness of the confusion which was, after all, yesteryear. But his withholds have got him pinned in that area of time. He's stopping and not communicating in that area of time, so nothing as-ises in that area of time, so he's stuck there.

And this, of course, tends to turn on a circuit, because it's a withdrawal. Now, the point of change, of course, is a withdrawal. The point of change of life is a withdrawal from his former change of life. So the whole story is out of communication, out of communication, out of communication, and then out of communication.

Now, if he wants to remain out of communication safely, he has to have a periscope up. So that the periscope is very dangerous to approach the eyepiece of, so he has to have a periscope that not only looks but tells him. And that is a hidden standard. And when an individual has gone through that cycle violently, he comes up at the other end looking at life through a circuit. He never looks at life, the circuit looks at life; he never gets audited, the circuit gets audited. That is an experience. Experience must not approach this individual. And remember, auditing is an experience.

So, if the individual is living a life on a via called a circuit, then of course, your auditing is only part of the via, and of course never reaches the person. And you are trying to audit
the person, you are not trying to audit the via. And when auditing takes a God-awful long
time, it is just because you are not auditing a pc, you are auditing a circuit. You haven't got an
Operating Thetan, you've got an operating GE, or an operating circuit. And so all experience
is filtered through the circuit, and it is true of auditing, too. Auditing also filters through the
circuit.

Now, the trick in supervising auditors is to give them some type of a rundown that hits
all this, and knocks all this out of the road. And they can do it rather sloppily, and they don't
have to finish it up in any terrific way, and they'll still knock the circuitry out of the road so
the person can be audited. And that is what this Problems Intensive is all about. And this
thing is tailor-made for a Class II activity. And people can be trained to do this much more
easily than they can be trained to locate goals and terminals. Why? Because goal and terminal
operation, and Prehav Scale running, requires a precision of auditing which is a very, very
high, hardly won precision. And you know that because right this moment you are struggling
up the line toward that precision. But it requires a terrific precision. There's only one goal;
you must never get the wrong goal. There's only one terminal; you must never get the wrong
terminal. There is only one level of the Prehav Scale live; you must never audit the wrong
level. The auditing commands have to be exactly the right auditing commands. The individual
going up and down the track has to be run precisely against the E-Meter. Precisely. When it is
flat, it is flat. And when it is not flat, it is not flat. And furthermore, the individual cannot be
run with rudiments out, much less assessed when the rudiments are out.

So that is a highly precise level of auditing, don't you see?

You have another level of auditing, now, in Class II, which is imprecise and will get
the job done.

Now, this has an additional advantage. Where you are shy about an individual coming
in off the street, this has to solve this problem. The individual is coming in off the street, he
doesn't know very much about Scientology; without giving him a broad, general education,
you cannot easily sit down and open up a Form 3 on him. You won't find auditors doing it
very glibly.

And the individual, not knowing what it's targeted at, is going to feel that he's being
suspected, and he's going to get some kind of an ARC break with the people who are doing
this to him.

Ah, well, on such a person, very simply, you run this Problems Intensive. It is what? It
basically goes back and makes the most fundamental Security Checks that can be made on the
individual, without getting very personal about the individual.

Now, when he's opened up and is expressing himself a little bit better, and you've got
the hidden standards out of the road, you can, of course, uncork a Form 3. Now the individual
knows what it's all about. Now he'll go for this now, he'll stay in-session with this now, and
he'll get it off. And he'll know where he's going because he has a subjective reality of what
he's been doing to himself with withholds. He got that out of this rundown.

So this gets you over the bridge of "How do you take raw meat and audit it directly?"
And actually, you could get somebody up here that just was walking down the road, say,
"Have you ever had any changes in your life, and what has your life been all about? Have you ever had any operations? Have you ever had this? Have you ever had that?" – it doesn't matter. It'd be any of the data. You could ask this individual any of the data on any part of this form right up to O, and the individual will be pitching right straight with you. And now, of course, part O, why, he'll be happy to tell you all about the changes in his life. Everybody is very happy to talk about all of their troubles and difficulties and changes. They're very happy to tell you their problems. That's for sure. And of course, the Security Check is not between you and the person, it is between the person and people who aren't there. And he's perfectly willing to give you withholds from people who aren't there.

So this is the answer to raw meat. And you take this particular rundown, which will be released to you shortly, and you will find out that an individual is then processable. Practically any level of case becomes processable if you approach it that way; requires no specialized address of any kind whatsoever. And the most self-conscious auditor would be happy to sit there and do that.

I developed this from this reason and this way: I found out that auditors will fill out forms. [laughter] That is not a sarcastic thing. That happens to be a common denominator of all auditors. They will all do it, and they will do it very well. All right.

Let's build on that cornerstone, and let's move it on up, and run some processes up along the level and you've got it made. How could you miss? [laughter]

Okay. Well, it's taken quite a bit of thinking to get this squared around, and quite a bit of looking, and so forth. I hope you make good use of it.

Thank you.
A lecture given on 11 October 1961

Thank you.

Okay. Now, we have before us, on this eleventh of Oct., the little handy jim-dandy, the Class II Auditor's pride. It's called a Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing. And you notice it says Staff Clearing. Staff always gets the best.

Okay. October eleventh, 1961, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And this is Problems Intensives for Staff Clearing. This is the second lecture on this subject.

All right. Now we take this up, we look it in the teeth and we find that we are looking at basically the Preclear Assessment Form.

And you've been using this on preclears or should have been using this on preclears for a very long time. The earliest edition of this is 1950 – Elizabeth and Los Angeles Foundations, 1950. So you're not looking at anything new. This has come a long way, and all that's happened here is we're now using it to resolve the case.

All right. It is of vast information to you and vast importance for you to know what the devil your pc is all about. I have seen an auditor, believe it or not, process a pc for weeks on end and not find out that the pc was having a dreadful time with a court, or a child has been taken off by the authorities or something. Now, you'd say that'd show up in present time problems. But it gets worse than this. I have seen an auditor process a pc forever, and not know their right name; not know if they've ever been operated on; not know they suffered from various ills; not know whether they were married or single. We'd say that auditor was running a big not-know. Now, the basic part of this and the early parts of it right up to section O, but not including section O. You notice the directions have been modified on this. They've just been deleted a little bit, so I had better say something about "when you do this."

If you have a new pc who is brand-new to Scientology, you certainly do one. But if you have somebody you are going to give an intensive to, that you have never done one of these things on, you should do one. It gives the pc some little confidence to know that his auditor knows something about him. And that, in itself, is an interesting factor in holding a pc in-session, all by itself.
Now, we see here that it starts out "Who does the assessment? The auditor assigned to audit the preclear does the assessment." Now, what does that mean? It means that's his first action. That's the first action the auditor undertakes. He doesn't go in and run fifteen hours of "Create a reactive mind. Thank you." "Create a reactive mind. Thank you." He doesn't do that. He sits down and he doesn't do rudiments and he doesn't do anything else, he simply sits down and runs off this form. And he sits there and makes out the form. But it is auditing. It is auditing. It is done in the paid auditing time of the pc, because it is auditing.

And when an auditor gets a preclear that he has not had before, he takes one of these forms, and he fills it out on the pc. Now, why is this?

The pc has a sneaking feeling that the auditor doesn't know anything about him, until this form is filled out. And therefore, you have a hard time keeping the rudiments in. But it's because the pc is certain that there is a not-know sitting in the auditor's chair. But as soon as you've filled out this form, then the pc feels that the auditor knows something about him, or her, and is happier thereby – feels more comfortable about this. Pcs always have certain things that they feel that somebody should know and those things are pretty well covered in this assessment form. All right.

The assessment form is for information. Auditors' reports are for information, not your information. They are almost never for the auditor's information. He knows. So if you could read your own writing, that would be for your information if you wrote that way. But it's for somebody else's information. An Auditor's Report Form in a Central Organization goes from the auditor to the Director of Processing, goes from the Director of Processing – very often is inspected by HCO, sometimes – but is certainly forwarded into here or one copy of it. And in a class of this particular character, you are – if I ever see Mary Sue complaining about her eyes and so forth, why, I'm just going to go back and find all the badly written forms and put a curse on you. [laughter]

You want to know something, and bad handwriting is just another method of running a not-know on somebody. It is withholding the information, writing illegibly. Now, some of these fellows in commerce that we occasionally do business with, you look at their signatures. Look at their signatures. Can you read their signatures? It's a bloou rh and so forth. And you'll find that fellow has withholds. You look over the letter he has written you, and you wonder how much of that letter is true, how much of it is false. The fellow is withholding information from you, ordinarily.

Now, that's true of all handwriting, and you would be amazed how your handwriting improves after you've got a Sec Check Form 3 flat. There's a direct coordination. So it is made to be read, and if it's illegible, somebody trying to check up the case is denied information that might be of value.

Now, we look down the line here, and we find out that we want information on the name of the pc, the age of the pc, and we want the tone arm position at the start of the assessment. Now this will give us some sort of an idea, as we look this over, whether or not this pc is going to respond to ordinary and routine auditing, because as they give you the answers to this form, they should get some tone arm shifts. And if they get no tone arm shifts talking
about themselves, of any kind whatsoever, oh-oh, oh-oh, this is a pretty desperate situation. You're almost running into a CCH situation when you're doing that.

So that gives you that information. If you carry your tone arm position notations throughout this form, why, you'll be fine.

Now, we have the first questions are "Family," and we want to know this data about Father and Mother and so forth. And this gives us reactive personnel, as you will see here at once.

(I'm going to pull this microphone closer to me.)

Okay. You will see this at once, that the individual had very bad relationships with his father, and that you're going to be running into Father, Father, Father, Father, Father. And that he can't remember anything about his mother, and so he's going to be trying to run into his mother, his mother, his mother throughout the auditing. You see what we can divine from that at once.

Now the next thing that we go into here, is the other relatives who are in immediate line. Now at this stage of processing, if this is the beginning of an intensive, the first intensive the pc has, you're going to have missing personnel here like mad. Well, should you try to find them? No. Just let it ride. Let it ride. The significant allies of the case are going to be missing, _always_, during the first Preclear Assessment Form. Great-aunt Agatha, Uncle Bill, the fellow who made a drunkard out of the pc, you see – he is never going to be mentioned at this stage of the game, if he is aberrative.

Now, if it is known to a pc, it isn't wrong with the pc. If the pc _knows_ about it, it is not aberrative. Someday you will hear me, and you will _stop auditing all these big knowns_, and you will start making some progress with cases that is rapid. That's one difference between my auditing and sometimes yours.

If the pc knows about it, I pat him on the back, shake him by the right hand, cheer him up and go on hastily to something else.

And you all too often say, "Well, obviously, look here, his father was a drunkard and a jailbird and beat him, he says, every day. And obviously we've got to spend a lot of time on Father."

And you do. You waste a lot of auditing time on Father, because Father has nothing to do with the case. How do we know that? The pc knew about it! If the pc knew about it, it doesn't have anything to do with his aberrations. The only time that crosses up is a hidden standard, but a pc usually doesn't even know about a hidden standard, until you start interrogating him. So this gives us _all_ of the areas we don't have to monkey with in auditing. You see, it's a negative assessment. We're not going to have to worry too much about these.

It's going to say, "Family: Mother."

"Mother living"

"Yes."
And you don't then, of course, ask what was the date of her death [laughter] and the pc makes a statement of relationship with Mother.

"Well, Mother was a dear, sweet person. Mother was always very good to me, much better than I deserved – much better than I deserved. She lives with us now. And somehow or another, she keeps the marriage from going on the rocks. She tries. She's nice – nice person, and so forth."

Well, you get trapped into this, you see? You say, "Well, what the hell is this? Some kind of an overwhelm here of some kind or another," you see? "And just exactly how does this thing stack up?" You say to yourself, "Mmmmmm-mm. Tries to keep their marriage from going on the rocks. I'll bet!" [laughter, laughs] See, and you actually get trapped into this, because you have a little piece of knowingness that is intriguing. Well, go ahead and be interested in it, but the pc knows all about this. Well, there are some things the pc probably doesn't know about it, but that will turn up in the line of auditing. But what the pc knows about, we couldn't care about.

Then we get into Father, and we – same thing applies. And the pc says, "Oh, yes, well, the old man died when I was eighteen, and so forth. And it was good riddance. He used to beat me every day, and he shot me on Sundays, and he's what's wrong with me."

Oh. Well, that's one area we don't have to have anything to do with. Get the idea? It's just negative rundown.

If you were to shake that down, you could find some surprising data in it. And the pc sooner or later, in this particular type of intensive, will find very surprising data in it – extremely surprising – such as his father spanked him once. Very ordinary. His father beat him every day and shot him every Sunday, and so forth. And you find out the father spanked him lightly once. That's the truth of the matter; see, he's got some kind of a synthetic. But this is something that's going to come up, sooner or later, and you're not going to have to worry about it too much, particularly if he says that is everything that is wrong with him.

If the pc knows that is wrong with him, and has known that's what's wrong with him for a long time, why has it continued to be wrong with him? See? That's the 156,000-pound question. Why has it continued to be wrong? Why hasn't it as-ised? Well, it hasn't as-ised because it isn't there, and it never was there. But it gives us a method of skirting these things. We're not going to take that up. It'll all come out on withholds sooner or later.

Now "Relationships": And there you're going to have missing personnel. And "Married," very often you find missing personnel.

Now, there's one thing that may possibly go haywire, is "numbers of times divorced" on this. That is important to know, because the pc is very often holding this up, and it'll hold up his case. But it's the number of times divorced. Well, maybe he didn't get divorced. Maybe he got married five times and only divorced once. And that would be quite a withhold, wouldn't it? So nevertheless, you fill that in, try to get the data on there.

"Any difficulties the pc presently has": Now that gives you some sort of an idea how many present time problems you're going to have to cope with in session.
And "If divorced, the reasons for the divorce and the pc's emotional feeling about divorces": And you had better remember again that it doesn't say how many times he is not divorced, or something of this sort. There might be some sleepers back on the case of some kind or another that never get mentioned. So you better get that question answered very, very well and very thoroughly.

And then "Educational level": This has some interest in the matter. Very often you will find a pc squirming around and telling you that he is not educated, and he has never been to school, and so forth. And it would actually turn out to be a withhold if you didn't go over it slightly. You every now and then find a pc who's ashamed that he hasn't been educated, and you very often find a pc who is ashamed that he has.

You know, I have a lawsuit I've been very laggardly in filing. It's against the University of Texas, and so forth. And these things do come up in education. But I want to claim all of the German courses that Mary Sue had there. I want to claim back the fee and considerable damages, because every time we're around Germans – she's had four years of German, see? And every time we're around Germans – I've only had a couple of lifetimes as German, you see, I've had no courses on it – and I have to order all the beds and breakfasts, you see, and so forth. And I turn around to her and I say, "Suzie, ask the lady to sell us a loaf of bread," you see? And Suzie looks sort of blank, you know? And then finally, I finally get brot. Let's see, brot, brot, brot. It restimulates hell out of me. After you've been killed in a country a few times, you know, and you try to talk its language, you get restimulated. So the University of Texas is going to get sued sooner or later on this business.

But you run into oddball angles on education of some kind or another. And if you were processing – well, I think probably if you were processing dear old Mr. Jenner out here. He's quite a fireball. He's our bricklayer, and he's quite a boy. You go out there, and if the materials are available, and if the East Grinstead merchants have been talked into letting go of something, [laughter] you go out there and you will see a low wall of bricks – a low wall of bricks being put up – and you go back about a half an hour later, you know, and the wall is over your head. You just never saw bricks throw themselves and plant themselves and get masonried into shape as fast as Mr. Jenner can do it. He is terrific. Right now I don't know how many cubic yards of dirt they've moved out there this afternoon, and bricks flying in all directions, and that sort of thing. But I don't know particularly he has a thing on education, but he rather considers, to a slight degree, that he is not educated. And he is likely not to inform you on this subject. And it sort of is a withhold, because you are processing him in some highly intellectual line, see – Scientology, and that would be intellectual.

And then he tries to kind of measure up to all this, and he gets into some kind of an impressive fog. You got the idea? And it - his relationship could be actually twisted and made poor with the auditor if this point wasn't straightened out with such a pc. Other people, they've had twenty-nine years of education, postgraduate courses and all that sort of thing, and they can't write their name, so they're ashamed, too. And they try to say, "No. I've never been to school." But you get a lot of lies in this particular area. And so you'd better get that pretty well straight. It's not that it has anything to do with whether he can run the process or doesn't run the process, but it's a fruitful subject of withhold. And you'll find most of this is.
All right. And you ask him about his professional life, and main jobs he's held and so forth. You ask him about serious accidents, and the date of such, and any permanent damage and that sort of thing. You ask about principal illnesses, and now you're getting into an interesting zone, because if you didn't know some of these things, you could run into them head-on. You could keep running into engrams of one kind or another that you wouldn't have any information on whatsoever because he never mentions them.

And then you go into "Operations" – and that's one that you should do briefly. Accidents, illnesses and operations are all subject to restimulation; and you can restimulate the living daylights out of a pc if you start auditing these things as he brings them up. Now, how do you audit them? All you have to do is ask about them. Just ask about them, thoroughly, and he'll be in it. You can throw him, as an auditor, straight into such an incident.

Now, you get somebody out in the Middle West, and you ask them if they've ever had any illnesses or operations, and of course there goes the intensive. [laughter] Don't know if you've ever read any letters coming from the Bible Belt. As I've mentioned before, they read something like – what was that quack's name that was arrested down in Texas for practicing medicine without a license? And somebody awarded ten million dollars damages for his having – Morris Fishbein of the AMA. Morris Fishbein, the head of the AMA. This is all true about Morris. He was arrested for practicing medicine without a license. But they actually read like his primary textbook. How to Get Sick and Go to the Doctor, I think the textbook was called.

And you get somebody started on this and my God, here we go. You get some pcs started on this who have a slight strain of hypochondria and man, they will give it to you blow by blow, and writhe around, and run their havingness down, and so forth, and then start on their families' illnesses and so forth; and then they get to all the mistakes the doctor made, and how the doctor had to open them up again in order to – in order to recover his nurse or something. [laughter] And this can become far too windy.

So your ability to acknowledge is the only way you turn this off. Your ability to acknowledge, in making out this form, must be good and never better than under "Accidents," "Illnesses" and "Operations." Your ability to acknowledge, wonderful. And you can say to them, if it doesn't turn off, "Well, you know, we'll be taking up that sort of thing in processing, in the direct processing. We'll be taking that up more directly." That shuts it off. You will, too, because inevitably, if they're going to talk about it that much, they're sort of hung in it. But this is not an auditing moment of running engrams; this is not the engram situation that you are running into.

All right. Now, what do we have here essentially? What do we have as we go down this line but data? And that data can be confused with the auditor – isn't ordinarily; auditors do well filling these things out. But an auditor's natural impulse is to take these things up with the pc. Well, don't take them up with the pc while doing such a form. That's all. Just don't take them up, that's all. Forget it. Acknowledge it and get off of it and get on to the next line – you got the idea? – without creating an ARC break. Now, sometimes that is neat. Sometimes you have to be very neat in order to get off of a subject and shut a pc off, because, you see, an ARC break is composed of "not able to talk to the auditor."
But if you've ever watched a pc talk his havingness down, you'll agree with what I am telling you. They can talk their havingness straight out the bottom, just as nice as you please – down it goes with a dull thud.

They talk themselves right down the Tone Scale: Enthusiasm, and the next thing you know, they're a little antagonistic; and the next thing you know, they're crying; and the next thing you know, they're not talking.

You can watch them. They'll slide right on down the Tone Scale if you don't hold up this. So, it's best, in entering these, to tell the pc – this is "Accidents," "Illnesses" and "Operations" I'm still talking about, (E), (F), and (G) on this form – it is best to say, "Now, I just want to know these things very briefly, exactly what these things were, very briefly." And you sort of emphasize this "very briefly," and you won't run into him talking himself straight back into an engram and finishing his first auditing session with a Christ-awful somatic he didn't know where the hell it came from. Got the idea? That's a good prevention.

Remember that a pc can talk down his havingness. If you're accustomed as an auditor to ever letting a pc run on and on and on and never stopping him from talking, you are doing him an unkindness. And don't think you're doing him a kindness, because you're not. You're doing him an unkindness. The best thing you can do is to get on with the auditing, but this can sometimes create an ARC break, and so you have to handle it carefully.

And the best way to handle it is to preorganize it. Don't try to handle it after the fact if it's going to be difficult. Handle it before the fact. So that part of your auditing statement is, "Now in the next minute or so, I want you to list for me all of the accidents you have had." you get that kind of a trick? "In the next minute or so," you see?

Oh, well, he's put in a sort of a little games condition now, and – is how fast can he do it, and he says, "Well, let's see, there were fifteen automobile accidents and twenty-five bicycle accidents and seventeen times when I fell off of railway bridges – I always seem to be falling off railway bridges. And let's see. And that's about all. Ha-ha, I beat you. It didn't even take me a minute." You see?


Any kind of trickery like that is better than letting a pc talk his havingness down. You got the idea? So you get the data without the ARC break.

"Present Physical Condition": Once more I refer you to the letters which you might see coming from the Bible Belt. This is one of the marvelous subjects.

"Well, I have misery. It's – misery has been going on for a long time." And you very often will see a pc, very often, just sit back and heave a long sigh, and you're just setting in for a long chat. This is going to be a nice, quiet afternoon we're going to spend. [laughter] And that's not what we're there for at all.

Once more, the "briefly," the this and that, the inference that we've got to get this listed so that we can get on to the next item. And the next item is something else, and we don't care what the next item is, you see? Briefly, you know: "Let's get this briefly so that we can get on to the next item. Now what is your present physical condition?"
And they say, "Long after... Oh, no. He... She... She really wants to know." [sighs] "Terrible."

"All right. Now how is it terrible? All right. Where are the pains exactly? Inform me exact – what parts of the body and so forth?"

"Oh, well," she says, "all over – my eyes, my head, my back, and I have athlete's foot. And so forth, and so on, and et cetera."

Now, you remember that the pc is on a meter. So at this point it'd be an awfully good time to look at that E-Meter. Now, we're not interested much in the E-Meter except for the tone arm, up to the point we get to this (H). Is there a withheld physical condition? That we're terribly interested in. And so we read the needle. And you can put right opposite that (H) that it's a little old needle-reading stunt right here.

And you want to know if there are any illnesses the pc hasn't told anybody about, if there are any worries about health the pc has not imparted to anyone. Pcs sometimes go around thinking they're dying of some dreadful disease, and they never let anybody in on it because it'd be too terrible for others to know – all that sort of thing. And also, and very, very much to the point, "Are there any diseases you would hate to have people know about?" Ah, and you're liable to collide with a freight train, where it can save yourself one God-awful amount of dodged processing. Just get it right there. Just – let's just get any possible withhold on the subject of present physical condition off of this case now. And you'll save yourself a lot of trouble, because a withhold about present physical condition is one of the most serious withholds there can be on a case.

All right. We come to section I. And section I is "Mental Treatment." And it says, "List any psychotic, psychoanalytic, hypnotic, mystical or occult exercises, or other mental treatment which pc has had, the date of the treatment and the E-Meter reaction." And you could very well add to that "Any treatment he is now receiving," and you would get yourself something else.

Now this, too, you want to shake down with the needle. You want to get any withhold in the area of mental treatment off, off, off. You know, a person who is withholding the fact that he has been adjudicated as stark, staring insane, is, of course, sitting on the one withhold that can stop his processing in its tracks. And, right here on this course, there has been an instance or two of somebody continuing treatment while training. And evidently this was not shaken down well, because you find no trace of it in their Preclear Assessment Form in the beginning of their folder. The auditor just did not find it.

Those things are important. Those things are very important during auditing. They're very important in an HGC. The person goes – gets auditing all day, and then has somebody cracking his spine all night while they're hypnotizing him or something, and you're going to get no place, man. He's going to be out of session every morning, going to have a high tone arm every morning. And then it takes about the middle of the morning to get the tone arm down. And then the next morning he comes in and he has a high tone arm again. And about the third time this happens – that he goes off with a low tone arm and comes back with a high tone arm – you can suspect that there's a withhold on "Present Physical Condition" or "Mental
Treatment," or "Current Treatment." That is the most fruitful source of that particular activity. There is something wrong. There is something going on here. The person is doing something else and they don't want you to know about it.

Although running Prehav Scales, of course, puts up the tone arm, the usual cause of high tone arms – it's not that a tone arm must not be high. As a matter of fact, they can't run the Prehav Scale properly without getting high tone arms, you understand; but I'm talking about the mechanism of the pc's always showing up with a high tone arm. You know, you process a pc for a week, and then all of a sudden for a week the pc only has a reading of five and a half. Well, there's just something wrong in this division. The pc is either physically ill and doesn't want to tell you, or the pc has some bug on the subject of the mind and doesn't want to tell you and so on; or the pc is actually getting treatment in between your treatments and doesn't want to tell you. So if you shake those things down during the Preclear Assessment Form to get the withholds off – now, this is not a chatty afternoon over a cup of tea. You're just going to go right to it and you're going to get the withholds off on this subject. Now, he actually won't mind you getting the withholds off on this subject. Be kind of a relief to him as a matter of fact. And if he does have withholds on this subject – if he does have withholds on this subject, and if he doesn't get them off, you won't be his auditor. That's it.

But if he does have withholds on this subject and you do get them off, then you of course are his auditor. Obviously. You know about these withholds and nobody else knows about them, so therefore you must be his auditor. Follows, doesn't it?

You know things about him, now, that other people don't know, so therefore that follows, then, that you are the person's auditor. You'll find session ... in-sessionness increases very well if you do that.

Now "Compulsions, Repressions and Fears" doesn't necessarily follow in that same category at all, and we just couldn't care less. It's going to be of no value to you to know of his compulsions, repressions and fears to amount to anything, except as a gauge of how daffy he is or isn't. And that's the only gauge you're going to get out of that. It's just a measure and you can already read that off the graph.

So you go over that rather rapidly, and you get down to "Criminal Record," and this, too, is a matter of grave interest to us. Because people who have criminal records and don't want us to know about it – that can make a bad show in auditing. So let's, when we get to (K), let's once more bear down on the needle, and let's examine that needle very carefully on this interrogation on the subject of crimes, prison sentences and so forth. And let's make sure that we've got that thing showing up.

It's interesting that I had a letter from a preclear that has gone through London HGC on several occasions over a period of time, and he's complaining about his case gains. He is; he's not blaming anybody. He's not mad at anybody or anything, but he's just written me a letter and asked me to please, can't I tell him why, or do something about it.

And the side note that appears on this thing, of course, is the man has a record as long as your arm. Now, I -- we know that here, but does his auditor know it there? See, that could just account for no case gain, right there in a lump sum, bang! Well now, if each new auditor
he has had has not done a Preclear Assessment Form, then he feels he has a withhold to some degree from that auditor, and maybe nobody has ever dug this up in this particular fashion. I haven't followed back the other data concerning this, but that is just an interesting point.

I very seldom get such letters. My letters are usually quite the reverse. They're "Dear Ron, I just this and so on, and wonderful processing and I feel better, and so on." But this chap – he's just worried about himself, that's all. So we would also have found him under "Present Physical Condition," and we would also have found him under "Compulsions, Repressions and Fears," and we might have found him under "Other Mental Treatment." See, it would all have dropped out of the hamper on the Preclear Assessment Form, had we done one properly, and if every new auditor that had the case had done one for himself.

Although I have said you have to write on this legibly, remember it is for you, the auditor, to facilitate your auditing of the case.

All right. Now we get down to one that we couldn't care less about: "Interests and Hobbies." This will have no great bearing on a case. It'd be very unusual. Once in a blue moon, he has the hobby of "killing little girls in dark woods" or something like that, but it isn't often, and it has very little case bearing. It, however, can serve as a cross index to his goals terminal. Not very important.

Now we have "Previous Scientology Processing." And this is far too specific when we list the auditors, the hours, and the E-Meter reaction, and everything else, in the HGC or the Academy. This is just too confoundedly specific. And we don't have to be this specific. There isn't any reason to be this specific.

The number of auditing hours he has had, he will seldom recall. The auditors you want to get to on the case will be buried, for the purposes of this preclear assessment. So we press him very lightly in this particular line. Very, very lightly.

So you would do much better to ask him a general idea. A general idea is what you want, and that's all. Otherwise, you're going to plow up all of his auditing, restimulate all of his auditing: You're going to have to take up all of his ARC breaks; you're going to have to take up all of his ARC breaks and failures with past auditors; you're going to have to take up all of his successes. And you've got another afternoon's activity all mapped out in level M unless you say, "Well now, briefly, and just in general – just give me some sort of an idea – when were you first processed – something – some date. And, yes. And you had some organization processing, and you had – all right. And field auditors?" – so on. "All right. That's good," and so on. "Thank you." you know, it's very brief.

The best way to get this data is to run the ARC break process on the pc. And you're not running it at this time. And you'll find all their auditors, and he'll find the auditors that are aberrative and so forth. But you just want to know how long this fellow has been in processing. And you've got another afternoon's activity all mapped out in level M unless you say, "Well now, briefly, and just in general – just give me some sort of an idea – when were you first processed – something – some date. And, yes. And you had some organization processing, and you had – all right. And field auditors?" – so on. "All right. That's good," and so on. "Thank you." you know, it's very brief.

Now, when you say, "List briefly the processes run," man, that's a grim one. You take somebody that's been around since 1951 – the number of processes run. In the first place, the
pc almost never remembers them, and you've got a big hang-up there, and so forth. So I would say instead of that, instead of that sort of thing, I'd want to know, "What's been run on you, more or less, that made a change in your case?"

Oh, they'll tell you those glibly and very rapidly; they can remember those. But those things that have made no change on his case, we couldn't care less. But at the time this thing was first compiled, it was important to know what engrams had been started and hadn't been started, you see? And then this was taken off the earlier form, so it has arrived that way.

And "List the goals attained from such processing." Well, now you've asked him the same thing, if you just asked the one I just gave you. You said, "What processes have given you a change?" You see? Well, that just – write them diagonally across the (2) and (3) all at once.

And "Goals not attained from such processing" is an adventurous question to ask a pc, but should be asked. And it'd be a very good thing to find out what he has not been able to do about processing 'cause you'll be able to refer to that later on, and it's part of the O section.

It gives you a clue of coordination. You want to know what he's been trying to do with processing that he hadn't done. He might even give you a hidden standard.

All right. The "Present Processing Goals." Now, he's going to give you some brief goals of one kind or another. These are not very important at this particular stage, but you want to know what he's trying to do with processing, but very often at this stage of the game he just gives you a social response. "Well, I would like to be better," and that sort of thing. Well, you don't want anything more than that.

Now, we have a whole section here, which is the ne plus ultra of the whole thing, and we get to what makes this a Problems Intensive. We get to section O. Now that was where we wanted to get; that was where we wanted to arrive. And this we are going to do now with the greatest of care. We are going to write this up ad infinitum, and if there are not enough spaces, we're going to make some more.

Here we have "O. Life Turning Points: List each major change the pc has experienced in life." And that means his whole life ever since he was a very small boy or girl.

And of course, you're going to have the pc giving you – you're going to see the perfect example of cyclic recall as you do this. So don't try to ask for a certain period at any given time, because you're going to get near present time ones, then you're going to get middle range, and then you'll get early, and then you'll get near present time ones, and then you'll get early ones, and then you'll get middle, and then you'll get near present time, and it'll just go back up and down this way.

But you want to list each one of these carefully, because you are now going to use these for assessment, so they have to be listed with precision. They have to be listed with great precision.

Now what precision? Well, it's going to be so that you can say it easily on an assessment. You're going to have to say this several times. So we don't want it long, lengthy and long-winded. We want a precise statement, so that's what we keep asking the pc for.
"Major change the pc has experienced in life," and the pc may want to know what you mean by a major change. "Well, when you didn't any longer do what you were doing and started doing something else; when you didn't any longer live where you were living and moved elsewhere; when you didn't any longer have that state of health but had another state of health."

"Ah, well, oh, well, you mean – you mean," and he'll tell you something else.

All right. Well, we'll get those changes and you take that up very carefully and then get these changes this way: "Well, after I had an operation for goiter, I found out that I couldn't go out as much."

So you put down "operation for goiter." That's all you write. Major change point. Then, "All right. What was another major change point?"

"Well, um… It was when I… It was when I finished my first year in college. I had to leave."

"Oh? Well, did you go back?"

"No. no. Never went back. Yeah. First year in college."

So that's what you want. So it's "leaving college" is a very, very excellent way of expressing that, see? So that's expressed very briefly. Your next point. Express them briefly, succinctly.

Now, each one of these is followed by a date. And his idea of the date is going to be the wildest scramble you ever heard of so don't press him for an accurate date, particularly, and don't go pushing on it, because the person will do enough hemming and hawing here to last a lot of people a long time, and the dates you get aren't going to be very accurate unless you sit down with an E-Meter and go through a timing exercise of putting the things on the time track. And we're not asking you to do that particularly. So "ten years ago" is good enough. But write down something like "around 1948." See, that's plenty good. Anything the pc tells you is the date.

And we go on down the line and we fill out all these major changes. Now, you may find yourself needful of more space in order to get all these major changes, and if you do, you just clip another piece of paper up at the top of page five on this assessment form. And you just keep writing them in the same wise. Pcs might have lots of them. This would be fairly adequate for the usual case, but you might find somebody with a lot more.

Now, he's probably missed a great many of these changes. He probably hasn't looked at these other things as changes at all. So you continue the list with specific requests. You want to know when the pc newly joined any religious group. That'll be a major change point in a person's life, you see? And the pc didn't. All right. He didn't.

Now, "When did the pc start going to church again?" 'Course, that's a major change point. Ha-ha. "Start going to church again." Well, that tells us something.

If I had been doing this on an archbishop in northern Greece one night down in Athens – if I'd been doing just this, I would have pulled half of his aberrations by asking him why
he joined the church when he was nineteen in New York City. Because his sole goal was "to die and go to heaven." He did have a psychosomatic goal, which was "to keep himself from going blind." But he gave me the whole story about he was in a terrible upset and so he joined the church, and here he is at 70 or 80 or 205 or something like that – there he was, and he's still riding the same stable datum.

This, by the way, is interesting. Maybe in the *National Geographic* sometime or another you've seen a monastery – picture of a monastery in northern Greece, where the people can't ever walk in and out of the place. They have to be lifted in baskets. And they're lifted up the face of the wall in a basket.

This was the archimandritid [archimandrite], I think, of that particular monastery. And he had come down to – he'd heard of Scientology, and they – had a couple of sisters with him. I could have pulled his whole case right there. Clank! Interesting. Because the major "When did he start going to church again?" would, in this particular case, have become "When did he become a member of the church?"

Well, he became a member of the church after a long period of confusion back in his middle teens. And that was almost sixty years before. Interesting. And had been riding the same confusion, and he'd been – he was sitting right there on the same chronic somatic. Fascinating.

"When did the pc subscribe to a fad?" Now, he's liable to give you anything, and even insult you with saying Dianetics is one, or something like that; we don't care what the pc said. But when we say "fad" – when we say "fad" we mean anything everybody else was doing with enthusiasm. But we also mean food fads, or clothing fads. He joined the Edwardians; he became a Teddy boy. Anything like this, you see? He joined up into something or other, but it will indicate a change.

"When did the pc begin dieting?" And the pc's normal first response is to tell you that he never did. And you should be very careful about that particular point – ha-ha – because after a moment or two, he'll find a dozen periods of his life when he had to change his eating habits.

Well, he was – he was in the army. And yes, well, he did start dieting, "If you want to call it that." You'll get that kind of response, you see? He couldn't stand Spam. He just couldn't stand Spam, and he stopped eating Spam, and he hasn't been able to eat meat of that composite-type ever since. And he won't eat meat of that composite-type ever since. That's it. "That – if you want to call that a diet, fine. All right. That's a diet. But they just serve me one more piece of Spam and they would have had it." That was a diet. It's a negative diet.

Of course, at that particular level, you write down when it was, and you want to know what it was. So you'd say, "1943, Spam." That would be your notation.

"All right. What other – what other diets have you started off on?"

"No other diets. I'm not dieting. I'm no vegetarian, or food faddist, or anything like that. I have no other unusual diets of any kind whatsoever."

Well, this one has to be followed up. You have to get a little bit clever.
So you have to ask a question like this: "Well, do you eat differently, or have you ever eaten differently from other people that were around you?"

"Oh, well, you put it that way, yes, they eat these poisonous meats all the time, and they eat these meats, and they didn't care what meat it was and what meat it wasn't, and so forth. And actually, for some years, I haven't eaten any meat." But you see, this to the pc is not a diet. He doesn't define it as such because that is ordinary, that is usual. And the thing he is doing ordinarily with food is the thing to do with food. It isn't what everybody does on the subject of food. He never notices that.

All right. He's liable to give you some answer and say, "Well, I was out on the China coast, and all the Chinese were eating rice, and who the devil could live on rice all the time, but I managed to get some food. And I was eating differently than other people then – very differently from the other people who were around me then. They were all eating rice, and I knew you couldn't live on rice, and so forth. And I had to eat other food from that, and there was a lot of trouble getting other food at that particular time."

You say, "When was that?" And you put down "1948, China." Not "rice." That'll all give you clues, clues, clues. Something was happening there. Something weird was going on. His life was changed. That won't be much of a point, but this is liable to liven up the next point, you see?

"Well now, did you – are there any other – any other food changes, any other diets or anything like that?"

And he all of a sudden tells you for the first time, "Well, my family only eats kosher food."

"When is the first time you had any difficulty eating kosher food or finding kosher food and so forth?"

"Oh, well, you want to know that, that was when I joined the army. Had a lot of trouble. Had a lot of trouble."

Put down "kosher food" and some sort of a date. There's upsets associated with all this sort of thing. But those are not as important as this one:

He said, "Well, I started to live on lettuce and muldeberries – dried muldeberries\(^7\) and lettuce in um… 1951." That's right out of the blue, you see? There's no explanation to this of any kind whatsoever.

You don't say, "Well, you did?" you know? [laughter]

You better write down "dried leaves" or "dried muldeberries and lettuce, 1951," right there. Bang! Because, boy, he must have run into a freight train.

If you look back of this, you see, you look back here, you won't find anything else happening in 1951, you don't think, you know? You look back here and Mother's death, Father's death – 1951: Where the hell is 1951? Nothing happened in 1951. Nothing. That is just

---

\(^7\) a made-up word for a type of berry
a stroke out of the blue, and you'll get it on such things as diets and fads, and that sort of thing, much more rapidly than you'll get it on something else.

All right. "When did the pc leave a job?" And, of course, this may get very lengthy, but you better take down every one of them. Much more important than the auditing he's had is how many jobs has he left? How many, how many, how many, how many, how many? And you get some sailors, for instance, and they never show you all their discharges. But they were on a ship in 1949, and they were on a ship for two months in 1955 and they were on a ship for one month in 1958.

"What have you been doing the rest of the time?"

"Well, I've been going to sea."

What the hell goes on, you see? There's holes all up and down the line, don't you see? And something going on during that period; it's all a big not-know as far as you're concerned. And as far as the pc is concerned, it's just all a big withhold.

So when the pc starts to give you his job lines and there's something going wrong with this, you want to start asking, "How long did you hold that job?" And get his job record so that it's somewhat chronological. Find out his leaving points, and at these leaving points – he says, "Well," he'll say, "I left a job... I left a construction company in 1951. And I left the um... Yes, and I left uh... The um... Merchandising department of Taylor & Sanford's in 1955."

You say, "That's good." Now you've jumped – made an unreasonable assumption: You think that from 1951 to 1955 he was in the merchandising establishment at Taylor & Sanford's. He wasn't. There had been about eight job changes in the middle of the thing, see?

So always find out how long he kept the job. That is the only keynote there. Find out how long he kept that job, and then you will see where the missing links are.

Now, because the changes are sufficiently interesting in that particular line, you had better E-Meter needle it. "Any other jobs you've left?" Blang! "What was that one? Any other jobs you left?" Blang! "What was that one? Any other jobs you left? What was that?" Blang! And so forth. And you get a pretty good employment record just as number 13's number of lines imply. Because every one of those, he was in coaction with a group. And a person who has too many jobs is having difficulty with coaction, mutual motion. He's having great difficulty with mutual motion. And this lends itself peculiarly to the development of tremendous overts and withholds. Overts and withholds all stem from mutual motion; that is, the whole theory moves out of that particular field. And job and employment and work are things which are notably milestone a man's decline and aberration, and that sort of thing. It's not that they're aberrative in themselves, but he is in mutual action with some group, and then finds himself in violent disagreement with some group. And then he's in mutual action with another group, and finds himself in violent disagreement there. Well, there must have been some confusions; some hidden confusions are in that period. And by getting a job record, you can spot a lot of hidden confusions.

Now supposing the person is not a working person at all. Then you change the question over to "When did the pc leave a certain type of activity?" And you'll find out she was a
housewife, and then she was a club member, and then she was a this, and then she was a that and you'll get a type of job record which is just an activity record. But this whole number 13 of section O is devoted to spotting departed or areas of co- or mutual motion on the third dynamic. You won't have much other record if you don't make a full one here.

Now again, that all has to be written in such a wise that you can easily assess it later because you're going to use this and use this and use this data.

Unlike everything up to and including (M) and (N), you're going to use the O section till you practically wear out the paper. So do your best writing in this particular area; make sure that you can read your own writing. That would be a good thing to be able to do, because you're going to assess it, and assess it, and assess it, and assess it.

All right. "When did the pc have to take a rest?" Ah, that's splendid. That's real good. And those are marvelous, because you're going to find those are the points just before which there were prior confusions of magnitude.

So you're going to find out all these points when he had to take a rest, and you're going to write all those down.

And "When is the time the pc noticed a body difficulty?" Well, you're going to write all those down, but this is going to be awful comm-laggy. Going to get all that straightened out.

Now, "When did the pc decide to go away?" Now, of course, you get wives, husbands, little children, almost anybody subscribes to this one, and of course, it is always preceded by an area of confusion. So here's a very fruitful source of confusions. Now, if these things are – suddenly start, about this stage of the game, to be the same areas as you've already recovered, don't worry about it. Just keep writing them down, see? Don't call this to the pc's attention at this stage and say, "Well, I see that you left a job in – in June of 1955 – you left a job June of 1955, and you started going to church again in June of 1955, and you decided to take a rest in July of 1955. Well, what about that?"

Well, you're jumping the gun. You are jumping the gun. That's the sort of thing you do in section P. So let's not take up anything here but data. You just want data from the pc, data from the pc. And you'll find out soon enough that it adds up and cross-checks and does all that sort of thing.

Now, the catastrophe for this whole procedure would be if the pc gave you nothing under the sun but the same date and the same incident. Of course, a pc doing that would be nuts. But an institutional case would do that. And you have one thing to assess. All they talk about is when they brought them to the institution, or something like this, you see? That would leave you with just one thing to assess, but people that you ordinarily audit aren't that daffy. But remember that if you did that, you'd have to, next time, fill out another O form. If you haven't got enough data on the O form, you fill out another O form after you've handled a P form.

All right. "When did the pc decide to leave and when?" Now that's almost the same question, but not quite: "Decide to leave." He didn't leave. He decided to leave.
After you've got all the departures then you find out that there were eighteen periods of deciding to depart and not departing. And what are you running? You're running leave and then failed leave. Asking him questions about leave and then questions about failed leave. Simple.

Now, "When did the pc start being educated in some new line?" That is doubled over with "What have you taken up?" "What have you taken up?" "When did you take up a course in this, a correspondence course in something else?" You see? "When did you start to study something else?"

Now I just – I just had a maintenance man out here suddenly take up pottery. Hadn't studied anything for years and he's suddenly taken up pottery. I know there's been a catastrophe and a confusion in his life someplace. Isn't any reason for him to take up pottery. He's had a little connection with pottery around here to amount to anything. But that's Mr. Jenner's job.

That's very interesting, isn't it? He's suddenly moving over into another field from carpentry, over into masonry, you know? And what's happened? Well, I also notice he looks a little upset. Now, I haven't interrogated him in any way, but I'm just giving you something there that is a cross-question. Now it isn't anything wrong with taking up new lines. Isn't anything wrong with studying something new. But it might be an indicator. It might be.

That's true of most of these things, is the bulk of them are "might be's."

Now, "When did the pc's physical body change characteristics?" Getting this out of women, you will have to take the E-Meter and beat them over the head. [laughter] A woman at 110 will never admit that her body changed anything from that of a beautiful 16-year-old girl, or something like that, you know? It's just things they won't talk about, so you have to pull that the hard way. Go ahead and grab it.

Now, "When did the pc collapse?" They've probably omitted telling you anything about this up to that point.

And "When did the pc start a new life?" That's just the same question over again in some other line, but this is with magnitude. They may have omitted any of those.

And then "When did the pc stop going to parties?"

Most girls tell you this, they look very sad, and they say, "Well, I met – I met Bill, and he was a stay-at-home type, and so forth. And so we stayed home thereafter." Well, I'll let you in on something. That wasn't the reason they stopped going to parties. You'll run into it in the P section, if this ever assesses out.

They did various things. There were various things occurred about parties. There were various heartbreaks and upsets, because stopping a girl going to parties is only done with sixteen-inch guns. [laughs] You just mark a big underscore under that. They don't easily stop going to parties. Might have been last lifetime, but they… It took something to stop them.

Now, "Who has the pc never seen again?" Now, you notice this is down toward the end of the O section, so that if we have to send for the fire department, and so forth, and get them to dam up the grounds because of the resultant flood, the end of this is very much in
view, because the pc is liable to spill a grief charge. Because you've shaken the pc up considerably by this time, you see?

You ask him for change, change, change, change, change; you're auditing him like crazy all through this O section. Now all of a sudden you say – all of a sudden you say, "Who have you never seen again?" [makes sad sounds; laughter]

And we finally finish up, "What does the pc now consider his or her major life change?" And we don't care what the pc said it was. We just don't care but it's a good thing to ask.

All right, let us go back now – let us go back now to what we are going to do with all of this data. We have now assembled the doggonedest potpourri of data that was ever recorded, and if employment offices ever interrogated employment sheets to the degree that we have shaken this one down, don't you see – even though we did it fairly rapidly – man, would they know something about their applicants.

Miss Jones comes in, applies for a job as a typist.

"Where did you work last, Miss Jones?" Lie.

Uh, "Where – why did you leave?" Lie. [laughter] Here it is, you see? "Is there any reason you would not be able to continue long on this job, Miss Jones?"

"Well, no reason at all, except the doctor's only given me two months to live."

You know, you'd have the lot.

So we're going to take the O section. We're not interested in any other part of this now except as a review and a cross coordination. And we're going to take the P section.

Now, if you are very wise, you will have stopped the O section – at the end of the O section, you will have taken a break. Because you didn't start this thing with rudiments, and the P section has to be started with rudiments.

So you either finished that whole thing off and ended the session and that was the auditing for that day or something of the sort, or that morning, and you start up the P section again, so it might take a little bit of interesting timing to get this thing straight.

Now, this, bluntly, starts an assessment of the pc's major life changes. But you start it in Model Session, and you start right going here with Model Session and you want to clear the rudiments. You want to know if anything upset them, you know, about what you just covered with them. You kind of aim the rudiments, you know, a little bit in the direction of what you've just been doing earlier.

And if you've only got fifteen minutes left of the session, and I find out that you started a P section with fifteen minutes left of the session, I will be upset. You could possibly get away with a rapid assessment, but you certainly couldn't bank on the assessment and so forth.

Now, if you had a half an hour or an hour left of your auditing period, well, by all means, do your assessment but don't go any further. Don't try to do anything with it. And the best thing would be to have them in completely different assessment periods because you're
going to shake this person up like mad doing an assessment. They're going to be in a fit state to be audited, let me tell you.

Now, you're going back here to O – you're going back here to O, and I don't care how many doodle-daddles or code marks or symbols you put on the side of this. You could put .1 divi- I mean 1.0 divisions, you know, fall, or something like that. You could make little notations. But all you're going to do is read them this.

Now, you go down the line. You make that notation: Fall, rise – don't ever note rise. Just fall, theta bop, whatever it is, how much. And you're going to make it, and this time I'm going to ask you to get clever.

It doesn't matter much if you assess this wrong. But this is a wonderful opportunity to get clever on a one-pass needle judgment. After you've finished up reading through this thing once, your record and recall, and so on, are quite adequate to tell you which change point of the person's life registered most. You just read it through once, rapidly.

Now, of course, you can do that by saying to the pc, "You don't have to say a word while I am doing this. You just sit there and hold those cans and I am going to read all of this off" – you've got him in-session, your rudiments are in and so forth – "and I'm going to see what this is all about."

And you simply read this thing off, each one, and note the reactions that greet each one of these change points. When you get over here, you will be able to say that "It is number 13 – something or other – was what assessed. That's good. That got the most reaction on the needle."

Now, that completes step one. Step one consists of that reading, it consists of your adjudication of picking out from the E-Meter reaction, needle reaction, which one of those life changes that you have gone over in O produced the greatest needle response – not just fall, but what had produced the greatest needle response.

Ordinarily, that needle response will be much bigger than the remainder and it will not be unusual for it to be a theta bop. A nice, wide, staggering theta bop – if you found something like that, you're right on his rock chain and it audits like mad.

All right. You've got to note that down and square that around.

Now, this is a disposable form, this form P on page seven. And you notice it's just on one side of the piece of paper only. And in mimeographing this thing and repeating its mimeographs, that format should be followed because that's – this is disposable. This is "add-it-able." After you've done this, this gets added to the pc's record. And then without throwing away anything from one to six pages, you get another form P. See, and you just keep running a new form P, and it's just on one page, one side of the paper. (Very well done here, this mimeographing job.) And of course, you look straight at the pc and you say to the pc very meaningfully, now that you've got the point – it was their "leaving Taylor & Sudrow's" – biggest change in their life, you see? That's the most reaction.

And you ask the pc, "What problem existed..." This is very meaningful. It's just – you plow that question right into him. Everything else has been rather conversational, don't you
see, and this and that, but you just plow this one into him hard. And you say, "What problem existed immediately before you left Taylor & Sudrow's?"

All right. He's going to tell you. Now, he may give you a fact. And if he only gives you a fact, you say, "Yes, yes. All right. That's fine. Good. But state that as a problem. Now what -- what was the problem connected with this? What was the problem? The problem connected immediately before you left Taylor & Sudrow's?"

"Well, it was that I did the accounts wrong."

"Yes. Good. All right. What was the problem?"

"Oh. Oh-ooh-ooh-ooh-ooh, ah... I ah... I -- I see. I s- I see what you mean. You want to know what the problem was. I didn't like my boss."

"All right. Good. Thank you. Now state that as a problem."

"...How to keep from going to jail."

Blang! You see? That's a problem but it's the first problem they actually state as a problem.

Now, they may be mystified as to why you won't accept these as problems, because they seem good enough problems to them. But you could even say to them, "A problem is who, when, what, where, how. There's some question about a problem. There's something undecided about a problem. We want the undecided thing, you know, the thing that was worrying you, the thing you were anxious about, before you left Taylor & Sudrow's."

"Oh, well. Uh-huh-huuuuuu, well, that's different. Ah-ha-ha-ha-ha. Oh, well, you ask me that way. I didn't like my boss." you know?

"Yeah. But what anxiety did you have about it?"

"How to keep from going to jail." So you write it down.

Now comes a little bit of a problem. "How to keep from going to jail." Now, how do you phrase a rudiments thing? You've got to do a shakedown on this sort of thing. You've got to do a little assessment here sometimes. You got to find out what this was all about. But it's not much of an assessment, because it's obviously jail that is a worry here.

So your with would have to be changed to about, you see? And you'd say, "What was unknown about that problem -- what was unknown with that problem about jail?" You've got to change the about to with and change it around. "What was unknown with that problem about jail?" Any such phrasing that gets it across to the pc so that you're running an unknown on it.

Now, if he gives you some significance -- "How to keep from worrying." Oh, man, that's -- that's a rough one because there's no target. You're not running any kind of a terminal.

Now, how do you state this around so that you run about "What was unknown about that problem with worrying?" Man, that is not going to be any process that makes any sense to anybody. Or you are going to say, "Just worrying? Worrying? Is that what it was? Worrying about what? How to keep from worrying -- worrying about what?"
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"Oh, just worrying."

Boy, you're really getting a defeat here, you see? A problem about – just about worrying. "I just found myself worrying. All the time I just found myself worrying and worrying."

All right. In the last moment of defeat, you can give up and say, "What was unknown about your worrying?" Because that's as far as you're going to get.

In other words, don't cave the pc in and don't abandon it. Just try, successfully if possible, to find a proper terminal to add into this problem. If you can't find a proper terminal, you can move off a bit and say what it was. Because you've got to have the thing run as the pc has it. There is no sense in doing anything else. And he could have a problem just about worrying, you see?

So if you can't get him to state a noun, or get him to state something else about this problem, or if you don't get a noun out of him, you will have to use the exact thing that he said.

"Oh, well, worrying," but this is liable to be your response.

"How to keep yourself from worrying. Yeah, well, all right. How do you keep yourself from worrying? Were you worrying about something specific?"

"Well, of course. Of course, naturally. Bill."

"Well, what is the problem then?"

"Well, how to keep from worrying about Bill, naturally, naturally. I mean, this idiot!"

You know, that kind of reaction.

All right. So your process is "What was unknown about that problem with Bill?" See, you've gotten the terminal out of the thing. But the pc could have a problem about – just about worrying. The pc knows that people who worry go to pieces. And the pc finds himself worrying. And that is the most problem the pc has got. And that's as close as he can come to any terminal. And you actually would defeat your purposes by being too forceful about giving him a terminal. There are times to be reasonable about this sort of thing. Try to get a terminal if you can. If you can't get a terminal, run what he'll – run the condition. And you'll still make it. But if you do, you better watch your havingness. And when you finish up that session with Model Session, just hardly ask him if it's all right with the room. Just run TR 10.

Because if you're running a conditional problem, his havingness is going to go down. It can be done, you understand, but his havingness is going to go down, and in end rudiments you're going to have to run some havingness.

All right. Let's take up the next brutal step here rapidly. "What was unknown about that problem?" has got to be flattened on the tone arm. It's got to be flattened on the tone arm. And that may take a long time, and it may take a short time, but you're going to get the tone arm action out of it and get the twenty-minute test on it and so forth, because that problem – you're really going to take it up and beat it to death.

Now he's in a position to answer number 5. We've got to "locate the confusion before that change (as number above)". Not before the problem but before the change. And now
you're going to list the persons present in the confusion. And this is going to give you some difficulty because there will be innumerable persons missing. So you got to shake that assessment down on the E-Meter needle.

"Were there any more people in that confusion?" And you keep reading that until you no longer get a needle reaction. You've shaken all the people out of that. And the most important person to the whole confusion will be the person who comes up last. Just take that as a general running rule and you'll be safe.

All right. You make a list of those persons, and then let's just read that list off, as you've written it right here on the form – don't write it anywhere else than on the form – and you run a rapid assessment which just gets your most needle reaction, not by elimination, and you write down the name of the person who reacted most on the needle as you read that list.

And now you've got to get the withholds off from that person. Now, that means that you might have an additional piece of paper. That means that you might have written up an additional withhold section. It might mean that you have used a standard form to get the withholds off, or it might mean that you just sat there and got the withholds off.

"What were you withholding from that person?" "What had you done to that person?" "What were you doing at the time that you didn't tell that person about?" And we want to get the basic withholds off that person. But we're not going to do a fantastic hour-after-hour grind to get the withholds off of that person. We're just going to get the major withholds off of that person. You're going to try to clean that person up till that person doesn't react. And that's as far as we want it cleaned up. We say the person's name. We don't get an E-needle – a meter reaction. And then we're going to assess the list again leaving the person's name in. We don't take names off as we clear them up. We just keep leaving their names in because they will turn up again. That tells you why we're not being terribly thorough.

So you run down the list, get the most reaction and you get the withholds off from that person. You get what the person has done to them, what the – what he hadn't told them, what he was unable to tell them. Remember the three classes of withholds, see, involuntary withhold – the unintentional withhold, rather – all of those things. We get that off and we'll find out that we've eventually – when we've taken care of all these people and none of these people react anymore on the needle, we'll have cleaned up the confusion.

But the end of that is when the needle does not react while you read the list with the rudiments in. And you don't get a reaction. All right. Great. Great. That's the end of that confusion as far as you're concerned, and that is it.

Now, you've just – run that again, and then you – again, as it says it in (9) and (10). You know, just keep repeating the same thing till you get all that – the people in the confusion off. And now, you return to the O assessment and do all of P again, which is to say that you take this P form as complete and you file it with the person's record and you make out a brand-new P form in exactly the same way. And you go over that thing exactly as you did before.

Now, that is the extent of a Problems Intensive. How long does it take? I don't know how long it'll take you to do this on how many pcs. But I know that this is terribly productive.
And this will get out all the hidden standards, and it'll straighten up most of the present – it'll straighten up all the present time problems of long duration. You'll have all kinds of interesting things occurring as a result of it.

It becomes better when you get the Havingness and Confront Process of the pc and run at the same time. You could do a lot of things. They could get a lot more complicated and so forth. But if you just do this just as it says through here, and keep up and finish until you finish every one of these change points of a person's life, you'll find the last ones are going just fast, fast, fast. They're just disappearing quickly. He gets the problem, he finds the confusion, bang! And he finds the withholds on it, boom!

Don't be too surprised if the person goes terribly backtrack. Let them go backtrack all they want to while you're running the problem. But that they went back running the problem doesn't let that lure you into getting the confusion before the engram. No, we want the confusion before the change in this life, always. And we never wander onto the backtrack from a standpoint of getting off the confusion.

But they will of course run into engrams while they're being audited on the problem. And we don't upset them by trying to get them off of it. We just audit them.

But we want the confusion prior to that change in this lifetime. So that this thing – we don't prevent them from going backtrack – but this thing basically, mainly, handles, and is only designed to handle, the present lifetime.

Okay?

Well, I wish you lots of luck with it. I think you've got a piece of dynamite in your hands that won't preexplode in your face. I think it'll do your pcs a lot of good. Okay?

_Audience: Right. Mm._

Thank you.
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Well, what do you know. I can see the room. [laughter] I just wanted that as a good example. I can discipline myself, too. No smoking. Now, of course, the first one that does any smoking, now, gets a ten-thousand-word infraction sheet. [laughter] And if it's me I'll write ten thousand words in the next few weeks anyway, so. [laughter]

Okay. This is the 12th of October 61.

Now, continuing our dissertation on the subject of the Problems Assessment. Okay?

Now, the grim part of this is that between yesterday's lecture and today, we have had a few mistakes. Now, in the view of the fact that it isn't possible to make mistakes on this, this is remarkable. [laughter] I'd say this was quite a feat. This is quite a feat. Well, it just shows you that anything is possible.

Now, the first mistake that was made is on writing down the changes. On writing down changes, we wrote a short story. When you're writing down the changes in a person's life in Section O you are succinctly and briefly dedicated to simply putting down something that can be assessed. Now you cannot assess, "Well, I went down to the store and bought two pounds of sugar and this was very unusual for me because I only ever buy one pound of sugar." Now, try and assess that, see.

So you've got more or less when it was. So your assessment statement would be something on the order of "1943, sugar." Got the idea? And if you want to get terribly long winded, "buying sugar." You see? It's that brief. Your changes must be brief or they cannot be assessed and your assessment will go by the boards because as you read the assessment, restimulative words will give you a kick on the needle. So that's the way that is. You write that very briefly.

What was another one, Suzie?

Female voice: Rock slams take precedence.

Oh, rock slam takes precedence over other needle phenomena. Rock slam is always greater in meaning than a mere fall. A rock slam will develop into a dial-wide slam if you pursue it. In almost any case, if you keep pushing the fellow into it, it will develop and develop.

If you have a rock slam turn on and the thing turns off again, well, you just ticked the edge of something and it wasn't anything there. But a real rock slam manifestation that really means there is something there – if it goes by rock slam – when you start to run it, you will see yourself a nice, great big rock slam, even if it started with a little rock slam. Rock slams always increase in magnitude.
A rock slam is a very badly overrun flow. It's a tremendously overrun flow. A fall is just a slightly overrun flow. But you still have the index of reality expressed by a rock slam. The only needle phenomena you pay no attention to while doing any kind of an assessment is a rise. And I suppose at any moment this rise is going to rise up again on some of the new students and so forth and they're suddenly going to say, "Oh, well, that was a very strong reaction because it rose and it rose and it rose." My comment on something like that was "I hope you provided him with a parachute." [laughter] This is about as close as that is to Scientology.

Why don't we pay any attention to a rock slam, pardon me, a rise? We pay no attention to a rise of any kind whatsoever because you don't know what turned it on. You have no idea of what turned it on, because it doesn't turn off. And so it doesn't mean anything. You see why it doesn't mean anything?

It is a latent reaction of the needle. It's always latent. You've said something. The person thinks it over and gets there and it's too much for him, it exceeds his reality and he can't confront it. So after – on that question or in two questions or in six questions or a half an hour later, while you were saying something else in each case, you start to get a rise.

A rise is not a spontaneous start. You do not spontaneously start a rise, so you cannot identify what began the rise. So if you start to run it down on the basis of what he couldn't confront ... You could adjudicate this. You could say, "The needle was rising. Therefore, it was obvious that the pc could not confront..." Yeah, but how are you going to finish out the sentence? How can the sentence be finished? In the first place, he's not going to confront any part of it, so you're not going to find it.

Now, you could go over, if you had a tape recording of everything you had said and everything that had happened in the last few minutes preceding the rise and the few minutes after you noticed it and then you took this one by one, item by item – it might be a word, it might be a phrase, it might be a this, it might be a that – you could probably find what started the needle rising. And after that, you would be no wiser than you were before, because the needle would simply stop rising. That's interesting, isn't it?

A rise is meaningful. It does mean that something has occurred which the pc is not about to confront with magnitude. It means something has occurred; he is going to throw his vehicle into reverse and step on the accelerator straight down to the floorboard. That has happened. But what from? What from?

Now, it is highly, highly, highly doubtful if you would ever be able to trace what it is from. You could get near what it was from. But, of course, you have to resolve the whole case to get him to approach what he retreated from. So now it's not worth it because after you've resolved everything you could resolve and worked everything you could work, all you would know then is that you had said something that began a rise. That's all you would know.

Forcing the pc to confront something which the pc is seeking to get away from will normally cause some sort of an ARC break. Now, an auditor has to do it to some degree. But when you have a rising needle phenomena, you are already confronting something that he is not about to go near and no matter how much you pushed him, overwhelmed him, beat him,
ARC broke him, overwhumped him in general, you're not going to get him to front up to it and that's it.

He'll front up to something else and tell you that was it, but you're asking for showers of red herrings to go across the track. You're asking for all kind of things to occur. So you just don't fool around with a rise. I'm just repeating that just to make sure that it's on the record good and hard. You just don't fool around with one. It means the pc couldn't confront something.

But in view of the fact that tracing back the something is both time consuming and uninformative, why do it? Now, you go over a series of terminals. And you're going over a series of terminals and all of a sudden you notice the needle is rising. Well, it means that somewhere in the last five terminals you went over, you struck one that he couldn't confront.

Well, it violates the rules of auditing, because he doesn't have a reality on it, to audit it. So why are you interested in it? See? You couldn't audit it even if you found out what it was. A pc will not respond under auditing to something which causes a rise.

Now, you've got something else that baffles you sometimes as you're busy doing something. You'll see a pc all of a sudden start to rise and rise -- and rise and rise and rise and rise and rise, and then rise and rise and rise and rise. Well, there's nothing wrong with a rise because it'll eventually wind up with a high tone arm, but as you're running things, tone arms go high. Don't try to restrain the rise of a tone arm. So it causes a high tone arm. All right. And you audit a little bit further and then the needle falls and falls and falls and falls and falls and falls. Well you don't change the process, do you? I mean just keep on doing this.

All tone arm rises and all tone arm falls are, of course, accompanied by needle rises and needle falls. Has to be because the two are interconnected -- of course, unless you have a meter built by Pembry. Then they're independent.

I'm merely saying that because there's just been -- we've just laid down the law on "HPA/HCA must have a meter" because we're about to turn out HPAs and HCAs that can operate with E-Meters, and an auditor should have the tools of his trade and they are beginning to show up already with old pieces of garbage, you know, that have been hoisted out and were built in 1952 by God knows who, you know and they're mains-connected, short-circuited, only put 220 volts between the hands of the pc, you see. And we're already running into this. So the -- hence the crack because this is the first squawk I have heard was from the gentleman mentioned.

Now, the best guarantee of case increase is the needle rises and the needle falls which causes a tone arm rise and a tone arm fall. Well, so therefore rising is a part of it, but it is not diagnostic when you're doing something.

Now, sometimes your pc has an ARC break and your rudiments are out and all the needle will do is rise. And when you get all of the rudiments in and the ARC break cured up, why, the needle doesn't rise much or it falls or something -- or something. You get the idea? I mean, what you want to know from a meter: Number one, you want a meter that will tell you the truth. See? You want a meter that is a good, standard meter that won't give you a buggy
reaction, won't be so sensitive you can't read things, won't do this, won't do that and so forth. A good standard meter.

All right. Given that, what you want is a positive reaction and your positive reactions are all needle reactions except rise. Rise is the unpositive reaction so it is not diagnostic. And that is about all there is to it. You – just for fun sometime, when you see a pc's needle rising and you're coffee shopping somehow or another, try to trace down what started it rising. Oh, you'll probably be able to do it fifteen, twenty minutes, half an hour, something like that and you'll probably find out a cat walked by the auditing room window or there was a lawn mower started up in the next field or you mentioned the word "work." [laughs, laughter] All of which gave you data that you could have had anyhow or didn't need, of no value.

All right. What was another one of these?

Female voice: Rudiments out.

Oh, well, yes. Pcs do not run with rudiments out. Goals will not assess with rudiments out and if it's also true that this list, this checklist, when you start going over it for Section P, why, it'll also misbehave if your rudiments are out. That's why the assessment has to be done in Model Session securely and severely. So you have to get the rudiments in. Because any assessment will go by the boards if rudiments are out.

It happens on an average of once a week, someplace in the world, that for half an hour of one session – someplace in the world – a pc is audited with rudiments in. It's accidental. It's accidental. He didn't mean it that way, but they cure it up pretty quick. [laughter] This is snide – snide and sarcastic, isn't it. But honest, that's almost the way it begins to look to me, you know. You know?

If you really want to know what rudiments in looks like, run a session like this: Short-session the pc. Run a Model Session and get the rudiments very severely in. Audit the pc for ten minutes on something – we don't care what, even the process you should be running – and then, put the end rudiments in. And you're going to say, "What happened to the rudiments that I put in a little while ago?"

All right. So you put the end rudiments in. You give the pc a little bit of a break and then you start the session again. And put beginning rudiments in and they're out. And you say, "But I just put rudiments in. There hasn't been any auditing; there's been a break." So you get the beginning rudiments in and you run ten minutes worth of process and then you put the end rudiments in and the rudiments are out. What's going on?

And you will begin to get of the opinion that it is impossible to put rudiments in. You know why? You never asked the question a second time. You very often, as a common failing – you say, "Are you withholding anything?"

And the fellow says, "Well, no." Clank!

"What's that?"

"Ah, well, that's uh – it's nothing, really, but Joe and I – Joe and I uh – we were down at the cafe last night till two o'clock and did nothing but discuss your auditing."
"Oh, I see. All right. Okay. All right. Now, is it all right now if I audit this process on you?" Something or other. [laughter]

What? You yourself run a – sometimes run on the rudiments a nonconfront. Get the idea? You don't quite confront this and you don't repeat it.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" Clank! "What's that present time problem?"

"Well, I had an awful fight last night with my landlady. An awful fight. And she's throwing me out. And as a matter of fact, right now while we are being audited, why, my bags are out on the front porch and the bags are all out on the front porch and so forth and it's raining. And so forth and so on."

Well, a man of no action at all would go ahead and try to run a session. A person who thinks auditing will do everything would go ahead and try to run a session. A person who wouldn't would say, "You go get in a taxicab or something of that sort and you move yourself over to your lodgings and pick up your baggage and bring it back and then we will start the session." See, present time problem.

But whatever you've done about this present time problem, we eventually get it so it doesn't knock anymore and we don't get a needle reaction on it anymore. So we sail along to find out if the pc has an ARC break and we find out if the pc is withholding anything all the way down the line. Well of course, the next time you take a swish across the rudiments we are doing what we should have done in the first place.

You see, that was just a present time problem. He had twelve! So every time you go over the rudiments again, you will run into what you should have run into by the repetitive question. You should have asked them again, you see?

After he came back, straightening up the bags or you had audited it out or something like this, why, you should have asked him again. Good. Just as though you had just thought of it and it was a brand-new rudiment, you say, "Now, do you have a present time problem?" And it goes clang! and you say, "What's that?"

But your self-satisfaction, your glibness, your feeling of the canary-that-just-ate-the-cat feeling, you know. You're feeling so good about all this, that it doesn't occur to you that he's got another present time problem, see. Or that there is also something else wrong somewhere. You got the idea?

So each rudiment, each rudiment itself, is in sequence to the last rudiment. Now look. There might be an ARC break on "Are you withholding anything?" but you don't now, of course clean up the ARC break because it occurs before the withhold.

So of course when you do end rudiments, you run into an ARC break, but it occurred in the beginning of session. Well, that's a criticism of you because it means that your rudiments were out during the whole session. You must have been wasting auditing time. Well, how could you cure such a thing?

Well, there's no provision in the Model Session for curing such a thing except just asking enough and realizing that you can take up a rudiment at any time. You can always take up
a rudiment. It's bad practice to take them up so often that the pc gets no auditing, but you can always take up a rudiment.

Now, just for fun sometime – just for fun, to enforce and show you what I'm talking about – run somebody this way. This is an experimental action.

Run the beginning rudiments and then run the beginning rudiments and then run the beginning rudiments and then run the beginning rudiments. And you will just be fascinated what happens. And it will be a wonderful example to you of the care you should utilize in handling rudiments. And when somebody tells you your rudiments are out – when somebody tells you your rudiments are out, why, you of course very well must realize that the rudiments you put in are still in.

You see, nobody is saying that the rudiments you put in went out. See, what you straightened up on the case is still straightened up on the case, if you did any kind of a job at all, but there were more things out than you asked for. You see, you've cleaned up this present time problem. There was another present time problem. You didn't ask for it.

It was there. It would have knocked again. There was another ARC break, but you didn't ask for it, you see. There's something else wrong with the room, but you didn't ask for it. That is much more difficult to achieve, this room proposition, because usually it takes care of everything in a full sweep and we've tried to get an ARC break process now which takes care of it at one full sweep, so that you get all the ARC breaks and we're moving up there into better rudiments.

But one of the things that happens as your rudiments went out is after the pc got off his withholds, he had another withhold but he didn't ask for it – you didn't ask for it.

Well, now how could he have another withhold and you didn't ask for it and he doesn't get a knock on withholds or anything of this sort? That's because the withhold he gave you was a damn lie. You ever consider that? It happens so often. So, your rudiments keep going out, keep going out, keep going out, keep going out. Why? Because the pc's withholds are not coming off; you're getting something which isn't true or something that is half true.

And so we have this new end rudiment line which is in lieu of the withhold question in end rudiments and that is to the effect, "Have you told me any half-truths or untruths in this session or said anything just to make an impression on me?" Could be worded, by the way, "just to influence me?" as in some types of case you find that more workable. The pc is always trying to get you on their side by complaining about somebody and that would get that.

Well, now, how about this? You ask a pc for a withhold, you get a knock and then the pc tells you a lie of some kind or another. And you ask him – and you try to clean up withholds and the withholds just aren't kind of cleaning up very well. Well, they won't clean up if you're getting half-truths or untruths. In fact, you're going to worsen the case because it – to tell an auditor an untruth, of course, is an overt. It's just throwing auditing away like crazy. So you have this new end rudiment situation.

We still have short sessioning with us. So now, by beginning a session, doing an assessment such as the P section here and ending the session, you've found it, you see, and by
ending the session, giving the pc a break while you figure it out – as good an excuse as any – and then starting the session again, why, you get the pc pretty well oriented, because this is about the first time you will have put him in a formal session doing a Problems Intensive if you've taken him straight off the street.

So that would be very, very good practice – extremely good practice – is to finish the O section. Get that all set, you see. And then put him into Model Session, come right down, get the rudiments in, do the assessment out of O section to fill in the first part of the P section. Do end rudiments. Give him a short break. Note which one it is and bring him back into session again. Why?

Well, you're going to get a double crack at this pc's rudiments. Now, you see that a double crack at the rudiments is beneficial because let us say again an ARC break – we have had an ARC break while pulling a withhold and of course, you don't have another ARC break question following the withhold question. That sort of thing is cared for by doing beginning rudiments, doing something or another which is – looks like a finished activity to the pc and doing an end rudiment. Bringing him back into session, doing a beginning rudiment. By that time, you've got this fellow pretty well grooved. Now you start asking him questions, you're going to get much better answers.

Now look, you put the rudiments in three times if you did that. Now, you see why it might be a good thing to put the rudiments in three times? Because a rudiment can go out while you're putting another rudiment in.

Now, that would pretty well guarantee that this pc had your – had you very much his auditor at the moment you ask this burning question: "What problem existed immediately before – ?" and you give him the change that you have assessed. Now, if you've got him in good session, man, it'll shake him down to the bottom of the Earth, see.

And he'll be able to recall it and he'll be able to handle it and he'll be in good shape doing that. So it would be a very good idea for you to do this in view of the fact that you're having some of this difficulty with rudiments. See how you could handle rudiments?

Now, are you aware of the fact that short sessioning has in itself therapeutic value? You can do the darnedest things with short sessioning. Everywhere a pc is restive, he can't keep his attention on something. You are putting rudiments in, normally, because he can't put his attention on the session. Right?

All right. A child's attention span is called to your interest and attention. It's very short. So is that of an extremely worried pc. His attention span is terribly short, very brief. So, you put the rudiments in, do something, handle something, out-rudiment the thing and give him a break. Put the rudiments in, do something – something final and finished, you see – put the end rudiments in, give him a break. You got the idea?

And if you were handling somebody like that early in an intensive – short sessioning him – look at all the rudiments you're going into and through. Now, he isn't going to get very restive, if every time you do this, you do something. And look at all the doingness you've got in this P section. This is fascinating the number of things you can do as a finished product or a finished action. Well, look them over. You do a whole assessment; you can do a
whole assessment. It's not going to take you very long to do an assessment, so therefore you can short-session an assessment.

All right. Now let's look at the next point here. We say, "What problem existed immediately before – " clank! – whatever the occurrence was. You write down the problem the pc gives. And now you could just turn loose and you could simply run, "What was unknown about that problem with (whatever descriptive word it was)." Get the tone arm action free on the thing, in pretty good shape. You find that this twenty-minute test will get in your road sometimes on one of these things, but I'd leave it in for Class II Auditors.

But you could finish up that problem, see, just neat as a package, you know. Finish it up. Dust it off. Might not last long. It also might last for three sessions, but end your session, give him end rudiments, give him a break, something like that. Now, if they've got a new auditing period coming up in the afternoon, take up something else, don't you see – which is of course what? You've got to locate the confusion before that change.

Now, I call to your attention, by the way, in passing and discussing this activity, it's the confusion before the change. It is not the confusion before the problem. Now, you must be very sure that that is what is asked. The confusion before the change. And you may get some entirely different period than existed – that the problem existed in. The problem also might have drifted out of that time area while you were running it and is no longer the confusion before that change. It is a problem he has had for a long, long while. Now, if you ask him "Confusion before that problem," he will say, "Well, actually, the soldiers of King Henry VIII were after me because I had written a brochure criticizing him for his number of wives."

Violates the Problems Intensive, see, because that problem went a long way back. Now, to understand that fully, you must realize that the only reason people move slowly, get parked on the track or anything else is that problems become timeless. The timelessness of problems compose the reactive mind. A timelessness occurs.

Whenever you are having difficulty in dealing with companies that do business, in getting them to answer your letters, in getting them to despatch any goods, in getting them to this, in getting them to that and you just can't seem to get anything done, think of this: They are slow to the degree that they have problems they can't solve. They are inactive to the degree that they have problems they can't solve. So most of their actions, then, are reactive. They are not as a result of thought, but they're drifting in the timelessness of problems.

Every new action adds into the old problem and it gets to a point where "Nothing we do will resolve the problem, so it doesn't matter what we do, then, does it?" And you'll find more business firms get in that frame of mind. They've had terrible problems of some kind or another and so on.

Well, I'll give you a better objective view. The bailiffs – in US, the sheriff – has just moved all one's goods out of the house and Aunt Isabel is being upset because the table was not polished that morning. And she goes around and tells everybody in the house that she is very upset because they have forgotten to polish a certain table. It's going to be sold at public auction.
Now, can you get the sort of attitude people would have toward Aunt Isabel? Well, do you realize that a person who is totally overwhelmed, whose head is half cut off by the guillotine or something of this sort – he just feels totally overwhelmed by life – you come along, you give him something that is so trivial compared to these enormously important problems he's worrying about... See, this is 1961, and he's terribly worried about having his head cut off in 1789, see.

He's so concerned about it that, really, there's nothing you can do about it and it's a terrible problem and that is so big in comparison of magnitude of what you want him to do, which is maybe wipe his shoes before he walks in the house, that anything you say is stupid. Do you get how this could work the other way?

And he has this same attitude toward other people that the whole family would have had toward Aunt Isabel at that particular moment. He just sort of looks at them apathetically. They're talking in another world about another subject that has no bearing on any reality. Something on the order of "Come to dinner," "Let us go to the show," "The car has run out of gas" – anything that you want to say to such a person, no matter how immediate it is, maybe he's standing in the rain, you know, and you say, "Well, let's walk over and get under the porch."

The suggestion you have made is as silly, you see – it's as silly as Aunt Isabel having to have the table polished. And sometimes you can get these things in some kind of an order of magnitude in an attitude and you can see how some people do that or see how people react. And such people react to everything in life this way. Everything in life that comes up, such as you ought to go out and get a job so that you can earn money so that people can eat, you see.

And they are crippled in this tremendously overwhelming problem of some kind or another and their immediate response is saying, "Oh, well, you go. It doesn't matter really, you know. Eat? What?"

What you see is an apparent apathy. Actually, the person in actual apathy is really not in apathy at all. He's just apathetic toward everything. He himself is in a fantastic foment. He's in agony, but his attitude demonstrates one of apathy.

And when people have problems of such magnitude that nothing could possibly solve them and everything is trivial compared to them, then they give this response of never doing anything, never communicating, never acting, never solving any problems and they kind of go along and they just hope it'll all somehow work out – somehow. But they couldn't say how. But, of course, none of that has any influence on this tremendous, overwhelming problem which they have. The odd part of it is, is they don't know what the tremendous overwhelming problem is. They can't articulate that either.

And you get the state of mind of people who are stumbling around in life. And the ineffective – where you see a person being terribly ineffective about existence and so on – they've got some state of mind like this. They are not easily and calmly in an apathetic serenity. No, no. They – volcanoes going off would be a better order of magnitude to describe how they feel about things.
So that if you ask them to take their attention off these tremendous problems, they
know they're going to get et up. So they have no attention to spare you, see. And they know
that if they get their attention off of this thing or if they get handled a little bit roughly or if
they get twisted around or they get an ARC break or if something is wrong with the session,
they know what's going to happen to them – their attention is going to shift and the whole
world is going to fall in on them.

There is some tremendous problem that's about to eat them up. And you've asked them
to shift their attention too hard or too fast and it is painful; it's extremely painful.

All right. You get a person who is in this state of mind. They can't spare you very
much attention for auditing and you get the rudiments in and they can spare you a little bit
more attention. And you run something that's effective, it illuminates their case immediately,
directly on the heading of a problem, see. Like, well, "What was unknown about that prob-
lem?" is what you're going to run. And now you're going to assess the confusion before the
change.

All right. All of these things are right what they're stuck in. They're very meaningful.
They – your assessment will put them right there where they can put their attention. They
know you are with them. They know they're being audited because they know where their
attention ought to be. And their attention can be there comfortably, if you've done a good job
of assessment, you have found where their attention is stuck, on what problem their attention
is stuck. And having found on what problem their attention is stuck, you then can go ahead
and audit them. But they pay very little attention to your auditing unless you follow some of
this stuff.

So you get your rudiments in. Make sure that the environment is as dressed up as it
can be. Then, to handle one of these bad-off cases – I mean, a case that is having trouble, is
getting no advance; not necessarily bad off, but it just isn't getting advance in auditing – and
then handle problems and confusions within this illuminative fashion as given in this Prob-
lems Intensive. What immediately is going to happen?

Well, the individual's attention is being traced right where his attention is. The reason
he can't doing anyth- do anything effective with your auditing command is his attention is all
tied up on something else. Only what little attention he has left in present time is either tied
up on something else also or trying to find out what his attention is tied up on. And he very
often thinks that his attention is tied up on something in his environment. So he's quite restive.
He's quite nervous.

Now, almost any pc is difficult to audit. If you think pcs are easy to audit, you'd better
change your mind because you're looking at the wrong standard and you'll never as-is the
situation. Pcs are never quiet to audit unless they're in total catatonic apathy. Pcs do things
about auditing. Sometimes they are a good response, sometimes they are a bad response, but
pcs respond to auditing. And if you think that when you audit, nothing ought to be there re-
sponding, then you should change your ideas about auditing because something ought to be
responding. And if you don't get any response at all from a pc, you start worrying.

If there's no change being registered in the pc, you start worrying like mad. The pc is
just sitting there and the pc is just answering the auditing question. "Yes. Well, how have you
endured a poker in a king's eye or something, you know. And how have you not endured it or something. And how has a king endured a poker in your eye? You see."

And the pc is saying, "Well, I've endured it so on and so on and so on and so on and so on. And so on and so on and so on." And you say another question and he says so on and so on and so on. And you say another question. He says so on and so on. Another question, and he says so on and so on. And it just goes on like that, hour after hour! Well, your rudiments aren't just out, they're in the next county! [laughter] There is something really wrong, because there's no change occurring.

Actually, to audit a pc in that line, you are in violation of the Auditor's Code. You're in direct violation of it, which says you audit a pc – audit a process as long as it produces change.

Well, what's change? Well, change is registration or action on the E-Meter. But where a pc has tremendously heavy problems, these problems are of very, very long duration. And all you're getting, ordinarily, are harmonics on the main problem and you've got to cut him back to the main problem.

He'll get there eventually. Sometimes he gets there, splang! and almost blows himself all over the ceiling. The first time you ask a certain proportion of cases – I don't know what that proportion will be – you put him in Model Session; you've got their Problems Intensive all done right up to the point of the first assessment. You put them in-session. You assess it. And you ask them a question, "Now, what problem existed immediately before that change with – ?" you know, whatever the occurrence was.

"Eyaaaooor" And with a pale scream, his brains practically spatter all over the ceiling. You're going to get that every now and then. Pcs' going to look at you with some horror. He gonna flinch. They're always glad to find out. Sometimes you're going to turn on wild somatics. And they're awful, awful glad to have them. "Oh, that's what turns on these somatics," they say. "Oh, you'll – that's what this is worried about. Yes, the whole back of my head is off. Ha, I can feel it, you know. It's missing except for the horrible, excruciating pain that is going through the middle of my head. So that's what's been turning that on."

You know? Whatever it was. They got the problem, they didn't hardly hear themselves speaking, you know. And all of a sudden a terrific cognition.

You'll also get a totally different response. You have to take the top of it off so lightly that they give you, "Well, what was the problem that existed before that change about buying sugar? So let's see. I guess it was how much sugar to buy. Ohhh."

I'm afraid I would follow that through at once with, "What was the confusion that existed just before that change of buying sugar?"

"Well, trying to figure out how much sugar to buy."

I would say, "Thank you very much," and go back and do a right assessment this time. That's just a total miss. But sometimes the pc is so worried about it that he can't confront it, that he can't differentiate it and you'll get a lot of little, tiny problems. And your first few runs
on this thing will be little, tiny, microscopic problems that he guesses he must have had. That's as close as he can get to this area, you see. He guesses he must have had them.

Now you ask him, "Well, now, how did you arrive at that?"

"Well, I just figure it must have been so."

And you say, "Was it so? Did you really have that problem? What was the problem you really did have there?"

"Oh, well, I really wouldn't know what problem I had. Actually, I could just guess at what problem a person in that particular circumstances might have had. You see, there was a change. I bought a new car and I just guess that a person who was buying a new car, he would have to have – he would have to have some kind of an idea that he wanted to buy a new car. So I guess his problem would be what kind of a new car to buy. Yeah, that must have been it."

You're going to run into that one, too. And that's about as profitless as swapping pounds for Chinese taels. This is totally profitless. What are you going to do about a situation like that? Well, handle what he gives you if he can't get any better. Handle what he gives you. Do another assessment. See if you can come closer to it or take it up. It might really have been a problem. Maybe that's just the way he talks while he's having the problem.

But in the presence of tremendous problems you get a freeze of time. Time is – doesn't exist. Time just doesn't exist in a problem. It's just something that goes on and on and on. How else would you account for the fact that people still have problems they had several thousand years ago? And you start tracing back one of these problems and the common run, when you hit the jackpot on one of these questions, the common run is saying, "Well, yes, and I – so on."

"What was unknown about it?"

"Well, the color of the ladies' hats."

And out of curiosity, you say, "What ladies' hats? You got a picture there or something," so on.

"Oh, yes, I got a picture here."

"Well, what kind of hats are they?" Thinking, you know, you got something in the seventeenth century, you know, something like that.

"Well, it's these – these priestess ostrich hats."

"Oh, yeah. Oh, where is that? You got any idea about it?"

"Well, priestess ostrich hats, you see, that was on the planet Zimbo, and so forth. And there it was and so on. And we all had that problem there. Everybody had the problem." The funny part of it is there was nothing unknown about the problem on the planet Zimbo. Everything was known because everybody knew what the problem was. Everybody knew you had this problem. No, there wasn't any unknowns about the problem at all. Man, have you hit the part of the track where the problem was the know.
You know? You see, a problem itself can become the total knowingness. Can you think of any problems that are in that category? The problem itself is the total knowingness? Let me mention something to you. And of course, there are no unknowns about the problem because everybody knows the problem.

Well, those things run way back along the track. And in the normal course of running, if you were to ask a person on the next line, "All right. What confusion occurred just before that problem?"

"Well, everybody in disagreement about buying new hats on the planet Zimbo. Yeah, there was a hell of a confusion."

Well, that isn't what we're trying to straighten out with a Problems Intensive. No, you've got to ask before that change, and your change has got to be very specific and you must have your rudiments in some kind of shape at the time you ask that next question, because it's another assessment, only it's just in a verbal assessment, you know.

You say, "What – what confusion existed just before that change?"

"Oh, well, oh, oooh, yes, well, no. That was eight years before that. No. No. Tha – tha – . Yeah. That – yup – confusion and so forth." And now you're going to go off onto a list of persons.

Now, to get any kind of thinkingness on this subject at all – you see, it's a species of assessment, so you had certainly better have your rudiments in some kind of shape. So when you're sorting out pcs, do the rudiments, do something of this, do the end rudiments, give them a break. Do the – do the rudiments, do something about it, you know, do the end rudiments, give them a break. And you'll find out if you're handling particularly wild cases that have been stalled, you'll really get places – even though the person appears to sit perfectly happily in that chair hour after hour and say, "Well, I guess I'd put out a king's eye. Yeah, well, the king had put out my eye. Yes, that's right. Yeah. Let's see. Other people would put out the king's eye. Yeah, that's right, and so forth."

And he's – evidently going on like this and you're fooled; you're fooled. Actually the person is just frantic and they're sort of given up and they're sort of asking it anyhow, even though it doesn't do any good. See? That's their basic auditing response. Well, you can queer that pitch by short-sessioning them.

Well, I didn't mean to overlabor the point, but I'm trying to give you some kind of design of the thing and what happens.

Now, the problem floats, but the confusion didn't. So it's the confusion that got them oriented. The confusion won't float. That confusion you're asking for, that occurred, and then you nailed it down to a specific dramatis personae: Mama, Papa, Aunt Agnes, Uncle Bill, the schoolteacher, George and, of course, Mamie. Now when you start security checking that area of the track, it's a sort of a "Hey, son. You've really got to confront this. This one you've got to confront." Because it nails an area of track and therefore that isn't going to float anyplace. It's going to stay right where it is. It's going to have an immediate and direct influence on present time.
You very often will have a pc who is escaping present time by being in the past. And you make a mistake sometimes when you're auditing a pc by believing that the pc would audit better on his terminals line. And you could just skip rudiments or any problems he's having in this life and just skip those things because it's much more significant and you could undercut it much better if you went back on the line. No, the pc is back on the line because it's safer and one of the symptoms of that is the pc who never gets a picture. Pictures are dangerous. Well, when did they become dangerous? You trace it back and you find out a pc had some pictures at one time and then in auditing something happened.

On the special course which is occurring right at this moment in Los Angeles, they have responded with enormous enthusiasm to these new rudiments. And one person, one student on the course, they were just getting the rudiments in, ran into the ARC break process and promptly and instantly had his pictures turn on for the first time in six years. They had turned off during an auditing session. They'd been off ever since and all of a sudden they had turned on, on that process. They were good and bright and clear and he was sailing beautifully. Everybody is quite happy on that course, apparently. But there is an example. There is an example of response to getting a rudiment in.

All right. How about just getting the rudiments in on somebody that never had any processing before? Well, you'd be surprised how much there is to get in on the person and what you're doing is showing him that life is solvable, life is solvable, life is solvable. It's solvable at these little finite points.

Now, it's a characteristic of a pc who is in apathy, that he's got to solve it all at once. That's a characteristic of a pc in apathy. That if he's going to solve it at all, it's got to be solved all at once, now. You very often, working in a Central Organization or running a great many pcs, will have a pc who has got to have it solved by this afternoon or they are going to die; that's going to perish the lot. Got to be done by this afternoon. Their case has got to be resolved is what I'm saying, you see, by this afternoon. And that is a symptom of the most severe apathy backed by a terrific fraticness and sometimes you'll move this little gauze of apathy off and you'll expose some of this fraticness and then they all of a sudden have got to solve all the problem, right now. They won't do an available auditing command. They will take the auditing command you give them, which is the available command and then they will make it into a right now command. This command has to resolve their whole case by one answer. Well, why is that? That's because the whole track has collapsed. The fact that problems are timeless and problems join to problems and it all makes a sort of a timeless strata, also makes a very explosive strata. And of course, anything that is that explosive about which they would worry that much, of course, has to be solved as explosively as that.

They have a look at it the way sometimes soldiers or something like that – they're trying to fix something and they're all standing around trying to fix this thing, you know, and all of a sudden, one will haul out a gun and shoot hell out of it. Or they'll kick it or they'll throw it away, you know. It's just got to be a huuugh! It's giving them trouble so, boy, are they going to give it trouble, you know. It's just a straight Q and A. Nothing to do with solving the thing. It has to do with "we must have a desperate solution by which to get rid of it all at once, now". And of course, we know "all at once now," "get rid of it" is going to add up exclusively to just one point: we don't get rid of it; we get rid of the pc, if we had such a thing.
Every once in a while we look for one button that just on – when I say one button, it is often interpreted as one command given in one unit of time, one expression and that one expression is very explosive. You see that, we just give one command, not repetitively, just one order to the pc. We say, scarooooow, see. And the pc goes Boom! Rrrrrrr – goes Clear. [laughter] Have you seen this around? Do you recognize some of this? All right.

Now, that becomes necessary to the degree that the pc can't. If a pc can't do any of the little things, he then in desperation will have to do one of the big ones and all auditing is done by gradients. All auditing is done by gradients. And it depends on this kind of thing, successful auditing: It depends on reaching a reality the pc can tolerate. It's getting to a picture the pc can see – that the pc can see at this moment of time in the auditing session. It's not what the pc should be willing to see or ought to be able to see. It's what the pc can do and what they really can do are little gradients.

You could possibly confront building a house if you thought of it in terms – I mean yourself, with your own paws. You could probably confront it on the basis of the fact that, well, you could work on it a half an hour every Saturday. That'd seem all right, you know. You could go out and scrape some mortar and bricks together and cut a little grass and so forth. That would seem all right.

I'm sure that you could confront building a fairly large house, if you thought you could do it at a half an hour every Saturday. You can afford that much time, don't you see? And it wouldn't take too much exertion and the amount of bricks and things you'd have to carry, you see – you certainly could carry them for half an hour and you start adding it up, that'd seem pretty reasonable to some people.

Other people, you say, "All right. Now, building a house from scratch ..." And the person gets the idea of "Well, building a house from scratch – uhm – oh, look why can't you just put it all there right now? You know? Why do we have to go through all of this – this you know, nonsensy little steps and all of these doodle-dads and so on and so on and construction of things and building things. Why can't we just say house, you know, and there it appears."

Well, they're on a lower harmonic of OT, you see. But the reason why they say that – the reason why they say that – should be of interest to you, an auditor. It's because they can't confront spending a half an hour every Saturday. That'd be too much. Oh, brother.

Now, we have to carve that down and we have to get something that is real and we will eventually achieve it on the basis, "Well, what is it that if every year we go out and move one brick one half an inch, could you tolerate that much action toward building a house?"

You see, it carves down from the gotta-be-here-right-now – you actually carve it down, you find out the pc has a reality of this.

Take money. There are a lot of guys running around – I know some of them personally, that are running around on the subject of money the like of which I never heard of. Their wives and they are just in some kind of a wild mess on the subject. Because they've got to have a million dollars or a million pounds now, see. There isn't even time for it to be carried in the door sack by sack, see. It's got to be now. And every idea and plan they get, you see, and that is to say, "Well, you see, if we took the North Pole and connected it with the South Pole and put a subway between them and charged the penguins eighteen-million dollars a
penguin for using the subway and so forth, why, then our profit on the matter would be so-and-so."

And you'll find them sitting around with some highly impractical stupidity of this particular character and you know, they just seem to sit back in their chairs further and elevate their feet higher and smoke more slowly. But these structures that are going to happen right now and the amount of money that has got to be made by tomorrow, you see, keeps increasing.

All right. We take such a person and we say how much money could you have? "Oh, millions" is the first response. "Millions. I could just have millions and millions and millions of dollars." Read it on the E-Meter. You start taking it down million by million and try to find the reality of how much money they could actually have. And the first thing you know, you meet the other side of the circle which is how much money they really can't have. And you'll find out that it is two cents or a farthing or that nobody makes a coin quite small enough. And that's the amount of money they could really have and they could really have that. And if you gave them that much money, they would know they had some money. But they think in terms of millions. All the time, you see, it's got to be millions and millions. They get poorer and poorer and poorer, you see. But they – the only money would be millions. It's very interesting.

I'm only bringing that up – just one point. I'm trying to show you something about a case. The case that has got to have the total change now, the case which makes no change now, are almost the same case. Now, the case that just sits there apathetically knows that there cannot be a big enough change or a big enough effect right now to solve his problems, so he's given up on the idea of millions. He's given up on the idea of the huge explosion. He's given up that anything is going to happen at all. He's cancelled all this out and he's on a lower rung than that. He can't have a change because there is no change tiny enough, until you figure out what it is.

Well now, how does he get into that state? Well, he got into that state by having problems that were so overwhelming that he must keep his attention on them all the time. And he knows nothing could be done about them, but they're terribly important. But you have to do something about them, but there's nothing can be done about them, so that everything else that's going on in life is trivia, including your auditing command.

Your auditing command has nothing to do with his problems – nothing to do with his problems unless you have the exact problem. If you've got the exact problem, your auditing command will have something to do with his case. If you've got the exact confusion which made him get that problem, your auditing commands will have something to do with his case.

But up to the point of that, even though you can find his goal, even though you can find his terminal, even though you can do other things to him, even though you can run processes of one kind or another on him, you couldn't find a gradient tiny enough for him to do.

The case, actually, cannot do any of your processes except find the problem he is stuck in because he – but you're not finding any problem. You get the misnomer here. He's sitting looking at it, so all you have to do is just kind of shake it. You don't have to put him back on the track because he's there. You don't have to move him around. You are not moving the pc anyplace. You're just trying to find out what's the pc looking at and the whole of this Prob-
problems Intensive is just dedicated to that. Where is this pc stuck? And what problem is this pc overwhelmed with?

Now, the trick is, is he doesn't know or they wouldn't be. He can tell you, then, a lot of problems glibly. But a proper assessment on this thing does give you exactly what his attention is on and an improper assessment will give some offbeat. So that's why he gives you such "I figure-figure" problems sometimes.

You say, "What problem existed immediately before that change?"

"Well, I – it must have been, I guess ... Well, one could say ..."

"Now, how are you – how are you getting that now? How are you figuring that out?"

"Oh, well, it just seems to me that a person in that condition would ordinarily have this type of problem."

You haven't got it, because he's asking from what he conceives to be a different time band and the first clue to any of this is, the problem is the time band of the pc. It is the moment in time of the pc and he wouldn't be saying, "a person who would have had a problem like that way back then, so on and so on." Because he isn't way back then. He is in the problem he is in, and he's in no other problem. And you will find him sitting square in the problems, if your assessment is done properly. And if your rudiments are in, your assessment will get done properly.

You haven't got any difficulties if your rudiments are in. And if you keep your rudiments in, your assessments and questions and that sort of thing will, perforce, fall right out in your lap, because you've said the one magic question that attracts his attention instantly to where his attention is. And then he conceives that to be instantly now and when you hit this phenomenon exactly right on the button, the pc's attention is not being dragged off of anything.

You never drag his attention off of something to the problem. Well, he doesn't have a present time problem. He doesn't have an ARC break. He doesn't have an immediate withhold. The room is all right. The session is in progress.

All right. You're already eliminating anything that might get his attention off of this problem and you've got his attention not in-session, but on problem.

And now you say, "What problem existed immediately before buying sugar in 1948? What problem existed immediately before that?"

And if you've done it very smoothly, his attention will be sitting right there and he just goes off brrrrrrrrr, there it is, see. And you will very often get an "Oh, my God." Now, you don't get a "What do you know." It's much more heartfelt expression.

Now, a pc who is ARC breaking while you're trying to do a Goals Terminal Assessment is ARC breaking or getting apathetic because you're taking his attention off of what his attention should be on and it is violating his idea of what's safe. The only thing that is safe is to keep his attention on this problem. That is safe and nothing else is safe. So you're trying to drag his attention off of the problem and he knows that's not safe, so he's flying back in your teeth. So he's ARC breaking. He's flying off this way. He's making extravagant statements to
you. He is upset. He is caving in one way or the other. He is upset! Now, exactly how does he get upset?

Well, he moves his attention just *huh-huh-huh-huh*. You're asking him something now. "What goal would you like to – if you think that you had when you were a small child? What goals you had?"

He's saying, "Huh – huh – huh. Do I dare look? Let's see. Let's see, all right. Oh, well, it's safe enough. When I was a small child, let's see, I had a goal of playing with trains. Yes, I had a goal of playing with trains." And he knows he's doing something pretty adventurous. What is he doing? He's actually putting his attention on a different part of the time track and he knows that's not safe. But he is doing it, for your sake. And if you've got the rudiments very heavily in and they're very well in and he's very smoothed down and he's lots of confidence in the auditor, you can do this. You can actually get his attention off of his main problems and get an assessment and it all runs off and he doesn't get ARC broke hardly at all. And everything is fine. And you wind up – and you've got his goal. And you've got his terminal. And you can actually do it. And it's a good thing to have because all of a sudden he feels swell about it. He feels fine. Marvelous, he's got his goal and terminal – can still have his attention on this problem. He got away with something, you see. That's great.

Now as we start running him level by level, however, we start getting into something else. He's got to keep his attention on the auditor, and he's got to keep his attention on this terminal. And he's got to keep his attention on and do the auditing command. And that is just too damn much mental doingness.

He goes, then, by hidden standards. He resigns from the auditing session. Runs it all on a circuit. He tries to get by with it. He vias the auditing command so that he can still put his attention properly on the problem. And boy, does he ARC break.

He ARC breaks and he gets upset, or he's just apathetic and just grinds – which is a level below ARC breaking.

A pc who just sits there and grinds is very often not up to getting ARC broke. Remember that. [in an apathetic tone of voice:] "Well, I see, you got – I guess you could put out a king's eye with a poker. And a king could put out your eye with a – with a – with an order. And somebody else could put out a king's eye with a – I guess uh – uh – uh – put out a king's eye with a ... I've forgotten the auditing command; what was it? Oh, how could you put out the king's eye? Well, you could put out a king's eye with a ... oh, just put it out; just put it out. That's all. Just put it out. Yeah. Just put it out. That's it. Yeah, well, thank you very much for the session." [laughter]

You watch that when pcs – they don't even have to run in that tone of voice. It's just grind, grind, grind, you see, nothing occurring, nothing much changing on the case. Ah, pc has got his attention on some horrendous problem of some kind or another, and so he gives you this little attention over here which is monotone. And any time a thetan's attention is monotone on the lower ranges of the Tone Scale, you can just bet your bottom kropotnik that the most of his attention is absorbed in some tremendous problem that if he looked at it squarely and if it looked at him squarely and it was all solved, the whole universe would blow up.
Attention is all absorbed over here because that's not a natural action. One of the things that speeds up my auditing of pcs and that sort of thing is because I look at them and I see them drifty-eyed and dreamy and so forth and drifting off and getting apathetic and they're grinding and I say very forthrightly, I say, "All right now. What are you looking at? What are you doing? What are you thinking about? What are you worried about? Where's this going? And where's the ARC break? And how – when did the havingness start to go down? And what is this and what are you looking at? And what are you worried about? And oh, well, that's what it is. All right. Now you can tell me. It's okay." And after five or ten minutes of pleading with them, they will get their attention off of the problem enough to actually say what it is. See, because that requires an effort, too. See, it'd be too much effort to say what the problem is, so it's kind of all operates as a withhold. You see how a pc would act?

Every time you have an ARC breaky pc, you would – you have violated to some degree fixation of attention on problems. It isn't just fixation of attention; you have violated his fixation of attention on problems. You've asked him to do something he doesn't consider safe. It is not your auditing he is finding fault with. He is actually, merely finding fault with having his attention shifted.

And when a person is in this condition, you have to work like mad to make sure that you keep his attention centered where it is centered and not shifted around. So therefore, a Problems Intensive is just about the hottest thing you can do with a case because there's where his attention is sitting.

But now what we've done is add up a way of getting backtrack problems, not present time problems. We're getting backtrack problems which slide up and become present time problems of long duration.

But we're getting the problems which underlie the hidden standards and then we're getting the prior confusions which made the hidden standards and the problems necessary.

In other words, we're turning loose machine guns, howitzers, hedgehogs and a few atom bombs loose on this same problem. But all of it can be turned loose because his attention is right where his attention is. His attention is right there anyhow, I mean, so you haven't asked him to shift his attention and he'll run a Problems Intensive like a lamb whereby he'd blow up in your face and explode all over half the universe if you did anything else. You see?

Therefore, it looks like very calm, safe, productive auditing – which it is, of course – but it looks like, well, it looks like anybody could do it. It gives that very definite appearance, you know. Well, anybody could do this. It's rather a sloppy process, rather wide and so on. It actually isn't a sloppy process. It actually isn't wide at all. You're just being assisted like mad in running it by the fact that you're running the pc only where the pc's attention is obsessively fixed and you never ask him to move his attention very much. The only attention you're asking him to do is just improve his attention so that he can feel confident and not have to worry about sitting there in session. He can go ahead and worry about his problem all he wants to. And you'll find out you don't have ARC breaky pcs if you bust in on cases to this wise.

Now, we do need a Problems Intensive that covers the whole track, that doesn't just devote itself to one lifetime. Whether I will ever dream one of those things up or figure out a way to do that and so on is neither here nor there. You have this one now. Be happy with that.
I would like to say one more thing. I've done a lot of talking here which may or may not have assisted you. It may – might not be meaningful to what you are doing. But auditors blame themselves because of ARC breaky pcs. They think they must be doing something wrong. There is some self-blame of some kind or another attached and pcs blame themselves because they ARC break. So that if you can get a certainty as an auditor on exactly why a session goes wrong, if you can see the exact mechanism and its exact magnitude, if you can see exactly where a session is detouring and why a session detours just in terms of a person's attention is on a fixated problem of such magnitude, his attention is on this problem to such a degree, it must be on it because of the tremendous importance of the problem, that he doesn't dare have any other attention for anything so that anything else that disturbs him causes him to go into – through this phenomena you know as an ARC break and the only thing you have done is disturb his attention.

But let me make one more comment on that which I think you will find of great interest. You very often – as this Problems Intensive will eventually demonstrate to you in running it on a pc – you very often have been running pcs with present time problems without recognizing any part of it. And very often a pc has, unknowingly to himself and unreceivedly by you, stated to you many times his problem. He has stated many, many times his problem and you have never heard it as a problem. You never hear it as a problem; you go ahead and solve it. And yet he has told you this problem over and over. And he ARC breaks when you're auditing him. And he gets upset and so on. And yet he's actually telling you the problem in one way or another over and over and over.

It is actually quite vocal. It's quite out loud. You're hearing it with both ears, but it's not going any deeper than the drum. It's fantastic. A problem is a problem. It is what the pc is worried about. That's what a problem is or it's the problem of unresolvable long-parked timelessness of conflicting forces which the pc can't do anything about or which is – he feels he ought to do something about or somebody else ought to do something about, but it's a big problem. And he will sit there in the auditing chair very often and tell you over and over and over again his present time problem of long duration and you never hear it.

And when you're running this Problems Intensive, you're very often going to have a pc come up and give you something and something is going to go, if you've been auditing before this, you say – go clink! "Now, wait a minute. This pc's been saying this all the time." Well, don't feel silly. Don't feel silly about it. You're going to run into problems that pcs have talked about and talked about and talked about. Because you've never recognized them as problems, usually on the basis that everybody has them or something of that sort. I wouldn't actually – shouldn't actually generalize any further than that, but I will give you a classic example of a problem that went on for a very, very long time and actually neither the auditor nor preclear in this particular instance recognized it as a problem.

The problem was how the pc could get some auditing and the auditor always solved it by giving him some. Only, it was totally goofy because the pc was basically worried about whether or not he could be audited! That was the problem. Was he auditable at all? And the auditor always just audited him to show him that he could have some auditing.
And they went on for a long time with the problem and solving the problem and it interrup-
ted every session and it upset every session and it went on for the longest kind of a
time. Why would it go on this long? Well, that's just basically and flatly and positively the
auditor never recognized that any problem is a problem and there aren't certain problems that
become solvable targets. There aren't certain problems you should solve and certain problems
you should run.

I'm sure that nearly all of you at some – if you'll think it over, there are certain prob-
lems that you feel should be solved, not should be run. The pc has these problems and he
doesn't recognize they are his problems and then you do something about the problem as a
problem.

Now, we go reductio ad absurdum. The pc says, "I am hungry." You say immediately,"That is a problem," and so instead of feeding him, why, you give him a big rundown on it.
Well, what you've missed at this particular point, you see, is it isn't a problem with the pc of
long duration or anything else. He's going through a repetitive cycle and he long since has
become totally submerged into the mishmash of this universe, so he no longer considers any
of these things problems. It isn't a problem. He gets hungry every few hours, and that's just
the way it is, you see. It's not a real problem to the pc, so of course you wouldn't take it up as
a problem. You'd tell him, "Well, go on. Have something to eat."

But there are other ones. They're much more definite like this. They're much more
positive. Is there's the fellow with a problem of, well, "Can auditors audit?" You know, he's
an Instructor in an Academy and he's been teaching a lot of auditors and he – something of
that sort and he sits there and, "Well, do you have any problems?" and so forth and he, well,
pling! you know. "What problem was that?"

"Well, I was having a little problem with the students and so forth," and about the
third session that you get a pling! and he's having a little bit of a problem with the students,
why, you'd better get busy, you know?

He's got a problem. He's got a present time problem. What is this present time prob-
lem? And you start searching it out. You find out by this time that it's with these – with stu-
dents. Well, all right.

And, "What is this problem with students? Now phrase this problem with students. What
is this problem with students? Now, all right, how would you describe that? All right.
State that as a problem. All right. Give me another version of it. Now, what is this problem?"

And all of a sudden the fellow says, "Ooooooh, well, can – can – the problem, actu-
ally, is not with students."

"Well, what is it with?"

"Well, it's why I became an Instructor."

"Well, why did you become an Instructor?"

"Well, I became an Instructor because I wanted to find out if people could audit. And I
don't think they can, you know. And uh – it's – it's – the problem is how to get audited by
people that I know can't audit – including you." [laughter]
You get the idea? So you very often take the matter-of-fact problem that you think is just – you should just go right ahead and solve and it's actually right in there. It's a real present time problem. It's a real, honest-to-goodness, dyed-in-the-wool, got-bronze-stars-on-it present time problem. There it is.

And if you say, "This is ordinary. This is usual. This is natural. This is like eating, so therefore, we don't have to take it up." Well, I'll call something to your attention: A problem on the subject of Scientology is of the order of magnitude of a withhold on the subject of Scientology.

Now, you've seen a withhold stop a case cold, haven't you? Have you ever seen a withhold stop a case cold? Do you have any reality on that at all? Hm?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now can you imagine a present time problem on the subject of Scientology stopping a case cold? Right?

Well, that doesn't mean that you should pay attention to every present time problem the pc has, just making eight sessions out of it or something like that. But watch this pc and if he starts coming up with problems about Scientology, then for heaven sakes get it stated, measured, so forth. "Have you got a present time problem?" Cling! And it's something about Scientology and so forth, give it the same order of magnitude that you'd give a withhold on the subject of Scientology.

And this fellow says, "Well, I got a withhold. I didn't phone my boss from the country club be – and tell him I was not coming back to work on Monday. I had a withhold from him."

You know, that's the bing you get. Well, man, you could run the case weeks with that withhold and nothing would have happened.

"Well, I made an appointment to be audited yesterday and then I didn't keep it." Now, try to get over that one. Because the withhold is on the subject with which the pc is dealing at the instant he's being audited. So, therefore, the auditing itself and the presence of the subject matter itself are a restimulator to the withhold or to the problem and everything you are doing is a restimulator to the withhold or the problem.

He can forget about his boss; his boss isn't here. But he can't forget about Scientology; he's being run on it. So you give present time problems on the subject of Scientology the same order of magnitude you'd give withholds on the subject of Scientology.

When you're assigning somebody to do a Security Check, always assign the last two pages of Sec Check Form 3. The last two pages. You'll find, there, they outweigh all of the earlier pages. If there's anything wrong there, it'll just park the case in its tracks. Well, similarly a problem. And because you're an auditor and the pc says, "I have a problem about auditors. I just don't ever seem to have an auditor, to have a problem." Get him to state it, for heaven sakes.

Don't solve it by being a better auditor than he's had before. Get the idea? Because you're running a pc who has a continuous, constant present time problem and the case will
behave just like a case with a present time problem. And it will ARC break and it will get very upset and it will blow all over the place and it will be very critical of the auditor and it will do all of these things. Why? You're running a case with a present time problem. How did you miss it? Well, you ran a case with a present time problem and missed it because the present time problem is something you're solving. That's the most usual course of human events.

You don't look at the problem the pc's got because you are doing the solution to it. The solution to it is right in his hand. So, therefore, there is no particular reason to handle as a problem.

The problem I just discussed with you just a moment ago was in existence for eleven years before it was contacted. Now, smile over that one if you want to. It was in existence for eleven years.

Could the person ever get any auditing? That was the problem and it was eleven years before it was suddenly detected. The pc, of course, had never gotten any auditing in all those years, because he was being audited over a present time problem of could he ever have any auditing during those eleven years. How do you like that? Interesting, isn't it?

So a present time problem – and the only thing I will give you is a passing note on all of this Problems Intensive – a present time problem in rudiments, a present time problem in the produ- in the Problems Intensive is not what the auditor would like to think a problem is; it is what the problem is to the pc and what the pc thinks the problem is and what is a problem to the pc.

Whether the auditor is solving it or not solving it or what he's doing about the problem or how intimate the problem is to an auditing session or any of these considerations have nothing to do with it. A problem is simply a problem and it is a problem to the pc. If it is a problem, it is a problem to the pc. It may be a problem to you but not a problem to the pc, you see. It's "What's the problem to the pc?"

The problem is yours. Every time you give him an auditing command, he coughs in your face. No problem to the pc. [laughter] You could keep – you keep running him, you know. You keep running him on "What part of that cough could you be responsible for?" Doesn't do anything for the cough because it isn't a problem to the pc. And you can't solve problems for a pc who doesn't have them as problems.

I know I've said something that sounds terribly obvious, but it's true. You can't run and solve and clear problems to – in a pc if they're not problems to the pc. It sounds an awful obvious statement, but very often auditors have made up their minds what's a problem to the pc, dive in immediately, run that because that's a good, hot, juicy problem and it's the fact that the auditor – the auditor misses the fact that the reason he doesn't like – well, there is something about coughing. He always has a problem about coughing.

What is it? Well, it's how to wash pocket handkerchiefs.

"Well, it – what about coughing?"
"Oh, there isn't anything about coughing. It's handkerchiefs, though. My poor mother, you know. You know, she might have had to have gone out and taken in washing to support us children."

"Well, what's the problem here?"

"Well, there isn't any problem."

"All right. Do you have a present time problem?"

No, he doesn't have a present time problem. Skip it! See, no matter while it should look to you dramatically that the thing ought to be the problem, the problem is what registers on the meter and what is a problem with the pc. And a problem is what it is no matter how idiotic you think it is.

See, don't edit problems, because you can miss problems. And problems that have directly to do with auditing have more weight on the case in slowing it down than any other type of problem. Just like withholds that had to do with Scientology have more stoppage value on a case than any other type of withhold. Okay?

Well, I hope some of this information about how you do a Problems Intensive is valuable to you. I see that you are sailing into them now and you will be doing them left and right and I think a lot of fur is going to fly and you'll probably have lots of questions to ask about it next week.

In the meanwhile, thank you very much.
Problems Intensive Procedures

A lecture given on 17 October 1961

[Part missing]

How are you?

Audience: Okay. Fine.

Okay. This is the 17th of October 1961, and boy, are you in for it. I hate that sadistic look. Actually, one life I – whole life I spent as a pirate I've resented ever since and I take it out on bad auditing. Bad auditing restimulates this life of piracy. Because that's what it is; it's just butchery. And there's just no sense in it. There's no sense in bad auditing.

To show you how bad it can get, when Saint Hillers go back for the first time into an area, the few who have left here, they've given demonstrations and they've found interesting things like this: The whole crowd they demonstrated to, all professional auditors, saw for the first time a null needle on an E-Meter. It's kind of a bitter criticism, isn't it. And the statement uniformly is made by somebody leaving here and going back to some area, "Well, Scientology has just never been done."

All right. You can dream up all sorts of fancy processes and you can find out what's wrong with the mind and you can search deeper into it and turn it all upside down, but if this never gets applied by the most elementary basics, what have you got left? You got wogs. That's all you got. Because nothing, no good, no wonderful process, no good and excellent analysis, no diagnosis, no expert textbook, seventeen libraries of tapes and all the rest of it are not going to make anybody well if Scientology is not applied.

Nothing is going to do it unless an auditor is going to do it. And there you have it. And an auditor has to do certain basic, definite things and he has to know these things very, very well. First and foremost of these things, he's got to get his TRs down, particularly TR 0. And then he's got to know what an E-Meter is all about. And then he's got to know how to Security Check.

Well, if he's gotten that far – if he's gotten that far, he's going to get results; and if he hasn't gotten that far, he isn't going to get any results. So this is the exact distance we're trying to pull up every auditor in the world just now. We're just trying to pull him up that exact distance. And that is a cornerstone on which we can build. That any results at all have been gotten around the world attest to my hopeful essays in ability, certainty, understanding, affinity and the other basics. Oh, that's a bitter statement, isn't it.

That's invalidative, but I've never invalidated before to this magnitude. But I keep getting these reports back from people who have left here. Now, I haven't really straight up, vis-a-vis trained anybody for a very long time. And now that I've started doing it again just here
at Saint Hill, in spite of the fact that I don't sit there and hold your hand every session, I'm to a marked degree looking over your shoulder. And Mary Sue is looking down your throat.

Now, to be able to do a good assessment on Routine 3, and so forth, is like asking most of the auditors of the world to build the fifteenth floor of a building before they have any cornerstone in the place at all. Let's build the fifteenth floor and let's have it float. On what foundation? The foundation on which it floats is a tremendously accurate ability to do the TRs, an excellent command of E-Meter and E-Meter phenomenon, an excellent command of Model Session, and a horrendous ability to security check. Now, if you've got those things, then – then we'll have something on which to build. But without those things, we have nothing on which to build.

I know now why characters like Mathison could go on and sell 18-dial, 14-gauge, short-circuit-through-the-pc E-Meters. They were just window dressing. Nobody thought they worked. And nobody thought they did anything. So, of course, you could sell anything.

No, an E-Meter is a very precision instrument, and when you can make an E-Meter talk, you can make a pc talk. But you have to know how to make an E-Meter talk first.

Now, there are other methods that have been used in the past to make pcs talk, such as my career as a space pirate. I recall one incident vividly. I was part of another unit. I wasn't being a pirate that life. I play hooky every once in a while and go out and get active. I'm a great believer in activity.

I go between being very active and being very scholarly, and I'm afraid the – there are burn spots on most planets where I've sacked towns while being active or have prevented people from sacking towns; same final result, you see?

And alongside of that sort of staggered things to confound students in the libraries. Yes, I've been a perfect example of the Aristotelian Pendulum. Don't ever go in for any half-way measures. Either be very active or very scholarly. No, no, no middle ground, no middle grounds.

And in this particular incident, a space pirate came aboard this merchant ship, and in order to make them talk to find out the destination and where the gold was going to be picked up, took a crowbar and pried the spine out of one of the crew members. It sounds like a rather exaggerated activity, doesn't it? I thought it was exaggerated myself as we told him.

The Inquisition – the Inquisition used to warm people's toes at the stake and pack their chest and mouth area in ice so that they wouldn't burn and die too quickly. Well, that was after the fact they couldn't make them talk, don't you see? And if you'll find out, most torture comes and most punishment comes after all media to persuade communication to exist has failed. Brutality is after the fact of communication. Brutality follows failed communication. Overts are always to be found in the wake of no communication.

For instance, there's a ruddy alleged British vice-consul sitting in a town in Spain just now who is sitting on a couple of suitcases of ours. And what are we going to do about these suitcases? Well, he refuses to answer any communication of any kind whatsoever. We shamed him into giving us one letter by taking some pesetas we had and pinning them to a self-addressed airmail envelope and sending it down to him. And he wrote back some entheta.
You know? It was some bad news he'd had from some other quarter but didn't mention these suitcases. See, all he's got to do is call up a steamship company, tell them to come over and get the suitcases and take them on the next boat, you see? Very simple. But he won't communicate.

Now what frame of mind do you think people get into after a while on something like that? I'm just showing you a tiny, little, present time piece of nonsense, you see?

Well, the immediate idea is to get the British consul at Vigo to go up and give him a good swift kick where it will do a lot of good, you see? Or write the foreign office and tell the fellow he's in league with the Russians, you know? [laughter] Of course, he probably isn't too honest or he would dare say something. But he evidently doesn't dare talk.

Failed communication always carries in its wake punishment. It's why you get mad at a pc. There's something the pc won't say, and you can't seem to find the means to make him say it. He's sitting on some type of a withhold or a noncommunication or something of the sort and he just won't communicate.

The pc says, "Well, my mother beat me and she used to lock me in the closet every day and then she wouldn't give me any dinner. She never bought me any clothes, and very often threw me down the coal chute. Every time we went for a ride on a streetcar, she threw me under the wheels, and I was killed."

Along about this time you suspect there is some sort of a withhold about Mother. And you're tired of this violin solo because it's not by Stravinsky, and so you ask this fellow if he has a withhold from his mother or a withhold about his mother. And you get no response of any kind whatsoever.

"No, I was good to her. I was always good as gold, and I always smiled every time she threw me under the streetcar and killed me."

You say (depending upon your immediate antecedents) a word of a few letters. [laughter] The auditor's ARC breaks down at this point.

Now, if all of this is true – that it's after communication fails that brutality begins – then any of an auditor's overts against a pc or any of his impatiences against a pc, must perforce arise by the auditor's own failure to make the pc sing – must so result. Doesn't that look fairly obvious to you?

Bad auditing follows failed auditing. You very often pick up somebody in a co-audit, you sit him down, have him just chatter repetitively some sort of a phrase at a pc, and the pc gets wonderful results, and everybody is happy.

Of course, the Instructor had to be there and everybody had to be there and somebody had to fix up the place and somebody had to put him in the chair and somebody had to hold the pc still. Well, beside that, there wasn't any failure involved and there's no brutality involved, and you'll find this (quote) auditor (unquote) loves the pc like a brother. And everything is going to happen for the best in this best of all possible worlds.

And then we put him on the Academy course and we fail to teach him how to run an E-Meter and we fail to teach him how to run Model Session and we fail to teach him any of...
the TRs and we fail to show him how you can make a pc talk. And he runs into his first pc or
two, and they don't talk. So we've eventually got an auditor who is going chop, chop, chop,
chop. And there is no "love thy neighbor" there anymore. Why?

The auditor did not learn the tools of his trade, so he instinctively falls back on tools of
former trades.

Now, even the inquisitor, as he walked in in his blood-encrusted robe and said to the
prisoner, "All is up, bud," in Spanish, German, French or hog Latin. He would still say,
"Now, if you will just confess and say that..." I don't know. What god were they worshipping?
Molech, Baal – no, no, that's – that's – I'm off the trail there. Some other planet. Anyway,
whoever they happened to have dreamed up at the moment. "If you'll just confess that he is a
trio consisting of Mama, Papa, Baby (or something like that)." [laughter] "If you will just say
this – if you'll just say this and give your soul and sin into the hands of, I don't know, the chief
goat or something like this, why, we'll let you off. We'll let you off, and that will be it. We'll
just execute you quietly or we'll...we'll let you go to prison, or something like this. We won't
do anything very vicious to you." And that's all you've got to say.

Of course, the reason I'm gagging that up is because, of course, the same gag has hap-
pened over and over, religion after religion, planet after planet, trillennia after trillennia. It
just happens to be in your history books that there's the Father, Son and the Holy Ghost.

Well, this is just modern parlance, and you'll notice it's gone up scale to a condition,
see? It used to probably be the rock, the tree and the plow or something, you know? Probably
more solid.

Now, let's look that over. He still is trying to make somebody talk, and when that fel-
low fails to do so, he takes him out, puts him in a red robe – or a yellow robe it was – puts
"heretic" or something on his chest in Chinese characters, and puts him out there and ties him
up to the stake, and puts some dry ice on his chest, if that's available from the local space op-
era club, and burns him. But he won't say it. He just won't say it.

That isn't a response of some cruel monster. The inquisitor is not a monster. He's just a
failed thetan. He's just a living being. He's got mixed up in some effort to make everything
come out right in the social dynamics – he thinks. He's trying to do a job.

And the net result is that he does a brutal job because he has no methodology to get
any information or to get anything figured out. He has no methodology. So therefore, an audi-
tor who is not trained in the basics of Scientology is somebody who has no methodology. And
you can absolutely count on the fact that as the decades march along, Scientology would go
exactly the same route of the Spanish Inquisition. And any Central Organization or group of
Scientologists anywhere in the world will move directly and immediately over into the same
frame of mind with regard to pcs and the society and their job and everything else, if they
themselves do not know that they have basic tools that make people talk. It is so simple.

You do not pull an overt when you badly process a pc. That is not much of an overt.
Yes, it makes you a knucklehead, and he's unhappy with it and all that sort of thing, but you
have not killed all of his chances. His chances are not all up the spout. Maybe next year,
maybe next life, he'll get processed, you see?
Maybe somebody will open the gates yet. No, the overt is bad dissemination because if you disseminate badly you head Scientology toward a brutality, and you make it impossible for this fellow next year or next life to have somebody open the gates.

Bad dissemination slams them shut and locks them forevermore. Now, the gates are well open at this particular stage, but they will not stay open unless the technologies of the application of Scientology are well practiced and well understood. That you can count on.

Now, I didn't mean that to turn into much of a sermon, but I'm dead in earnest about it.

Now, new students coming in here have a tendency to go on living at their same rate of speed. And we have introduced a new and shocking state of affairs. A person can audit, obviously, to the degree that he can command his tools. Certainly, that's true. The more I know about the mind, the more I know about my tools, the better I can audit, myself. So why shouldn't it follow true elsewhere?

There are about seventy-eight items on a student checksheet here. Seventy-eight items. If you passed one examination on one of those items every week, it would take you seventy-eight weeks. Oh, you aren't here that long. But if you passed one examination a day, one examination a day, you could probably make it. So that's what I want you to do. One examination passed – passed, not taken – passed per day.

"Oh," you say, "it's impossible." Well, you're in good company. Scientology is impossible. Nobody could have dreamed up Scientology; that's the impossibility. So if the impossibility is also nobody could learn it at that rate of speed, all right, so it's merely impossible. One exam per day. One bulletin per day. One tape per day. Whatever that checksheet item is. One per day. And you'll find your auditing skill will rise.

But it is fundamental that you have to get out of the road your TRs, your Model Session. That's very fundamental. Your E-Meter. Very fundamental. And how to security check. Because, listen, if you can't security check, you will never be able to make a pc talk. It isn't that security checking is looking for all the evils of his life, but how could you even find out if he has an ARC break if you can't security check.

After all, isn't it a Security Check situation? You're asking this fellow who doesn't want to talk, "Why are you not wanting to talk?" And find out whether he wants to or not want to because he's liable to sit there in some kind of a social chatter with you. And maybe you could look in your crystal ball or between his ears or be three feet back of his head and ascertain his exact state of vibration at this particular aura. Maybe you can do this. But it seems just a little bit odd that we should have to since I point out to you that people have also been able to do this for the last couple of hundred trillion years and we didn't have Scientology and we didn't have well people.

So don't buck against the E-Meter and its ability to pick up information because your inability to get information from the pc is what drives you down first into not asking for any information from the pc and then drives you into a vicious frame of mind about pcs, and then will drive you eventually into not wanting to audit any pcs at all.

Now, it's an oddity that the auditor who has withholds will not ask for withholds. So if an auditor has withholds and then on top of that can't get information from the pc and doesn't
know how to go about getting information from the pc and doesn't know how to sort this out and can't make any sense out of what he is doing – he of course will wind up eventually not auditing, won't he?

And any auditor who at this instant is not auditing is not auditing because he didn't know his business, or at the time he was auditing, the business was not well enough understood. And he is not capable of using direct tools. He has lost confidence that he can obtain the information necessary to resolve the case. He's lost his confidence in this.

Now, I'm looking at a couple of students right now that came down here because there is a Scientologist sick someplace, and they want to get the newest and best and go back and do something for this fellow.

Oh, yeah, but this fellow has had a lot of processing by this auditor and that auditor around about the place. Why hasn't he suddenly recovered? Because I tell you there's nothing wrong with him at all but he's got an area of withhold. And that's everything that is wrong with him. I could find it and knock it out in minutes. But so could any trained auditor who knows his tools.

There is no reason under the sun, no reason at all why Scientology should fail in anybody's hands at this stage, at this precise instant on its developmental track except if he doesn't know his business. Now, he could fail if he didn't know his business.

But you have just had placed in your hands a Problems Intensive. Oh, surely the form will be rewritten and will probably be rewritten again. It will probably be in the process of rewrite ten years from now, but it's a useful form just as it exists right now. And it will simply be rewritten and rewritten only to the degree that auditors goof with it. And the only reason it'll be rewritten is to add another line or something saying, "Do not ever assess Section A," you know? "Assess O.", you know? Something like that. I'm shaking this Problems Intensive form down. I'm shaking the form down. We know exactly, exactly at this instant, what the stack-up is in current lifetime that puts a pc out of action.

One can go in on this with such accuracy as to practically stand anyone's hair on end. And a new person, dragged off the street and given a Problems Intensive, her hair will stand on end because we not only have the tools of how to get information, but we also have this other thing: we know exactly what information to get. Because the anatomy of the current lifetime's confusions, failures and upsets is clearly laid out before us.

It is one of these idiotic maps, once it is drawn, of how to get to the house next door. I mean, it's that simple a map. There is nothing very complicated about this map. Exactly how you follow the map depends once more upon these basic tools which I have enumerated.

There are tools secondary to these tools which you will find it very useful to have around, such as the Auditor's Code. Recently, a Central Organization got ahold of somebody who was an epileptic. Person didn't say they were an epileptic. Nobody spotted they were an epileptic. Nobody spotted the fact the person had been on drugs and had knocked it off the day before processing. You know, after a year or so on drugs, you all of a sudden don't take drugs. All of these goofs, you see? But if they had followed the Auditor's Code, they still would not have come to grief.
We have never had anybody go spinnny – oh, this person is all bailed out and is all straight or will be – but we've never had anybody go spinnny under processing unless they've had usually a change of auditors or they weren't eating or they weren't getting any sleep. Those are part of the Auditor's Code. I haven't actually seen a good example of this for years because people follow it very, very well usually.

And sure enough this pc, because she was off of sedation, was getting no sleep and, having been on sedation, was not hungry and wasn't eating. I don't know how the change of auditors set up, but it probably was all awry, too. And the person spun.

So it's a good thing to know the secondary tools of one's trade, such as the Auditor's Code. It is secondary, but it is a tool of the trade. And you can spin people if you don't know it.

There are a lot of people around, for instance, that invalidate like mad while saying, "Never invalidate a pc's data."

You know, they invalidate, and then you say, "Well, all right, you're invalidating."

And they say, "Oh, no, I'm not."

And you say, "What is invalidation?"

They misinterpreted what invalidation is. They don't know what invalidation is. They don't know what evaluation is, so they disobeyed points of the Auditor's Code, so the next step comes up. It's a good thing to understand the tools of the trade in addition to being able to use them. And understanding of those tools is quite valuable.

What is evaluation? What is invalidation?

I had an old-time auditor suddenly blink one day and say, "By George, I do evaluate." Had never realized it before. It was on questions, and this auditor was asking questions something on the order of "Do you still beat your wife?" They were unanswerable questions. The question could not, of course, be answered by the pc. So it was accusative. It accused the pc of beating his wife. That was of course evaluative, invalidative, all in one fell swoop.

No, I explained the pc had to have an out. The pc had to have an out. That is to say you can't say, "Do you still beat your wife?" You have to say, "Have you ever beaten your wife?" And he can still say no. Don't you see?

So you can actually write up security questions that are completely off base. "How long have you been a dope addict?" you ask the pc out of the blue. Just out of the blue, you see? He's just sitting there, you're running down the list, and you say, "How long have you been a dope addict?" There's no out. He can't say, "No, I've never been a dope addict," without going out of agreement with the auditor, and so forth. And that is both invalidative and evaluative – both things in one. The auditor is saying, in essence, "You're a dope addict," you see? And he's also invalidating the pc to the degree of saying "You mustn't answer this 'No.'" But it's more of an evaluation than otherwise.

So in writing up security questions and so forth, you have to know about such things as invalidation and evaluation, and more importantly, know what they are. What is invalida-
tion? What is evaluation? What are these shuns that you must shun? But these are basically elementary tools.

All right. Now we front up to another one of these elementary tools when we front up to the form of a Problems Intensive. This form is one of the oldest forms of Scientology, oddly enough. This form was first dreamed up in Elizabeth, New Jersey, in 1950. Found out that auditors knew nothing about pcs that they were auditing, so therefore, it was an awfully good idea to find out something about the pc, so this basic form was written up, and that was it. And this is almost the form. The early form was very close to it. I think that earliest form was used to make up this form.

Now, where you have an early form that comes through, it must have had some usefulness. There must have been some use all the way through. Right? Something that lasts this long. Well, so therefore, knowing something about your pc is valuable. Knowing something about your pc is valuable.

You can get into all sorts of messes knowing nothing about a pc. Well, it's just like a Central Organization. They never bothered to ask the pc, "Miss, have you ever been sick?" You know? "Have you ever been well? Have you ever been sick?" "Have you ever been?" And went ahead and audited the pc without ever finding out any information about the pc. Adventurous activity. Fortunately, it only happens once in a long while, but there it is.

Now, that was what this form originally set up to cure. Just that; no more. And we found it of value to know where the secondaries on the case lay. That's why you have Mother's death and Father's death and other deaths.

That's why those deaths are there. Because they tell you the most fruitful source of secondaries.

Frankly, if you run any one of those points as an engram, if the pc is capable of running an engram, if you know how to run an engram, if that is the engram to run on the case – all of those things providing – you'll spill considerable grief charge. And you open up a lot of track. Very often around a death like that you just get a total close in.

All right. We go into these various things, these various sections. They are simply an effort to find out something about your pc. Now, of course, a pc will always answer questions of that character, and if those sections I've already covered with you in another lecture, an individual going on down the line will run into some of these things and rather be unwilling to give you the dope; and after that will be out of session on you and you will be in a perilous state of nowhere with the pc.

A great many pcs have secret illnesses. A great many pcs have had mental treatment of some kind or another. A great many pcs have compulsions and fears that they don't want you to find out about.

As long as you have a social mores built around "One must be social" in some fashion – there are actually thousands of such mores – as long as you have those things, people will violate them. And when they violate them, they go out of communication with the group. And when they go out of communication with the group, then they're out of communication with
groups. And an auditor-pc relationship is a group. So therefore, you've got to raise their group consciousness before you get an auditor-pc relationship. Auditor and pc form a group.

So therefore, some of these sections are pulled with an eye on the needle. You put your eye on the needle, and you get all there is to know on that particular thing. Not operations. Who cares? Who cares how many operations they've had.

You say, "How many operations have you had in your life?"

"Well," the fellow says, "I had tonsillectomy, and I had a tooth operation once, and I had a uh – uh – had a uh – uh – hernia and so forth. Let's see if there are any more."

I say, "Good. Fine. Thank you. Now, what is your present physical condition?"

His operation denotes nothing. You don't know who made up whose mind that who had to have an operation, you see? That is not the type of change or anything that you care to have much to do with at this particular angle because you can throw him into the incident. You can throw him right down into the incident. So it wouldn't do any good to plunge him into a series of engrams, would it? So there isn't any point in plunging him into engrams.

You take accidents, operations, dust it off lightly. Just very lightly. Skip it.

I know if you're from Iowa or something like that, you'll have to restrain yourself because that's the sole source of social conversation. But dust it off lightly.

And then we get into this thing: physical condition. What's wrong with the pc? What is wrong with the pc? Oh, well, the pc has a couple of social diseases. Oh. And if this is a withhold, it becomes a circuit. Ho-hoooo. And the pc will never answer an auditing command as long as you audit him. The auditing command is always addressed to something or other which is addressed to something or other which is scheduled to cure this thing he hasn't told you about.

All societies set themselves up to be ill. No society is any exception to that, because as soon as you get together a huge mores of thou-shalt-not's, you of course get the two phenomena of withhold and make guilty. And people will use them to make other people guilty. And people will withhold them and make other people withhold them. And it throws the people out of communication with the people and therefore you get no as-ising of those conditions and so all civilizations grow ill and die, whether they are Egyptian or Greek or Roman or British or American. They all become ill from their own mores because they bring with them the attendant phenomena of withholds and make-guilties. Whenever you have a mores as the sole method of being civilized, you will have decay and death.

Now, Scientology is the first track area that has ever been which could form a mores which did not result in destruction. But it can only do this if Scientologists know their business. It would inevitably sicken and die the moment that nobody could make anybody talk. Then they could only make people guilty.

You see, if you can't as-is sin and if you can't wipe away sin, then you can only repress sin. However you look at it, that is the only way civilizations have had of handling sin. "Thou shalt not kill." "Thou shalt not butter thy brother's wife." Didn't matter how idiotic or stupid or odd it was. The thou shalt-not's were their method of holding it all in line.
And they never noticed that to the degree that the thou-shalt-not's were enforced, the society sickened; the more punishment was administered to criminals, the more crime eventually took place. Direct ratio. Punishing criminals: just making people guilty of. After some criminal has been punished, of course, everybody else who was guilty of the crime is supposed to be restrained from committing it again because of the punishment. Well, it's a short-term activity; it's very short-term and it does have a workability. A very crude workability, but it does have a workability.

Now, someone could debate alongside of me on this subject – some character back along the track or something like that who was fond of oratory could debate along this line and could prove to you absolutely and conclusively that civilization, any civilization, owed its becoming a civilization totally to the mechanism of making people guilty and making people withhold their crimes and sins. He could prove this conclusively as long as he was arguing from the basis that man is evil. If he was arguing from that basis, he could prove it conclusively. But remember to examine his premise. And his premise is "man is evil."

Now, you have to process somebody and find out that they are nicer people before you suddenly realize that "man is basically evil" is not a proper premise on which to base an argument. But man has uniformly used this premise and therefore has not thought any other method of civilization was possible. Obviously, if man is basically evil, what you have to do is punish man. That's the only thing that you could do with a man. If man was evil, you have to punish him. There couldn't be any other mechanism because if you freed him, he'd become more evil.

You will find that in trying to disseminate Scientology. You will find people horrified: "You mean actually erase this man's sexual repressions? Well, what is he going to do now about his sexual morality?" Oh, I think most sexual morality is based upon not getting any fun out of sex. Immorality is based on an anxiety to get fun out of sex or an anxiety to create a new generation. There's worry mixed up in all of these sexual abnormalities.

Somebody who can experience sex or doesn't have to, of course, would not then be immoral. But you get into all kinds of debates. And you can get into many philosophic debates about civilization, punishment, make guilty, evil, sin – all of these things – you can get into a lot of these debates. But you have to watch this one point: The premise on which the person is arguing – is that demonstrated? Is the premise proven? And of course, you can knock all such arguments apart merely by pulling the rug out from underneath the premise. There's nothing sillier than a premise sitting on its "blank" on a bare floor.

Now, if you look over argumentation, you'll find you can always win the argument by pulling somebody's premises out from underneath him. But you've got lots of examples. You have demonstration which is quite interesting.

A person is spreading entheta, chopping up, nattering, raising hell, leaving – leading a very unhappy life and is actually committing sins which are recognizable sins of one character or another through life.

All right. You process this person; this person stops doing it and becomes more effective. All right. When you've watched that yourself and when you yourself have seen this with your own two eyes, then you will be able to conclude from your own experience that when
you free man from his inhibitions, he becomes better. That you could prove positively. And then you could surmise, then, from that, that basically, if you let man's nature be demonstrated, and if you see his nature demonstrated and find it good, then you have to make up your mind that man is basically good, not basically evil.

This flies in the teeth of almost every Christian premise there is, by the way. You can get into some very, very nasty arguments on this subject because the concept of the original sin is the whole basis of Christianity. But I'm not leading you out into debates. I'm just showing you where this is and where it sits.

Oh, it's quite interesting. A preclear of whom you have some information – Quentin; he's a very, very little fellow; pint-size pc. He had five weeks of auditing at about thirty-five minutes a day, five days a week. Now, add it up, whatever it is. He's seven years old. Found his goal, found his terminal and ran his levels, and did a child Security Check.

That was what was done during that period of time. Needle is so loose now that the tone arm wobbles. He is very close to Clear. The next sprint of processing he will get, which is two or three months up the line, he will undoubtedly go Clear because he's proceeding that rapidly.

But it is quite amazing to have a polite little boy who is very active. [laughter] This is one of the oddest combinations I have ever seen, you see? He's extremely polite and very active. He's now able to run about twice as fast as he could before and he can yell twice as loud. [laughter] And he's about five times as polite. It's kind of fantastic. You wouldn't realize this when you saw him running around shouting, particularly, but if you had a conversation with him – even you – I think you'd find that he was very polite. Well, you see, that's just happened. He wasn't very polite before.

All right. Now, there's an example. There's an example. Now, what happened there exactly; what precisely happened? Actually, he became freer. He no longer has an odd feeling of being pushed around and being enturbulated. He described it to his mother, shaking his shoulders, as one of the results of his processing, that he no longer felt – just shook his shoulders and that – back and forth and grimaced, you see? He had no word to describe it. But that was evidently the way he had felt before.

Now, there's what we mean by freedom. Of course, you wouldn't think in seven years that a man could accumulate much crime. [laughter] Well, it's very interesting the tininesses of the crimes, you know? Hit his sister, you know, little things. Made a big difference. When you see that, you will see then the workability of this. The freeing of the person brings about a goodness. The person becomes more pleasant to others, and so forth. It's quite interesting. So that you can see to that degree a group restoring itself and you can see a vitality. You can see a greater motion, a greater action.

And where an individual has drawn out of earlier groups, they then become accordingly difficult to process in the group called auditor-pc and similarly hard to get along with in the group called Scientology. That's about all there is to it. If they've withdrawn, you see, to too great an extent from some recent group to which they have belonged, you'll get withholds, and so forth.
You try to make a psychologist into a Scientologist and – I mean a real, honest to God, dyed-in-the-wool, sat-in-class-for-six-years-and-learned-nothing psychologist. I beg your pardon. They did learn something. They learned the parts of the brain. I don't know what that had anything to do with it. I'm talking about a real, honest to goodness, supertrained psychologist.

All right. He comes over. You put him in the Academy. Oh, man, wow! We had one in Washington. And I think it took her three or four weeks to get through a Comm Course, and she was really trying. She was really trying. And everything it took a normal student a week or two to get over, she was taking five or six weeks to get through. Her rate of study was something on the order of about four times the amount of time consumed for the same absorbed datum. Slow!

She was not stupid. She simply was a renegade from a group. And nobody had run out the "renegadity," see? [laughter] Because the person was now a failed group member, they didn't make a good group member, you see? And that mostly applies not to past groups, but it applies to more recent groups. That is to say it's most forceful right here in this lifetime.

You'll find it showing up in former lives and affecting the pc. Of course, that is the basis of it, but you will find out that you can't even get him in-session if he's messed up with groups in this lifetime. So if you get too much withdrawal from groups and so forth... So therefore, processing against the mores of groups is quite interesting. It – well, it rather forecasts a Security Check for a college student, a Security Check for a high-school student, a Security Check for a basic student in earlier forms, a family Security Check, so on.

If you were to just take a Security Check for each group that the person had been part of and then gradually patched them up so that they actually could again be a member of that group, you'd all of a sudden find them going into session, bang! you see? They go into session very easily. Their rudiments would go out very slightly.

And some day you'll be picking up psychologists. After all, they had the goal of healing people before they got mixed up in black magic. And the psychiatrist similarly, the medical doctor, and so forth. Just remember that this fellow, when he moves over into Scientology, is a renegade. And as a renegade, of course, he has overts and withholds from the group he has just "renegaded." So you had better – you better pay attention to that. It isn't what has he done to Scientology that is bothering him. It's what he has just done to medicine. That's what would get him in, you see?

No matter how idiotic this group sounds to you, it is worth investigating on the basis of a Security Check in order to get somebody in-session.

You know, it could have been the Girl Scouts or it could have been anything, you know? Suba-hooba-hooba. Well, they probably believed in it while they were doing it. Didn't get them anywhere; that's why they left it. But they're still a person who has been part of a mores, see, and certain things were guilty and certain things were make-guilty and certain things should – had to be withheld, and so forth.

And frankly, you have to be quite clever to do some of these because you have to figure out what is the mores of the group they have departed from. For instance, what's the mo-
res of a medical doctor? I don't think it has very much to do with social mores, but it certainly is a mores that is a mores. "Never give the patient an even break." I don't know if that's part of it. "Never sit down to dinner with your fellow doctors without discussing the gruesome points of the last operation so as to condition them."

"Have you ever failed to try to condition one of your fellow doctors so that he would be able to better practice his profession?" You'd get a knock on it.

Yeah, well, the fellow went to dinner one time and didn't bring up a single bloody operation. You know? It might be a breach of mores, you know? Well, what the mores of the group is, is what the mores of the group is.

And when you realize that there is no crime on the face of the Earth – there is no crime on the face of the Earth – that isn't somewhere else on the face of Earth a virtue. You'll realize that there's differences. There are pretty wild differences from group to group.

Now, when you start coming down this line, you will be able to spot groups that the person has been a part of. Present physical condition. Well, he said, "I was in the army and ..." we don't care what else he says. He was in the army. Ooooh!

Now as you go through processing this case, you've got a lot of processing bait here. It says "army." Army. Right there under present physical condition. Well, of course, we picked up "army" someplace else probably, but we might not have, too.

Well, his present physical condition – when he was in the army, he got pretty tired and actually was hospitalized for a while, but is better now. That's interesting. That's interesting all by itself. Now, you're going to get it later over here on O, but as you go down the line later on when you run this thing, and when you've run O two or three times and found the areas that you ought to get off the case, you would be very clever to go back over the whole form and find out if there are any more possible changes in there that he gave you on the rest of the form that you are now beautifully missing on O and add them to O. And just include them in your next assessments.

Well, his physical condition is much better now than when it was in the army. What army? What is the mores of an army? Later on you are going to have to realize that when you're cooking up a Security Check. He's going to mention a sergeant. Well, I don't know. What is proper mores for private soldiers about sergeants? It hasn't anything to do with obey the sergeant; be nice to the sergeant. It has nothing to do with that. He almost lost out in the whole military field. As a matter of fact, out at target practice, he never really used to be able to go up on the firing line with any degree of confidence. Why?

Well, he had a withhold from his other privates. He'd laughed at a sergeant's joke. [laughter] It's all right to laugh at a captain's joke, but not a sergeant's.

There's various types of mores, Lord knows. And then it's of importance what army he was in. Zulu army would conduct itself quite differently. And in addition to that, you'd find out, I think, that the Algerian rebel army conducts itself quite differently.

I know the Chinese armies conducted themselves very differently. A withhold from a Chinese general would be something like he did engage in a battle once. That showed he was
very decayed, and he's never told any other – anybody else about it. Or he thought of actually joining a battle. He thought of doing this. Of course, Chinese generals never do. What you do is maneuver. They used to in the old days – they used to maneuver until the enemy was at a disadvantage, and then the general who had the other fellow at the disadvantage then made bids for his rifles – for the men's rifles, and bought them at something on the order of ten maces per rifle or something like this. And that was the way the war ended.

In 1914-18, I think you would have found the soldiery involved in 1914-18 – I think you would have found them very, very pleasantly disposed toward that particular idea because the prevailing idea then was to take the generals of both sides, put them in an arena with clubs and let them fight it out. And you know, I don't know that at 14-18 it wouldn't have settled just as much. I don't know that it wouldn't have settled it much better.

You look back on wars, you know, after you've been in there pitching and trying to prevent this or save the world for Rooseveltism or something like this, you know? You look back on these things and you begin to, you know, say, "Well, I don't know. This is the way it is now, and we don't seem to have saved anything," you know? Usually can be depended on to give you a lose.

But mores depend on groups. And the more data you get such as interests and hobbies, his criminal record (group of a prison), compulsions, repressions, fears. These might tell you all sorts of groups of various kinds. You're getting future bait for putting together a Security Check, so you want to shake those things down with an E-Meter.

Furthermore, they could operate as a withhold from you. And in view of that fact, they could knock you out as a group, you see?

Now, as previous Scientology processing, you usually require four, five, six, eight, ten pages if you had it one by one and so forth. So we're not terribly interested in long dissertations on it. All we want is an estimate because we're not trying to run an ARC break here. We're not trying to patch up former processing. We just want to get some idea on how long this character has been around and more or less where has he been processed and how much just vaguely.

You're going to get all of that in the ARC break process anyhow, you see? Now, his present processing goes – we couldn't care less about that. But his life-turning points and so forth – O. And now here's where I get into a frame of mind where I speak to you the way I have spoken to you early in this lecture, sadly, urgently, disappointedly. Look, nobody – nobody – could do this form wrong. It isn't possible. You have to try.

So let's go over the points which we have caught. And these points are simply these: "List briefly". What is the word briefly? How do we list briefly? What does the word briefly means? Well, briefly, translated through ancient Anglo-Saxon means two words! No more.

Now, you'll find the pc assesses better if you move his time track around so you get the change. And then you move over in front of the change and put the date in front of it. And if you will make that change, you will find out your assessment has less trouble. Write the date, and then write the incident, the change, briefly: "1955, left Boeing". Totally adequate statement. "1947, tobacco." It's all shorthand. It means something to him. He either gave it up
or took it up or something of the sort, but it means something to him. But if you said, "1947, tobacco," you see, this gets a proper registry. It doesn't mix it up with "1934, tobacco," when he smoked his first cigarette. Get the idea?

You'll find out your assessment goes more rapidly if the date is first. I've been studying what you've been doing and I've come up to these conclusions that you had better be doing it this way and this answers some of your problems. It's not an extraordinary solution. Your next forms that are issued on these things will be written up so that you can't do it any other way than this. You got that now?

All right. Date, then item. Date; item. Now, what is a change? What is a change? What change are we interested in? And don't let me catch you after this exact hour and minute on this particular time track ever listing again in the O Section: "graduated from high school." Don't. Don't ever write it down. Why not? Because it is not a self-determined change.

The fates called the school board decreed it years before that in 19-yumpf-de-yumpf he was going to be graduated from high school. And it gives you no forerunning change. It does not assess. It does not mean anything at all. In 1950, he certainly was going to graduate from high school in 1954. Right? When he went to the university, he certainly graduated from the university. So graduating from the university, from high school, anything else – it is not a self-determined change.

Left the university in the third year – oh, well, now, now, now we've got something here, you see? That's a self-determined change. You say, "How come you left?"

"Well, I just wasn't getting along well, and I decided. And I talked to my father and we decided and ..."

Got it? That's a self-determined change. Understand?

Demobilized from army. Do not ever let me catch you soiling the end of a ball point with that one. Why? Men are demobilized from the army quite without any consultation. That is not a self-determined change of any kind whatsoever. The war is over or the enlistment is up or a time that is predestined and predetermined has now expired or the individual was foolish enough to stand up and bare his breast to the winds of the gunpowder and they couldn't use him anymore.

Well, what are you doing? What are you doing if you write that one down? Oh well, you're just setting it up to assess the times the pc has been a victim. And it will give you a totally different result. And I'm rather horrified to realize that I have to explain this because I will tell you this: that this whole thing can be thrown and its whole effectiveness can be knocked out and all of a Problems Intensive can be knocked in the head by listing other-determined changes.

If you list other-determined changes, what do you get? All you do is actually list Sections A to N all over again. And look, you already listed them. These are occurrences. O is a different kind of occurrence. And I should make this completely clear if you're ever going to make any. O is a different kind of occurrence. It is a self-determined occurrence.
He up and made up 'is mind, he did. For reasons best known to 'im and God that 'e was going to do something else with 'is life. That's what.

And that's what O is. O is not "Had an operation," "Was in an automobile accident and that made a big change in my life. Yes, yes. Well, there's the automobile accident. And you had better put that down. And then one day I was standing on the curb and a bus came by and the conductor hit me over the head and that put me in the hospital. Yeah, that was a big change. That was a big change in my life. And then I graduated from school, and I didn't know what to do with myself. And that was a big change in life. That is for sure a big change in life."

Now, you get these things one after the other, and you assess being run over by a bus, being operated on, being graduated from school, and what do you have? You have a picture of a pawn being moved on the chessboard of life. And there it moves and there it moves and there it was taken by the knight. [laughter] Oh, how sad.

"My career as a victim" is what you're liable to get under O if you don't know the facts of life. And the facts of life are these: What you are looking for – what you are looking for in the times when he made up his mind to change. Why? You're only looking for the solutions to problems. You're not looking for changes in life. He changed in life as the solution to a problem he didn't know he had. And you're never going to find the problems, and you're never going to find the prior confusions if you go ahead and list other-determined changes.

Well, how will you never do it? Well, of course, an operation will rock on the E-Meter. You give a complete list of operations – try it someday. Have somebody say, well – let's have somebody that was – really been hanging around the medicos, you know? There's only one part of one fingernail left of the original body. And here we are, you see, and you list this person's operations. And you say, "Did these make any changes in your life?"

"Oh, yes, made a big change in my life. Changed me from the house to the hospital, and then changed me over to the rest sanitarium. And then I got home. Yeah, that made a big change. And then from the house to the hospital and the rest sanitarium, and the house to the hospital to the rest sanatorium to the house to the hospital to the rest sanitarium ..."

And you assess this. You assess this: "1956, had right foot amputated. 1957, had ear operated on for earisipulus." [laughter] "1958, had torso annexed." [laughter] "1959, had head amputated. 1960, toenails trimmed." [laughter]

And you know what you're going to do? You're going to get some reactions on the needle. There will. [laughter] There'll be reactions on the needle. Because you are listing a list of engrams. You don't want engrams.

You want times when he was walking straight up, apparently his own boss, and he said, "School, thou shalt not anymore house my sacred portals." And so he went, he did. Why?

He was going on a ship from Pernambuco to Liverpool, and it stopped in Bermuda, and although his ticket was paid, he got off. Why? You get the idea? The kind of change. He decided to go. He decided to do something.
And behind each one of these things, you will find a major problem in the hidden confusion. And that is the plot you are trying to solve. So why list anything else but the self-determined change. Have I made that abundantly clear?

All right. Now, in your problem, this is where you had quite a little bit of stumble. We are running Routine 3. Routine 3 selects out the terminal of the case. Now, some tests made recently indicate conclusively, and this changes something, because it's very rare actually I change anything in Scientology, but this changes something.

As long as you weren't running up against goals terminal, and you weren't pushing the person toward a goals terminal or anything like this, you could get away with running terminals, of course. But if you've got a person's goals terminal, you better not run any other terminal except with withholds and overts. O/W can be run on other terminals. You can security check Mama and all that sort of thing, but you sit down to a long grind of "What about that problem with your mother?" "What is unknown about that problem with Father?" It's this sort of thing.

It's Father, Father, Father, Father. Grind, grind, grind, grind. Repetitive process. Repetitive process. And it toughens up the bank. Makes a present time problem too hard to solve. I'm giving you a new datum.

But when you – you can run terminals, and we used to do it, and it's quite well to do it, but when you have the goals terminal of the pc, it doesn't do him any good to run repetitive processes on any other terminal than the goals terminal. You can security check other terminals, you can talk about other terminals, you can move other terminals around, you can find them as parts of prior confusions, but you cannot run repetitive processes on them with any profit.

So you just ups and takes whatever the pc gives you as the problem and you fit "unknown" into it in the simplest, possible fashion and you run it. And you find it'll do no damage whatsoever. As a matter of fact, it is better to do it that way than to run it with a terminal. Sounds strange. Sounds like a volte-vis, but I'm giving you the latest stuff.

Now, rudiments – don't ever assess for a terminal while doing your rudiments. A person says "I have a problem."

"Well, what – what problem do you have?"

"Well, I've got a present time problem." You finally isolate this present time problem. "And I'm having dizzy spells."

Obviously, the process is "What is unknown about dizzy spells?" As easy as that, you know? And the only mistakes you're going to make is get too complicated.

There's one other rule goes along with it...

You don't avoid terminals! Don't get that idea.

It's just – "Well, I just – what was my problem then? Well, I just thought I would go, gee, you know, how to keep from going mad living with my mother another day."
"Well, what is the problem there? Is it how to keep from going mad? The problem living with your mother, and so forth?"

And it finally works out to be "Living with my mother."

"Well, what is unknown about going mad living with your mother?"

Yeah, all right. But it is the most elementary statement you can make of the problem using the most of the pc's phrasing. You know, run the process he gave you.

Now, don't go over into a terminals run under the line of running a problem. "What is unknown about mother?", you see? Ahahaha. No, you're not running the problem. That is not what we want out of life at this stage of the game. We want this problem flattened.

Now, in view of the fact that you're not going to work on it for the next seventy-five hours, it's perfectly all right to run a significance. Oh, yeah, it'll run the pc's havingness down, but it'll only run it down to the degree that you've got the rudiments out.

Pc's havingness goes down to the degree the rudiments are out. That's a stable datum for you, by the way. If you find yourself having to remedy very much havingness for a pc, you know your rudiments are way out.

All right. Now, is there anything else to be known about this problem? Yes. Yes. One more thing that is quite interesting about problems.

Never run a stop. Avoid stills. Avoid stills.

I'll give you a problem that actually came up: "How to stop fighting," came up on a pc's report here. "How to stop fighting."

What is the first consideration there? You say, "What is unknown about stopping fighting?" No. No. The better process is "What is unknown about fighting?" You know? Avoid those stills. Try to keep the still out of your – out of your terminals, your levels, and so forth. Get away from the still.

The Prehav Scale is a doingness scale. And you notice No Motion has now come out of it. So avoid the stills. Don't avoid them in life particularly, but you'll find out that in processing, oddly enough, is what it takes to make the thing move.

Well, how to stop smoking. "What is unknown about smoking" is your problem phrase. "I was worried stiff about staying home, and I thought I would have to stay home the rest of my life and there I would be and that is it." And that is the pc's problem.

Well, as the auditor, that's your problem, too. How are you going to word this thing so that it is not a still?

Do something. "What is unknown about home?" Assess it out on the E-Meter. Find out what you get a bang on, you see?

"What is unknown about not being able to leave?" See? That's right around on the back door, see? Not being able to leave home. Try to avoid the idea that he's stuck in the house. "What is unknown about being stuck in the house?" Well, boy, you're going to be stuck on that process from here on out, see? But sticking in the house won't blow.
Remember that even while you're running the problem, the theory of the prior confusion still operates, and unless you've got movement in the auditing phrases, you see, why, the thing is just going to stick. And you're going to get onto an awful grind. And if you find yourself grinding sometime on a problem, and you keep running "What is unknown (blank, blank, blank) on this problem?" and you go on and on and on and on and nothing's happening. Nothing is happening at all. And it just doesn't seem to be flattening, and there seems to be some tone arm motion, but the thing just doesn't seem to be flattening, and "What are we going to do? What are we going to do?"

I think you'd better go back and look at the phrasing of the problem that you have phrased for the pc, because it's probably got a stick in it, and it's probably doing exactly what it says. And you've probably phrased it something on the order, "What is unknown about Mother not moving?" See, that's great! That's going to run practically forever and get nowhere and wouldn't blow. You see that?

It's just the thing to do. If you find yourself running too long on the problem process or running too long on a rudiments problem process – which comes up all the time, not just in this Problems Intensive – and you find this thing isn't flattening well, look over the thing to see if you've inadvertently included no motion in the auditing command. "What is unknown about your being stopped in life?" Oh, boy, that'd be great, you know? That'd just jam the bank, and it'd just keep going and going and going.

Oh, there is no expert, instant way unless you've got the pc right in front of you to transpose it over into a motion command. You get the pc to state it a couple of times, and hell generally give you a motion version of his problem. Take it quick before he changes his mind.

"How to keep from being stopped in life," don't you see, is not a no motion. See, it still implies action. See, he's still preventing himself from being stopped. Well, the preventing himself from being stopped at least implies action. And that will barely run. You're right on the dividing line there, you see? Right on the dividing line. How to keep from being stopped in life.

Well, it's questionable, you know? But it'll run. "What is unknown about being stopped in life?" Oh, no, no; that won't run. "What is unknown about keeping from being stopped in life?" Oh, that's very clumsy. And you can get a pc, however, phrasing it and ... "Well, you know! How to keep going in life. That's what I'm saying, you see?" he'll explain to you. "How to keep going in life."

You say, [speaks hastily] "Good. Well, then the auditing command, then, will be 'What is unknown about keeping going in life?' That's good. Here we go." And you'll find out it'll work out to the same process.

See, everything goes on the stop and the motion. So in putting these problems together, don't do an assessment, and make sure that you keep it in a motion category. And make sure that it's as close to the pc's problem as you can possibly get.

The best way, if it doesn't include the total stuck in it, is just to use the pc's statement of the problem or use the action verb of the pc's statement of the problem or the noun of the pc's problem.
"Well, how to get over being in France life after lifetime," you see? Maybe this is the problem, you know?

Well, you can avoid that very easily. "What is unknown about France?" See? That gets around the stick. You got the idea? He's got a lot of significance about this thing, but there must be something unknown about it, and you just use the subject matter of the thing and throw it in.

You'll find these problems will run. It requires no great anything, but you do have to know those two points.

Don't assess, and keep sticks out of the phrasing.

All right. Now, as you're running your assessment on the P form – "List persons present in the confusion" – you're going to be doing a Security Check on the assessed person. In other words, you're going to list all the people present and then you're going to do a Security Check on the person who falls the most – the most reaction rather. See? Everybody present in the confusion. What was the confusion immediately before that?

And he, "Oh, well, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Well, who was present in that?"

"Well, there was Mama, and there was Grandpa, and there was Aunt Bessie, and there was Sister Kate, and uh... Oh, yes, and there was my father, yes. That's it."

You write all these things down, and that's it.

Now you assess this thing out and you find that you get quite a bang on Mother. All right. So you get the withholds from Mother at that time, and you pull these out in any Security Check fashion. And you get him security checked on the subject of Mama. You know, what had he done to her? What is he withholding for – about that thing. And in that period what had he done? And all that sort of thing

And you finish up Mother.

And you come back again, and you say, "All right. Now, with regard to that confusion, was there anybody else present?"

And you nearly will always get the hidden person that is the source of the whole thing. In the hidden area – you see, you got the change. That was the only tag showing, and then you got the problem, and you ran that. And now you assess the person in the confusion which immediately preceded the problem, and just as the confusion was hidden and just as the problem was hidden, so there is a person hidden in that confusion. Ordinarily that person has gone.

So the only thing I want to tell you is add to line 6 – or section 6 of P – add to it. After you've done one Security Check on it, let's find out who else was there in that confusion. Let's find out who else was present. And you're going to get some jim-dandies dropping out of a hamper. They will appear suddenly and mysteriously and the pc has not thought of them for years.
All right. Now, one more thing. There's no need to read the meter while listing O changes. Why would you read a meter on the list that you're going to assess anyway? So you just skip the meter while you're listing changes for O. Just skip it.

Now, don't do section O – A to O in Model Session. It is simply done. You do not get any Model Session until you get to P, and you do Model S-... P in Model Session complete. But no Model Session in A to O, and you don't remedy pc's havingness, and you don't do anything with the pc except pat him on the back and cheer him on. Okay?

Your Model Session starts with section P. Those are the basic things that have shaken out of the hamper. Those are the basic things which so far have shaken out of the hamper that auditors are having difficulty with doing this Problems Intensive.

It's not possible to have difficulties with but some people manage it.

All right. Now, the results coming through on this Problems Intensive are very, very, very, very, very good. They're excellent. They're hitting right on the button. And it's very nice. So if you're not hitting on any button when you do a Problems Intensive, you better call for Mama quick, in a hurry.

What you have done wrong? You have probably made a list of occurrences, have assessed the problem for some terminal that isn't the goals terminal of the pc and are running something else. And it doesn't have anything to do with the case or it's been a misassessment of some kind or another. There's – a wild misassessment can keep you from getting a result with this Problems Intensive. You can do the assessment pretty bad. But I have seen a couple that were completely off, and boy, you talk about there was no problem, there was no prior confusion. There was nothing.

So a misassessment, you say, is never preceded by a problem.

Oh, here's the other test. The person – I did have a test for it – the person sits in present time and surmises what his problem must have been at that time if you have done the wrong assessment. They do that every time. They sit in present time and guess what their problem must have been during that period. If you have done an actual, prompt and proper assessment, if you have the actual changes and you've done an exact assessment and you're dead right, you ask them what the problem is, they could not fail to tell you; it just leaps out of their mouths.

So a test of whether or not you're on the right run is to say to the person – just flatly – you just say to the person, "Well, is this – are you trying to figure out what your problem might have been during that period?"

And the person says, "Yes, I was trying to figure that out."

"Are you trying to figure out what the problems of a college boy would have been?"

"Ah-hah-hah. Well, that's what I'm doing."

And so you say, "Well, let's go back and assess this thing again." See, it's that abrupt an action as you'd take on it. Skip it! Because if you've got the right change and the right zone in his lifetime, you ask, "What is the problem?" you say pointedly, you see?
And he tells you, *Boom!* See? It's an "Oh, my God." Almost a "What do you know" reaction if you've got it right on the button, you see? And it's a "Well, I guess my problems during that period – let's see, what would have been the problems of a young boy at that period? I guess getting dressed, and going to bed in the evening, and so forth, and so forth."

And you say, "Well, I'm going to assess again. Now we're going to ..."

I actually go further than that. I'd look over the list. If I'd done the assessment, I'd know it was fairly right, and I'd know that he just hadn't mentioned a lot of changes in his lifetime. I'd do another O section. If I was getting something that crazy.

If it works, it works. And if it doesn't work, you haven't done a proper list of changes or an assessment. That's all.

Once more, just go back and do the whole thing again. I mean, go back to the beginning of O section, ask if there are any more changes in his lifetime that he himself determined. Find out if you haven't maybe added a lot of other-determined points in it. Correct the thing up as I've been giving you gen about in this thing.

Get it going again, and that time you'll hit it, *Boom!* He'll feel like he's been run into with a sledgehammer if you do it exactly right. A person couldn't have a lifetime without having one of these or he wouldn't be in bad shape. Do you get the idea?

So the person either has one of these or he's Clear. If you don't find it, you haven't done it right. Okay? It's one of these selfproving mechanisms. If there isn't a black cat in the middle of the room, there is no black cat in the middle of the room. It's very simple; very elementary. And if you've done it right, there's the damnedest, biggest black cat in the middle of the room that you've ever heard of.

Okay. Well, I've chewed you out a good bit, and you realize now that there is one slight thing I will have to let you in on. That every day you *don't* pass one of the checksheet points on your checksheet, you owe an hour's auditing. Some of you would drown at that rate, so let's get going.

Thank you. Okay.
Valences, Circuits

A lecture given on 18 October 1961

Yeah, you see, that's all for Mary Sue. That's good. [laughter] That's good.

All right, this is what? The 18th of October, AD 11.

Now today, you are dealing with Problems Intensives, and so forth. And the modus operandi which we are following, very ordinarily, can be considered to be finding somebody's goal; finding somebody's terminal; giving them a Problems Intensive; giving them runs on the Prehav Scale on the found goal; flattening off two, three levels; spotting and assessing some engrams that have been turned up during that period; running those; flattening some more levels on the Prehav Scale; and then probably giving a whole track Problems Intensive; and then flattening off a few more levels on the Prehav Scale. If they're not Clear by that time, run a few more engrams, and then run some more levels.

Now, the truth be told, they had a barnyard one time and they had an election. I thought that would wake you up. [laughter] And they had decided that all animals were equal. And this is perfectly fine, but they had decided all animals were equal and they're having an election, and the pigs were finally elected as chairmans and governors of the barnyard. So, life went on along the barnyard way, very nicely and smoothly and everything was going along fine, except most of the animals began to notice that the bulk of the feed was going into the pig trough. And so they complained about it and were overruled by a point of order. [laughter] And then they noticed that the pig quarters had been moved to the warmest part of the barn. Oh, by this time it got a little bit rough. And finally it got to a point where there wasn't anything to eat anyplace but in the pig trough, so they had a big meeting. And the animals wanted to know why, if all animals were equal and all had equal rights, the pigs should be living in the warmest part of the barn and should be getting practically all the food in the barnyard. So, the pigs had a considerable meeting amongst themselves as an executive committee and finally came up with this conclusion, which they published: that some animals are more equal than others. [laughter]

This thing about equality comes up amongst preclears. Are some thetans tougher than other thetans? Are thetans all of 61.1 grasshopper power, or you see, and so on. That is by the way, an unanswered question. But the basics of the thing are that some people are certainly – all cases are rough, but some cases are more rougher than others. And in this particular wise, all cases will now be found to respond to what we know, but some require more of it than others.
And regardless of the equality of thetans and how some thetans might be equal to some thetans and all thetans are more equal than other thetans – in spite of these problems, which are unanswered – you'll find that all thetans who are here at this time on this particular time track in this universe (you must qualify it in that wise) are suffering from exactly the same levels of aberration.

The difference is magnitude. And that is the only difference. Now, this is an important conclusion because it doesn't give you Kraepelin's – I think it's probably pronounced differently, but I prefer the pronunciation of "Craplins" – Index of Insanity. Now, his Index of Insanity goes on for some pages, and it's all the different kinds of insanity that people have. And it's very interesting, and it was developed many, many decades ago in Germany, and then was exported and arrived almost simultaneously on Park Avenue and Madison Avenue. On Park Avenue it was applied to the rich and on Madison Avenue it was applied to the advertising world.

And they expanded it. And in most insane asylums in America – I prefer that, too. I prefer that derogation of "insane asylums." I think they're insane, don't you? [laughter] And they have expanded this. Believe it or not they've expanded this almost unexpandable list. Well, it begins to look like Kraepelin's list originally was quite simple compared to the list which they now have of the numbers of types of insanity.

Well, these different types are only manifestational. It's how does the basic aberration manifest itself? And that is the only question which is answered by a long classification of types of insanity or aberration. Manifestational – they manifest themselves differently; they are the same aberrations. So you have different manifestations and different orders of magnitude and you have no difference of insanity.

In other words, this is what we have been working for, for some time in Dianetics and Scientology, is to understand all of these various types and responses. But basically, you have the condition of all aberration arising from the same causes, but manifesting itself differently and manifesting itself to greater degrees of magnitude or lesser degrees of magnitude. It's the same thing, you understand, but it can look different and it can be greater or lesser.

And what are these manifestations? Well, we've talked about them for many, many years; there have been many points of address to them. But the reason why we are clearing people, broadly today, and the reason why you can clear people, is because you are taking people out by the same process that they went in. At the beginning of Book One, *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* – actually its third volume, not its – I think it is – not its first volume; it's the third book of the first book. It says if you can just parallel what the mind is doing, why, you can lick most anything. So you have to parallel what the mind is doing. That's one of the fundamentals.

Actually, the fundamentals with which we operate are expressed in that book. And also many of them, of research, are expressed in *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*, and *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*, as a little short essay, is basically more important than it looks, because these are the various indexes which are used in sorting out data, and it's the only place they've ever been expressed. But here today, we have a process in Routine 3 of
becoming aberrated – the process of becoming aberrated. And we, in Routine 3, you see, reverse the process of becoming aberrated.

And it sort of works like this – it does work like this: A thetan, doing and acting in this universe, loses confidence or conviction of his own strength, independence or power. A thetan loses confidence – basically in himself. He loses confidence in his ability to do and to survive. Having lost that confidence, he then assumes an identity which he considers will stand instead of self. He himself goes down into degradation.

Now, what he is overwhelmed by – or what he has overwhelmed consistently – is adopted by him as a full package of behavior, and that stands in lieu of self. And that is a valence. And that's – technical terminology for that is a valence: A valence is a substitute for self taken on after the fact of lost confidence in self.

Now, as a thetan sinks into degradation – lost confidence in self – he goes down into personal oblivion, so that he himself has no further memory of self, but has only memory as a valence. Now having – having taken on this valence, he then carries it on as a mechanism of survival. This is the thing that is surviving. He is doing a life continuum actually of what he has overwhelmed or what has overwhelmed him. This is a valence.

Now, at the point of degradation you will find it backtracking this way: Now, just before he assumed the valence he had a problem concerning his own survival, which he himself could not solve. He could not solve it as himself. Now, just before that problem, there was a tremendous confusion in which, by processes of overt and withholds, he became enturbulated as himself. Usually these overt and withholds were – well, always these overt and withholds were against the various dynamics.

Now, that was the route by which he went in. He missed his way and he had some overt and some withholds, particularly against the mores of the group in which he was operating. And then he lost confidence in himself completely. He felt he couldn't go on as himself, and this gave him some tremendous problem relating to survival. He felt he couldn't solve this problem and he adopted a valence to solve this problem. He adopted an identity he thought would stand as a solution to this problem and then he went on as that identity.

Now, that identity in turn, as the millennia progressed, submerged by the same cycle. As the identity, while a member of a group, the thetan committed overt and had withholds from other members of the group, and this finally mounted up into a tremendous unsolvable problem. And this problem, of course, was solved by him by actually the acceptance – usually, not of another valence – but the acceptance of a change or a different status.

Now, there are several ways with which he can face up to this situation. Now, I've described the most basic one. The most basic one is represented by Routine 3, which is to say he had a certain goal line of some kind or another, he did not succeed in this particular goal line, while part of a group he accumulated overt and withholds, and this amounted to a tremendous problem. This problem was solved by him by the acceptance of an identity.

Now, he is in trouble because he himself has gone into oblivion and the identity knows, the identity knows, but he doesn't. All right, that's the most fundamental. But how many ways can this then work out thereafter? Now, having committed that basic error, how
many ways can this work out thereafter? Fortunately for us there are not very many of them, but the cycle is always the same: While a member of a group having certain goals, he commits overts and has withholds from other group members, from which arises a confusion, which summates into a problem, which he then solves by... Now you name it, see? And there's the only variable, is what does he use to solve the problem.

Now, he has always used a valence, early on the track, to solve the problem. He always has done that. That we're sure of. So that you always have a thetan that you're processing who has adopted a valence. That's for sure. See, you know that. And you can take a look at any person, any human being, anybody walking around, and you know that he's had some goals and he's – as a member of a group, he's had overts and withholds, and this has amounted to a tremendous problem. And that he has solved this by assuming a valence, and that this valence is greater than himself, and that he himself has disappeared into an oblivion while the valence is dominant and paramount. This we know about every human being we meet who is not Clear. That's fundamental.

But remember now, as this valence, with certain goals, while a member of a group, he has developed overts and withholds which have culminated in a problem which he then solved by... And we've got the next variation; we've got the next thing he did.

Well, now, the common denominator of it all is change. And of course he's always solved the problem by changing. By changing what? See? We don't have to say what. We just say he solved the problem by changing. There change came about in his lifetime.

Now, that is equally true of the first assumption of a valence. You see, that was a change of identity. And life after life, as he's gone along he's shucked the old identity – the dead body – and he left it lying there in the coffin with the relatives weeping about, or left it stashed up underneath the dashboard, rather poorly preserved meat. He's done something with this body and he's gone ahead and he's picked up a new body.

Now, the whole of the Buddhist concern was the life-death cycle. The birth-death cycle of Buddhism is their total fixation, and actually is probably the greatest wisdom that Earth had up until we came along. It wasn't much, they ran it kind of backwards. But nevertheless it was a lamp burning.

Now, here, an interesting thing: The whole goal of the Buddhist is to escape this cycle of birth-death, birth-death, birth-death. And he's very afraid of making a change. The Buddhist is afraid of causing something, and he is afraid of making any change in life because he might then change somebody else, and he might then become responsible for broader changes. You see? Now, actually he's doing all this on the basis of "If I shirk enough responsibility, why, I will somehow or another float out of my ead." Well, unfortunately, it doesn't work very well. If Buddha did it sitting under the Bodhi tree, he didn't write it down on rock. He wrote it on men's minds and that is writing as upon quicksand, because there's something, something missing.

Now, it is true, that occasionally, accidentally, a thetan can sit down and be very quiet and go out of his ead, bong! You know how he does it? He's so concerned about escaping from dead bodies that he will actually set up an ejector mechanism, like a fighter plane ejects the cockpit and all at the press of a button, you see? The fighter pilot in these modern jet
planes – the better governments build them this way at least – presses a button and the whole cockpit flies out into space on a shot, and a parachute bangs open and he floats to earth.

Now, you'll find every once in a while – while you're processing a thetan, you'll find one of these things. And you'll know when you find it because he got an awful start, something happened, he exteriorized, it's all very mysterious, it's exactly what happened. We are hard put to find out unless we know that we have simply run into one of these ejector mechanisms. Accidentally we've pushed the button.

Well now, they don't work. Usually they're – most of them are broken and they haven't been functional for ages and they're quite silly, actually. Now, one fellow was so afraid – . You see, they get all mixed up. If they got into severe pain they should be able to die and get out of their heads. See? So they will set up some kind of a mechanism like a guillotine right above their foreheads – actually, it's a mocked up, heavy-energy guillotine. And at a certain time, when they experience enough pain, they feel they won't be able to think while they're doing this, so they trigger this to respond to pain. And they get enough pain and this guillotine will go – clank! And it's supposed to knock off the body. And nearly everybody has wound up at this stage of the track with the belief that you have to kill the body before you can get out of it. That is very interesting – you have to kill a body before you can get out of it. And people will just work like mad trying to kill a body so they can get out of it. And, of course, it has nothing to do with it – it is a via.

If you didn't have that many overts against – on the body, you would float out of it anyway. You'd have a hard time sticking with it, unless you had a few overts on it. So in trying to get out of the body, they try to kill the body, and they're – they're just all mixed up. And this is a silliness. They – they're doing the exact thing they shouldn't be doing.

All right. You find people are gimping around, being ill and that sort of thing. They very often have triggered some of these ejector mechanisms. Mysterious how these things occurred. Here they are, twenty years after they triggered something that was supposed to blow them out of their heads, or knock off the body or something like this. And they're still in their heads, and it didn't blow them out. And this is a big defeat and it's a – wow! – it's a problem the solution of which failed. It's a failed solution.

Do you see now, there is the birth-death cycle. And the Buddhist believed that he could escape this cycle. He could leave this vale of tears and woe. Now, it's one of the mechanisms of that particular series of truths that they believed that the world was horrible and poverty-stricken and that it was pretty well all bad over there. Now, the basic truths which they were putting out are so interlarded with these other exaggerations, overts and unkind thoughts, criticisms, alter-ises, and so on, that it operates as a selftrapping mechanism. If you get a guy to be still long enough you will key him in like crazy. All motions of the past will come in and kick him in the head.

Well, why do you find your pc sitting in the middle of a problem? Or why do you find him sitting there with that solution? And why is it such a still solution? Well, it's a still point on the track. And every time the pc has tried to rest he's practically been overwhelmed. And then as soon as you get the problem out of the way and you look back for the motion and the confusion, the motion and confusion runs and the still spot disappears. In other words, the still
spot is held there because of the pressure and duress of an active spot behind or earlier than the still spot. Do you see that? So therefore, every time the man tries to rest, the motion threatens to overwhelm him. You see, the still spot is there to hold back the motion earlier. So, every time he goes still, of course he restimulates the earlier motion.

You run into somebody, he can't rest, he can't rest, he can't rest, he can't rest. He doesn't dare! He walks down the street, he doesn't even dare stop in the middle of the block to look in a shop window. All of a sudden something goes merrrrmmmmm! He knows better! And a traffic light stops him as he's driving the car, he hasn't got any place to go. As a matter of fact, he's sitting alongside of a pretty girl; he would just love to have a moment to chin-chin, you'd think, you know? And there's the traffic light — perfectly good excuse to stop, you know? Does he talk to the pretty girl? No. He says, "Well, damn the police department! Rrrrrrr. And these traffic lights and so on — . And look at it, there's nobody on the side streets anyhow. Rrrrmmm." and so on, you know? And he finally throws it in gear and jumps the last instant of the light and goes roaring across the thing. Why? Why? Because it's upsetting to him to be still. Because the second he goes still he starts getting overwhelmed by all the former motion. The former motion restimulates on a still. And this is an oddity. The still is there to prevent former motion. So of course, then, the still becomes the restimulator for former motion.

Every thetan is subject to this. The Buddhist, he wanted to go out of his bloomin' head, 'e did, and sail around in the sky. Now, the last time I was sailing around in the sky, do you know I was bored stiff! Interesting. I was just bored stiff. Interesting! There was nothing to do! There was very little to look at. There was nothing to participate in. But, of course, there's enough former motion to make me feel like maybe I ought to be in motion, or ought to be doing something.

That's all beside the point. The point is that there was nothing to do. So the basic goal of the Buddhist must have been "do nothing". That is the defeatist goal. Whenever you have people in defeat, they are telling you that they wish to do nothing. Now, they will gauge it in many, many ways, and they will say it in innumerable ways and justify it in a thousand, thousand ways; but it still adds up to the fact that they want to do nothing. That's what they think they should be doing.

Now, of course, the nothingness is the point of overwhelm. So people who yearn for nothing inadvertently yearn to be overwhelmed — inadvertently, by mechanism. They get overwhelmed. And so you have every great culture working hard to achieve peace. And they achieve more peace and more peace and more peace, and it gets terribly peaceful. It's awfully peaceful everywhere. And then up jumps one barbarian with a busted slingshot and knocks over the whole ruddy lot. They finally achieve no motion. And, of course, that is synonymous with death.

So a thetan's ambitions can often be contrary to his best interests. But this is not surprising in view of the fact that there are no real liabilities to being a thetan, except the liability of inaction, of no interest, the liability of nothing to do, the liability of nothing to have, no place to go, nothing to be. Those are all liabilities. And when you see people around preaching these, you are seeing people in the finest possible games condition. That is the ne plus ultra of all games conditions.
When you see somebody preaching to everybody that they must be very still, that they must be very good, that they must be very, very peaceful, that they mustn't move around much, that they should settle down on the farm and never again do anything else, that they should content themselves with that little swivel chair in front of the desk, that they must not do anything else. Whenever you see somebody preaching this – or "What you need now, Mr. Doakes, is a long rest." The fellow strokes his blood-stained lapel and gives you the business, you know? What a finer, finer way to kill a man, there isn't. That's the medico – his advice is always in this direction, you see?

But when you see these people talking about peace, peace, quiet, still, stay in one place, don't move, the best life in the world is for you – is to stand there like a lamppost; look at the wonderful life a lamppost leads – especially with dogs!

Anyway, you're asking. You're seeing somebody there who is in a games condition. He is playing a game in which he wants the other fellow to get overwhelmed. And he's using basically and fundamentally the mechanisms of the track which will best overwhelm the other person. It is not at all in the interests of helping somebody out. That is all part of the game. "The best way we can possibly help you out is to give you a long rest."

Now, the proofs of this are quite interesting. The proofs of this are all over the place. You take a soldier wounded on the firing line, and you put him in the first-aid shop, which is right hard beside the 155s that are slamming away, and you would think offhand that that would be the worst place in the world (because you see the propaganda is otherwise) for him to recover from his wounds. But what do you know! The death rate in the first-aid station alongside the guns is much lower for the same wounds than the death rate in the base hospital. Why, that's fantastic!

They move the guy back to the base hospital and they say, "Peace, peace, rest, rest. Now you take a long rest." And – poof! There he goes! They got rid of that one right now!

Yeah, but what kind of care does he get in the first-aid station up alongside the guns? "Is this one gonna live, or is he gonna kick the bucket? Oh, well, tie him up a little bit, move him over there, we got three more in the tent! How you doing Joe?... All right."

You know, just not, "You poor dear fellow. How are we possibly going to save you?" You know? People practically walking on them with hobnail boots and the characters get well. Because nobody up to that moment has introduced the idea of quiet. Nobody has introduced the idea of motionlessness.

Now, they've attributed it – the "psyrologists" of yesteryear – attributed it to the fact that he did this. They had no explanation, except perhaps he felt he was still participating or something. But this is one of the great puzzles, because the medical figures are so directly contrary to what the medical doctor does. If you leave him in the first-aid station between a couple of slamming guns, he gets well. And if you send him to the rear, he dies – same wounds, same type of case. They know this, so they keep sending him to the rear.

Now, there are many instances of this. You take old Mr. Doakes. Well, he's worked hammer and tongs in that lumberyard for the last forty-five years, man and boy, and he built it up himself, he did. Splinters in all ten fingers. And here he is, he's working on the thing. And
truth of the matter is he does know more about the lumberyard than the other people around there, and he's going around just having a time.

And one day he gets gallbladder trouble or something – one of the splinters got in his gallbladder. And he finally has to go down and he unluckily lands in the middle of "Peace, peace," you see? And he gets a bit sicker. And he keep – first few days he's there he keeps fretting away, you know, and he's saying, "I wonder if that damn foreman is going to load that pine up on the wrong truck again, and do you suppose they remembered to get the oak out of the rain?" You know? And worry, worry, fuss. And every time he starts worrying about it, what operation is run on him? Is "No, no, they'll get along all right. Be quiet now, and don't fret yourself." Can't you just hear it running off?

Well, it's an operation. It doesn't do him any good. The best possible thing that could happen to him is for the telephone call actually to come in, and the foreman has left the oak out in the rain. And they loaded the pine, not only on the wrong truck, but sent it to the wrong continent. No peace going on. Next thing you know, he says, "Well, hell with this gallbladder," and goes back to work.

Well, now, you see examples that are pointed out to you as fellows who are dying from overwork. These are examples of fellows that are killing themselves with work. And the whole society subscribes to this. You see how a thetan lays the red herrings? He doesn't throw red herrings across the track, he throws flats of red herrings across the track. Dumps truck-loads of them – because the evidence isn't there. He's dying from stills; he is never dying from motions.

How does a thetan – how does a thetan get sick? You know yourself that the moment that you release the still that he is stuck in, he'll get well. What is an engram but a still, you see? He'll get well if you can release that still. Now you – he's lying there with a broken leg and it's going to take him six weeks for the leg to get squared around – well, all right, how about this? This is wh – . We've done this so many times it's just routine, practically. If you go in – we go in and we get rid of the engram of breaking the leg, and we get all holds out of the thing and all resistances out of the thing and so forth; he's out of there in about a week or so and the doctors are flabbergasted. They can't believe it.

You've been around – if you've been around where they've given lots of these assists, or if you've given some yourself, well, you recognize that you've run out what was holding him in the accident. Now, that's well within your own reality.

Well now, he was suffering from a broken leg because he was held in the accident – not because there was too much motion, but because there was too much still. It's this motion before the still, don't you see, which is crowding the still into being a still. And you could release it better by getting the motion before it.

But what has happened to him that he is not any longer in this condition? That he falls off a motorbike, hits the pavement, several limbs bend the wrong way to, he picks up the body, puts it back on the motorcycle and rides home. The punctures close in the flesh, and the bones go instantly back together again – what has happened to him that he cannot do this? He's been leading too quiet a life, that's all. That's all that's happened to him.
Now, you get around, you get around very active people, you will see them taking fall... Well, get around a circus. That's not too good an example because they're on display. Another factor is entered into it, if they're giving other people mock-ups all the time. But you'll see these fellows take falls and flops, and so on, that would kill you. And they just pick themselves up again and they never think twice about it, you know? Of course, every once in a while their, the bull elephant, or something like that, will lean into an elephant man, and he will lean until the elephant man is pasteboard. But that's not the type of accidents I'm talking about.

But I also could add: what's the matter with the elephant man that, having become pasteboard, he now doesn't resume his former shape? Why is it that when you hit a body and knock it out of shape, what's the matter here that it doesn't come back to shape again instantly? Well, we say immediately, "Well, it's broken. Well, it's like a toy, or it's like a piece of wood, or something like that, it's broken." No, toys and pieces of wood are not alive.

Why doesn't the body come back to shape? Because we know the body comes back to shape slowly, why doesn't the body come back to shape rapidly? Because of stills. Because it is held out of shape. And that should be well within your reality as an auditor that if there is something wrong, it is being held that way with considerable magnitude of force. Those things that are wrong with people are held wrong at the expense of considerable energy.

How a man can stay crazy has often been a great deal of mystery to me. The effort it must take to stay crazy must be fantastic. And true enough, if you get the exact unknown spot in a person's craziness, you undo him utterly. He goes zoom, and he goes sane. I've seen it happen time and again.

The most fruitful source of these sudden recoveries of course are withholds. Withholds best overcome stills, because they're the motion before the still. The motion before the still was going on while the person was not participating with the motion. See, the person was withholding himself from the motion already, so while in motion he was being slightly still, in that he was withholding himself from the motion. Get the idea? He's practicing withholds.

So he's already dragged himself back out of the motion. And eventually he drags himself back so hard and so thoroughly out of the motion and he makes so many overts against the rest of the participating elements of the motion that he is no longer part of the motion. And what is there left for him to be but still?

When you haven't any right to longer be part of a motion, you have only one other choice. If you are – cannot be part of all available motion, you can only then be still. If the only motion available to you in a group is motion A, B, C, D, E, F, you know, and yet you've withheld yourself from the group, and have overts against the motion of the group one way or the other, of course where can you go but still? There's no place else to go. If that's all the available motion there is, is the motion of this group, and you withhold yourself from that, you go still. And, of course, that is the basic mechanism by which you get a confusion, overts and withholds, winding up in a problem.

Well, the problem is the still. It's postulate-counter-postulate. It's idea-counter-idea. It is a held and timeless mechanism.
Now, everything I've been talking about problems this past summer is totally applicable. We haven't gone astray a bit. What we've done in a Problems Intensive is find just a better way to handle the same mechanisms. There have been a couple of new discoveries on the exact anatomy of those mechanisms. Exactly how do – how does a problem hang up? That's what's been found. Very closely stated that the confusion comes before the stable datum on a time plot. The confusion and the stable datum are not in the same instant of time. It's the confusion, and then time lapse, and then the stable datum. The stable datum is always after the fact of the confusion, and that the overt and the withhold eventually culminate in a still. And, of course, that still can say it's a problem, it can say it's a this, it can say it's a that.

But immediately after the problem is a solution to the problem. Now, because the problem is held motionless in time, of course the solution becomes continuous in time. So you have a thetan with a terrible problem: how to get some motion, how to have some excitement, how to do something, how to stop sitting on this condemned cloud.

Now, you could say, earlier, well, he must have had motion earlier that prompts him into this. No, we have to accept the fact that although moving is quite aberrative – obviously – thetans like to do it. And we sort of have to accept the nature of the piece that thetans will move around, and that they are happiest when in motion, although motion is apparently very foreign and to them and very bad for them. It's something on the order of a child gets sick every time he eats ice cream, but he does and will eat ice cream. You can say, well, motion is very bad for a thetan, a thetan likes to move. You could – the Buddhist adds it up, of course, and these other people who are practicing this games condition are saying that motion is very bad. That is their first lesson: motion is evil, evil is motion.

So we get the concept of the Devil, of course, is fire and the concept of God is nothing. But the Devil is at least something, and the Devil is always up to something, and the Devil is always in motion, and the Devil will find something to do for idle hands, [laughter] and nearly every – and nearly every phrase that we associate around, around Lucifer has to do with doingsness and motion. So, the lesson which we should of course gain out of this is that if we want to be godly, we'll stop dead-still and do nothing. And that is the penalty. And, of course, the second you stop dead-still and do nothing, everything you have been doing then overwhumps you. That's the way it is.

You see, if you hadn't been going at – taking Reg's new car – if you hadn't been going at 165 miles an hour, having your bumper up against another car's bumper – [laughter] nothing wrong with that, is there? You've got a bumper against another car's bumper. But if you add to that, just prior to it – that you were doing 165. Reg would have to get a new Jag! [laughter] You get what I'm talking about, see? It's the motion before the fact that makes the impact. And there you have the – the mechanics of existence – you have the motion and the still.

Well, now, there's nothing wrong with a still, actually, if there hasn't been some motion. And there's actually nothing wrong with motion if a – if a still doesn't occur. But like oil and water, alcohol and petrol, these things don't mix. Motion is motion and stills are stills. And if you're going to live a life as a priest, for heaven's sakes, live a life as a priest! But if you're going to live a life; if you're going to live a life as an alpineer or an airplane pilot or
something of the sort, well, for heaven's sakes, live a life as an alpineer or an airplane pilot. You got the idea? Unless you can adjust.

Now, if you can tolerate motion and if you can tolerate still, you never get into any of this trouble. But those are the two things that a thetan cannot do. There are certain motions he cannot tolerate and there are certain stills he cannot tolerate. Do you know that if you just put a huge boulder in the middle of a courtyard in an insane asylum, and just let this boulder sit there, and put a lot of seats around, and the patients could go out and sit and look at the boulder... Doesn't have to have any further significance than that.

You could blow this up and make it a temple, you see? You could have a – you could have an idol there, or you could have a piece of architecture or something of this sort there, but just as long as it's a big massive still. And they go out and they could sit and look at this still. Well, some of them would at once be sort of overwhelmed, and some of them at once get terribly enturbulated. But I assure you that if they were permitted to do this, day after day after day after day after day, after a few years, in the wildest state, why, they'd all of a sudden go more or less sane. You're familiarizing themselves with a massive still, you see? Just familiarize them with a still, familiarize them with a still, familiarize them with a still. You could do that and you'd blow – you'd blow them up the track. You'd move them around and so forth, without ever processing them. It's something to do.

But you say, never process a still. All right, that's perfectly correct. Don't process a still directly. But that hasn't anything to do with familiarizing somebody with an actual still. Processing a still in the bank and making somebody observe a still in the physical universe are two different actions.

Now, observing a still in the physical universe can be quite therapeutic, and observing stills in the bank without blowing them can really louse a thetan up. His bank has limited quantity and he loses havingness and other things happen when he observes bank stills.

Now, if we look carefully over how a thetan got aberrated, we will see that he went through a cycle of: action, confusion. Confusion is caused by overts and withholds against the people he's in action with or the things he's in action with... And of course he was in action because he wanted to do something. The mores of the group, his goal, the goal of the group, and so forth – this is all part of motion and action; it's a goingness-doingness proposition. That is followed by overts and withholds, and that culminates in a problem which is a stop. And the problem which is a stop is then followed by a change which is a solution to the problem. Now, we get that anatomy repetitive. It goes over and over and over and over and over. And it's been going on for the last two hundred trillion years.

Thetan wanted to do something and he was in motion, and then while in motion along with others he developed overts and withholds against the people he's in action with or the things he's in action with... And of course he was in action because he wanted to do something. The mores of the group, his goal, the goal of the group, and so forth – this is all part of motion and action; it's a goingness-doingness proposition. That is followed by overts and withholds, and that culminates in a problem which is a stop. And the problem which is a stop is then followed by a change which is a solution to the problem. Now, we get that anatomy repetitive. It goes over and over and over and over and over and over and over. And it's been going on for the last two hundred trillion years.

And he always set himself up for a new cycle, and every cycle is like every other cycle. And this is the – this is the sameness which runs as the woof and warp of life. That is the cycle of action of a thetan's aberration and a thetan's doingness and so forth, but basically the cycle of action of his aberration. And it doesn't matter what aberration he winds up with or
how that aberration manifests itself, it all goes back to the same anatomy. There's no difference of the anatomy at all.

All right. Early in the game he adopted a valence. That was the change which solved the problem. He had a goal, and that was a basic goal and that has been going on ever since. And then he got a problem across this goals line, and then this valence came along and this valence solved this goal. And here he is now. He's now somebody else.

Now, while being this somebody else, ever since, he still picks up new bodies who are somebody else. Oh, well, this masked the whole show. This really made it complicated. The thetan already is not himself. No, he's a valence. And as a valence he then picks up new bodies, each one of which is an identity. So he apparently would just stack up endless and endless and endless valences on top of his basic valence. Funny part of it is, he doesn't. That's what's amazing. The basic valence is in there so solid that transient valences from lifetime to lifetime don't overwhelm it. That's what's going on.

So while living these lifetimes he could subscribe to the identity which he had in the lifetime, but it still was underlaid by his valence – the – key, central valence which was motivated by a basic key, central goal. And although he gets other goals and these goals come and go, he still has that valence; he still has that basic goal.

Well, that is the biggest single shift; that is the biggest single change that takes place in a lifetime that is available to the auditor. Now, that is a big one, and it is available on anyone with whom you can communicate.

That's available on anyone with whom you can communicate. That is a requisite. Because you wouldn't have much chance getting the basic valence of a Chinee while you were speaking Portuguese and he was speaking Japanese. I mean, this is – get rather adrift. So some communication is necessary to the resolution of this situation. Given that communication, you'd be able to do something about it.

Now, to a limited degree, you would be able to process the Chinee with the CCHs without the benefit of communication. So you have a whole strata of processes which one way or the other will work out things for somebody, called the CCHs, which are without much benefit of communication. Those things will work on – those things will work on animals. You probably could process insects this way, maybe you could even process a stalk of corn or something this way, who knows. But it would be a CCH proposition. And we've got that whole band pretty well taped, and it's an important series of process, because it means processing in the absence of communication – that is what that gives us. And that is really what the CCHs are used for, is processing in the absence of communication.

If you can communicate to somebody, or with somebody, and get that person to answer your questions, even somewhat laboriously, and so forth, you have no business using the CCHs. That's about what that amounts to. And the CCHs can be categorized in that fashion now only because we can get rid of hidden standards. Now, until 1A came along (1A did a little bit), and until prior confusion came along (which did it much, much more), we had only one method of getting rid of a hidden standard, and that was the CCHs.
Now, in view of the fact that we have Problems Intensives, you can relegate the CCHs back to where they came from, which is processing in the absence of verbal communication – you can process somebody you can't talk with. And that's where the CCHs belong. Well, therefore, they are important.

But now, what else could happen to this thetan? Remember, he's still going to go on this same cycle – going to have a goal to get something done; he's going to be part of a group; and then he's going to get overt and he's going to get withholds from this group; and then he's going to get a big problem; and then he's going to change.

Well, what other changes are available asides from valences? Well, the first and foremost one that you run into, as far as body line is concerned, is he can pick up new bodies. He runs into an awful problem in life so he decides to die. The solution to that, of course, the change of that, is a new body. And you have the Buddhist cycle of birth and death. And that is – the Buddhist cycle of, of birth and death is simply the problem of "How do we keep going after the fact of an unsolvable problem?"

You could say that every death is accompanied by, preceded by – that every new life is preceded by an unsolvable problem. Somewhere in the vicinity of that death is an unsolvable problem. Death was a solution to the problem. And then new life was the solution to the death. Because in between the life and the death he ran into the brand-new problem. Is – that is being an unemployed thetan. [laughter] So he solves that problem.

And he goes ahead, then, by his action – desire for action and accomplishment culminates in overt, withholds which produces a problem which he then resolves. And then – we're talking now about – specifically about the resolution point. Well, it can be solved by death, couldn't it? And all illness – all illness of whatever kind – derives from unsolved problems. All illnesses dissolve – resolve or, or evolve from unsolved problems. That you must know pretty well, because that is the key to illness.

There is no illness in the absence of a wish to live. Illness is always a gradient scale of dying. Illness is always a gradient scale of dying. It is – expresses a resentment against life. It can be traced back to that.

The person is so overwhelmed by it he can no longer tangle it out, and we say, "Well, that person is ill because he wants to die." Well, it's a rather careless statement of it, because you're saying that only reactively does he wish to die. It's a reactive problem, and therefore not exposed to his analytical consultation.

So the person gets ill. He wins a football pool and they come around and after the government's had its cut, why, they stuff his pockets full of five pound notes, and shovel them into his living room and say, "Well, you won the football pool," and he gets very ill – in spite of the medicos. The medicos occasionally have written essays showing that every time you win a football pool you get well. Well, that is not – doesn't follow. It's too much change there. This fellow's goal line, long ago, was set up that you were safe as long as you were poor. And if you could just be good and poor then nobody would want anything you had, and so you wouldn't get stood up in the corner of the basement and hung up on raw ice tongs and be bled to death – which was the last time he had anything – what happened to him, you see?
So he solved this problem by saying, "I should be good and poor." And he's gone along being poor, and he's been a very successful poor man. I have – I feel like shaking a beggar's hand sometime, and when he's a really, he's really a mess, you see, and congratulating him, you know, on being such a successful beggar.

You'd be amazed, if – if you congratulate somebody who is pretending to be a victim, congratulate them on being such an excellent victim, you suddenly do something – bwww! of course, because they are doing that reactively. It's intentional, reactively.

So where you have this beggar being very proud, reactively, because of accomplishing the act of beggary, you'd have somebody who was being very proud of being a poor man. And then somebody fills his living par – living room up full of five pound notes. Ooooh!

Oh, boy, this is the one thing – this is the one thing – that he shouldn't have. We are – had case – case here. I seldom quote cases out loud, but this – this – this fellow came into possession of something and has been sick ever since. But most everybody would consider that it was good luck to have come into this possession. And medically, and by all other rules, this should have made him well. But it didn't, it made him good and sick because, of course, it made him unsafe – he felt unsafe. Somehow or another the possession of these things threatened his survival.

All right. So havingness is also the consideration of how much havingness should you have in order to survive. And, of course, you have lots of fellows that if you just filled their pockets full of gold they would be terrified. That is too much havingness to survive. And although they might say, "I'd like to have a million dollars," hand them a million dollars. And they go "Duhuh! Oh-oh! Um-hmm!" Just hand them a million dollars in one-pound notes, you see, or one-dollar bills. Whew!

The guy… Well, preferably do it about dusk, five or six miles from the fellow's home. And he doesn't have a car. Just do that to somebody, you see? Oooh! Why, the fellow wouldn't be fifty – fifty yards from the house before he'd have a nervous collapse. Why every sparrow in every tree would be lining up its beak on him to drill him dead, you know? It's unsafe.

I just give you that as an exaggerated aspect of what normally happens. Some child suddenly finds itself part of a rich family and is terrified. How did he get there? Family wasn't rich when they were born into it, but got rich afterwards, and now the child's a nervous wreck. It's too much havingness.

Now, they'll solve the problem some other way: by dying, by getting poor, by wasting things, by – by trying to make everybody else poor. I'm sure that Edsel Ford over in America, considers himself utterly overwhelmed by the magnitude of the Ford Motor Company, because ever since he's had anything to do with the Ford Motor Company he's done nothing but boob. He's a complete idiot. They've got a Mercury, so he builds another more expensive Mercury and calls it an Edsel. He's torn up every textbook and policy of the Ford Motor Company wherever he operates so as to do exactly the wrong things. You see? It is not safe for him to be in that position. So he can't destroy himself – that's bad, so he's got to destroy the position in some kind of a fashion. How else would you account for the fellow?
The whole country is starved for a cheap car. The compact is on the way up so he builds a clunk that is exactly like another Ford Motor Company car, and calls it the Edsel, and sells it for too much money, and the dealers all go broke, and he goes broke, and everything goes broke in all directions. [laughter]

Now, these – thetans aren't stupid. That's the other thing you must recognize about thetans. One of their aberrations may be stupidity. But according to the computation on which they are living, what they are doing is very clever. And you will always ha... always find, inevitably, that the very stupid have the most fantastic belief in their great cunning. And you often find somebody who is very bright who has great belief in his own stupidity. But these are mostly survival mechanisms of one kind or another. These are ways of getting along, ways of surviving, ways of living.

All right, not to be tortuously long-winded about it. How many changes could occur – how many things or ways of change could occur – at that point just after problem? You know, problem! exclamation point. Now, how many types of changes could there be? Well, you could think of billions of them in life. But how many mental changes could there be? Well, actually, very few. They could suppress or enhance certain characteristics or they could get rid of or adopt certain manifestations. And you've just more or less got the whole package in those two things – you could get rid of or adopt certain manifestations. Characteristics, manifestations – there aren't even two, see? – there's just two of them.

You could get some kind of a manifestation or you could get rid of some kind of a manifestation, and that's about all a thetan could do mentally. And what's the earliest step of this? Well, he takes on a valence. He takes on his valence. And that, of course, is a manifestation. A valence both limits and exaggerates a person's own skills – exaggerates some, limits some others.

Anything a thetan has, a thetan can do. Anything a thetan is doing a thetan can do. You can put it down to that. A thetan can be stupid. It isn't thetans are always smart but they get aberrated and get stupid. No, thetans can be stupid. Thetans can be bright. If a thetan can fix up a circuit of stupidity, therefore a thetan can be stupid. You see? He can only set up what he can do. He can only do that. That's all there is to that. But he is so dedicated to the idea that it requires a strongman's body to do that, that he only walks on the stage and does it when he has a strongman's body. You see that?

All right. Now, your next little step on the thing is he only walks on the stage and does that in a strongman's body when he is feeling – when he – when he is in training. See, a strongman body has to be in training. Then he can lift the thousand-pound weight. You get the conditions he's adding on to these things?
All right. Now, he can only do that when he is in a strongman's body, when he is in condition, when he is well. Get the additional conditions that are added on to this. All right. Now we get this additional condition: He can only walk on the stage and do this when he has a strongman's body, when he is employed to do it, when his agent has permitted it, when the billing has been perfectly okay for him to do this, when he is in condition, when he does not have any problems with the manager or the family; when, you see, he believes in himself.

He's got – now got a new circuit. You see, he feels powerful tonight. But on another night he doesn't feel powerful, so you see, he only picks up a five-hundred pound weight, you see? And he gets very prima donna-ish about all this, you know? And this gets wilder and wilder. But these are all vias.

And in actual fact the basic truth of the matter is that a thetan can walk on a stage, pick up a thousand-pound weight, twirl it around in a circle and put it down on the stage. That's what this all basically comes down to. A thetan can do this. But these conditions – limiters, limiters, limiters – are each one of them the solution to a problem he couldn't otherwise solve.

So limitations or exaggerations are always solutions to problems which are otherwise relatively unsolvable and which are hanging up. And the problem got there because of: they wanted to get something done as part of a group, and in that motion had overt, had withhold, and these resolved in a problem. And that whole story goes back of each one of these problems which results in a solution like, has to have a strong-armed body, see? Has to have a strongman's body. All of these things are just more and more complicated, more and more complicated, but it's just a summation of problems. And each time that whole cycle has had to take place for him to wind up at the other end with some kind of a wild solution.

Now, the solutions you are interested in, as an auditor, are not very many. You are not particularly concerned that he is in a body, because he's been in bodies before and he's gotten out of bodies before or he wouldn't be here. So there can't be very much wrong with him in this particular department. But what is he doing with this body? Now, that gets very interesting. In the first place he isn't being the body he is in. He basically and fundamentally, way back when, is being a valence which is in a body. Ah, he is not a thetan in a body, he's a valence in a body. He is a thetan who is a failed thetan, who is a valence which is a failed valence which is in a body. You get where this goes?

All right. Now let's move ahead just a little bit further, and recognize that there are new things that enter in which put you out of communication with him. Now, up to this point* we'd find it very easy to communicate with him. There'd be no difficulty in communicating with him. But these new problems and solutions with their changes that come after, interpose such things as constant somatics.

A constant somatic is a solution to some problem, and you're auditing him through the problem. You've got a constant somatic so there you've got a problem, and you're auditing him through the constant somatic because his attention is on the constant somatic because it's on the problem. And his attention is not on valences so you can't run Routine 3.

* Editor's note: the next few words up to and including "There'd be" were deleted out of the audio version.
Oh, you could find his goal, and you can find his terminal. But I fully expect there are some people that you'd actually have to run a Problems Intensive on before you could find the goal and terminal. You will not find them in Scientology, or able to do any kind of a job of auditing or anything else. They're really bad-off people. But you could find that condition. Now, they're just a total circuit, you know? And the valence just wouldn't be available, nothing else, you see. You won't find those, I repeat, in somebody who can walk up to the front door and say, "Here I am."

Now, he could be in a circuit. Well, what's a circuit? Well, a circuit is a kind of a subsidiary valence. A circuit is a mechanism which modifies a valence. A circuit is a solution to the realization that the valence can often be wrong, so therefore needs dictation to or needs things hidden from it. So you've got a circuit. And you set up a valence that can think, allegedly, and then you set up a circuit to modify the thinking of the valence. All of which happens, of course, when the – the thetan, as a valence, has run into a problem where the valence has failed. Do you see what could happen here?

You see, after the fact of the thetan failing, now everything he adopts after that is susceptible to failure. And each one of them becomes a barrier to processing. And a circuit is something which modifies the thinkingness and doingness of the valence. It's a dictational machine. It's like you set up a tailor's dummy or something in a window, and the tailor's dummy is animated. And it's supposed to be able to turn its head backwards and forwards and shake its finger at the people who are looking outside, and it's doing this all the time. And now you set up a circuit to keep it from turning its head quite so fast. See, it's already built in so that it will turn its head at a certain speed, and will raise its hand at a certain speed. Now we'll put an entirely new machine over here. We will modify this dummy, see, with an entirely new machine over here, and wire it in to slow down the turn of the head, see? Of course, this is rather uncomfortable because the machinery in the thing is to speed the turn of the head at a certain speed, and then you put another machine on top of it to turn it at a slower speed, see?

Now, there's another machine there that, because it is turning its head so slowly, this new machine is fixed to turn the head up rapidly. So while – while it is turning its head at this speed, it's got a machine which turns the head at this speed, but this machine over here turns the head this speed. And after a while the dummy starts wearing out. [laughter]

You see what these circuitry things are, you see? They're things to slow down or speed up. They're things to show or to hide things. They're occlusion circuits or demonstration circuits; they're picture circuits. They are all kinds of wild things. They're secondary thinkingness apparatus that modify the basic thinkingness which is built into the valence.

Now, if those circuits get too wild and there's too many of those and it's all too complicated one way or the other, then the person can modify the circuit with a somatic in some fashion and do something there. So that, frankly, if he gets some kind of a circuit that goes operative, he gets a somatic, and that sort of makes him turn the circuit off. Soon as a circuit gets operative, and the somatic comes on, and off goes the circuit. And it's – all kinds of this weird via, via, via, speed it up, slow it down, hide it, show it, do this with it and do that with it.
Now, you get somebody that has this amount of – of bric-a-brac, additives and subtractions… You get this amount of bric-a-brac which is modifying the modifier, you see? You've got something that modifies and then something that modifies that, and then something that modifies that, and something that modifies that.

Somewhere down along the line, about the level of the somatic I mentioned a moment or two ago, or any one of these circuits, you would have a hidden standard. You could have a hidden standard. It knows more than the valence, which of course knows more than the thetan. Of course, the valence itself could be crudely classified as a hidden standard, but we don't so classify it because it is a whole package of thinkingness, doingness, beingness – that is a valence. It's a whole package. It's complete. You see that package when you get a profile. And when you don't move off that package you don't get a profile change. That's all there is to that.

Now, the modifications can be many without becoming hidden standards. A hidden standard is only qualified this way: It's what knows better, to which the thetan is paying attention. See, a fellow could have a hidden standard to which he was paying no attention, therefore it wouldn't be a hidden standard. You see, you could have a circuit that he never gave any attention to. Well, it has all the qualifications of modifying his thinkingness, but it would not slow up processing at all unless he paid some attention to it. Hey, if he paid some attention to it, then it would have a modifying characteristic on processing.

Now, the difficulty is this: A concentration on this item – whether it is a circuit or a somatic or anything else – the concentration on this item can be so heavy, so thoroughly concentrated and the dependency on that particular circuit or item could be so tremendously heavy that the thetan only knew if it knew and if it tells him it's true, but if it doesn't tell him, it isn't true. And that is what we exactly mean by a hidden standard – must be a very heavy concentration on it and it must be what tells him.

Now, when you're auditing him, he goes in to the cycle of only consulting it: He does not see you really; he does not hear you, really; he – it's all set up on vias to such a degree that you're really processing some kind of a piece of circuitry. It knows, he doesn't.

This produces some of the greatest oddities you ever saw. I mean, an individual could – he could be standing in the auditing room, as you often see a newspaper reporter do, and he'll see some demonstration and not even see it. But such a person could be standing in the room; a person comes in, sits down in the chair, you take two passes with your hand, and they grow two legs that they didn't have before, you see? And they walk out of the room, and the person would ask you, "What was the price of..." You expect him to say, "an intensive," or something like that. He wants to know the price of the cigarettes you smoke.

This used to absolutely drive me daffy, you know? I'd give some kind of a demonstration. It'd be a fantastic demonstration, some wild thing would happen or another, and some newspaper reporter would ask me, you know, very searchingly and so forth, what – what – what state was I born in. You see, he'd say – like it just had nothing whatsoever to do with anything observed, and it was non sequitur to anything he had observed. And seeing this originally got me onto the track of this sort of thing – not because I was not getting proper
recognition from such people – I began [laughter] – I began to wonder if they could see any-
thing.

To some degree everybody's attention is absorbed in various parts of the bank, to some
degree. To some degree they're absorbed. But where a person's total overwhelm exists, attention
is so absorbed that only it knows. So, they walk into a room, the person who is in the
room sets somebody down in a chair, they throw a sheet over the body. The person who threw
the sheet over the body picks up the sheet, and nothing – no change has occurred. And says,
"There you are." And the person walks out. And you turn around to this person with a hidden
standard and you say, "Isn't that wonderful?" And he says, "Yeah, I guess it is," and so on.
"It's probably very wonderful." He doesn't even know what he's seen.

That is how you can fool such vast numbers of people. You can fool people – you
don't really ever do anything. Why? Because they don't see.

Now, this is more real to you in this wise: If you had any difficulties with your parents
of any kind whatsoever, you had them because you were assuming they knew you. You were
assuming they observed what you were doing. You assumed they heard what you said. They –
you assumed that the basis of their judgment was based upon the actual fact of your activities.
And after a while you became very confused. Because if you were having very much trouble
with their parents – your parents, they never observed anything you ever did and they didn't
know anything about you at all. They had somebody else there entirely different.

If you had asked them for a recount of what you had done in any given year of your
life you would have gotten the doggonedest potpourri you ever heard of. It would have had
nothing to do with any part of the fact – not because you didn't have a different memory, but
because they didn't observe anything you ever did.

Now, their adjudications of what you did do – should do in life are usually based on
not having observed anything you could do in life. So you get into a hell of a lot – if you'll
excuse the French – get into an awful lot of confusion. You've demonstrated conclusively that
you can't dig ditches, and your parents absolutely insist that that is the very career for you.
And you assume, then, that they have observed that you cannot dig ditches. And the joker in
the deck is, is they've never observed this. They have not seen you. They have never met you.

What have they met? They are running on a social circuit of some kind or another.
They're running on a whole series of now-I'm-supposed-to that is dictated by some kind of
circuitry. And it runs this way: "If I have a son or if I have a daughter, why, that person
should go to a certain kind of school and they should do this and they should do that and in
life they ought to do this and the best way for them to survive is that and so forth…" And if
you don't compare with all these I'm-supposed-to's – the pity of it is, you see, you don't even
know what these I'm-supposed-to's are – if you don't compare exactly with these, of course,
you're a great disappointment to your parents. You're an enormous disappointment to your
parents.

Of course, you get baffled in that you might be quite successful in doing what you are
doing. You might be going along fine and be driven half out of your mind all the time because
they keep telling you you're not doing well.
Child goes out, wins a contest of some kind or another. Comes home just overjoyed, you see, covered with laurels and so forth, and Mama says, "You know your feet are muddy." And the little girl looks at her feet and, by George, she doesn't have any mud on her feet. And she - "What is going on?" and she gets kind of confused along about this point, you see? The truth of the matter is, Mama has a circuit that says "Children have mud on their feet." See, it just happens that "You should take care of a child's appearance at all times," or "A child should always be polite." Or there's something – some I'm-supposed-to circuit operating like this, you see? Hasn't anything to do with it.

And you could sometimes appear, you see, in total dishabille – never a word. The next time you appear, you're neat as a pin, you see, and you get all, all scolded. Why? Because what the circuit protests against, of course, activates the circuit. Now, a child is supposed to have good appearance. So any child who has good appearance gets criticized. You – the circuits are idiotic, see? They're set up on the basis that the thetan didn't know, so, what is set in its place is usually pure idiocy. "A child's appearance should be very good." So a child has very good appearance and he's criticized. But if his appearance is very bad he's ignored. See, it's an A=A, you know, it's not the reverse.

And this confuses children, and they don't understand what they're doing right and when they're doing wrong. You trace it back and you'll find out that it's just the awfulest mishmash of 8-C you ever heard. It's all reversed 8-C, and so forth. Little Johnny's sitting in a chair, and he hasn't made a noise for an hour, and all of a sudden his mother comes in and says, "Johnny, be quiet now!"

"Well, what have I been doing?" you see, big protest, injustice, betrayal. All of these things follow immediately in the wake of this sort of thing. But a circuit is most likely to go into activation on the thing it is trying to achieve. So a circuit most ordinarily protests when it has won. It'll protest its own end product at any time.

The basis of this is most circuits are set up on overts and withholds resulting in a problem and going over into, then, a change of some kind or another. And of course the circuit will dramatize the problem, or dramatize the overt and the withhold.

Most things that are protested against, the person will do. We call it hypocrisy. This fellow goes around, he's always on the platform, he's always beating the drum, he's always screaming at people, he's always jawing about secret drinkers. Well, he's got a circuit about secret drinking. He drinks secretly. See? It's all A=A=A=A. It defies logic because it isn't logical. Because circuitry is an escape from knowing. It is knowingness in a substitute for lack of knowing.

When a thetan escapes from knowing he sets up a circuit. When he no longer wishes to confront life he interposes circuits between himself and life, or valences between himself and life, or identities between himself and life. Get the idea? He makes an interposition of some sort. He has thinkingness done for him. He has beingness and doingness done for him. He wishes to divorce himself just a little bit from life. So he sets up an interposition of some kind or another. And when you start to audit him, this gets terribly important because you are part of life. Aren't you? You're right there in the room, aren't you, as the auditor? And if you
were there in the room, as the auditor, of course anything you are saying or doing is liable to get an interposition.

So he sets up the interposition between you the auditor and himself the case. And you are auditing a circuit from there on. And that is why you cannot do a pure Routine 3. That is why only a few people go Clear on straight Routine 3 without preparation.

Now, by getting off his present time problems, his ARC breaks, by accustoming him to the room and getting his rudiments in, of course he is less susceptible to this particular phenomenon of an interposition between himself and life. You cut those things down and you can talk to him for a while. And that is the most powerful general and common mechanism to make it possible to talk to the pc, not a circuit. Because circuits go into action on PT problems and ARC breaks – withholds, that sort of thing, pop a circuit into view. So you're talking to the circuit, you're not auditing the pc when the rudiments are out. You get the rudiments in, and for a short time you'll be talking to the pc.

But people have problems of such magnitude on the immediate backtrack that it sets up as a permanent circuit. And you're always auditing at the circuit. And you are making very slow progress. Well, you now have a tool or a weapon with which to get this out of the road. Understanding the exact cycle that a circuit comes into being on, you can then get a circuit out.

You find any self-determined change, trace the problem immediately behind it, flatten that, get the confusion, the withholds and the overts out of the confused area immediately ahead of it, and you will find out that a circuit will disappear if done right. And that is a Problems Intensive.

Now, all a Problems Intensive does is pave the way so that you can at least audit the pc out of the valence he is in. It keeps scraping the top off so that you can actually pull the bottom out. Okay?

That is the system of aberration which has been operative on the whole track, and that is how it works and that is what it is, and you have the tools that get rid of it. And it's never any other cycle, but you have, of course, different tools that are effective on it. Okay?

Thank you.

_Audience: Thank you._
How are you today? What is this, the 19th? Guess it is. The 19th.

Okay. 19 October AD 11, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill. And today I have nearly one and all who is busy wrestling with the gruesome problems of problems.

If you're having trouble doing a Problems Intensive, then I could say offhand that you're simply Q-and-Aing with the title of it. And if you're having too much trouble with a Problems Intensive, why, call it the "Solution Intensive" or something. [laughter]

I could absolutely count on labeling something "Difficult Procedure" and then have the comm lines jam. It isn't quite that bad. I'm in a snide and sarcastic mood today. Mean. [laughter]

All right. Now, it is unfair to release a new procedure without giving you an opportunity to ask intelligent questions concerning its application. So this is your opportunity to let us all in on the fact that you haven't quite surrounded this one. If you have any question about a Problems Intensive, its administration, its expected result or anything else, speak up. Yes.

Male voice: There used to be a process, "Spot a change in your life." And when you um – told us to list changes, I was reminded of that. Is there anything we can do wrong to a pc by sort of having their kind of Change Process unflat as it were. A sort of change list ...

Is there anything wrong with ... There's an old process, "Spot a change in your life," and is there anything that we might be doing wrong by doing the assessment which then leaves an unflat process.

Male voice: Yes.

No. Don't worry about it because, in the first place, if you are doing your assessment properly, it will come out at the other end as simply a list, such as a terminals list or a goals list. And it'd be no more restimulative than making somebody go over the goals. You see, there used to be an old process called, "Recall a goal you've had," or something like that. There was an old process like that. And that could be completely unflat and we would still be able to get the same Goals Assessment that we got before.

No, I wouldn't say in any way. The only reason changes have been difficult for the individual lies squarely on the fact that there is one that has a tremendous problem behind it. The changes were never the difficulty.

That would not, by the way, be a very good process. It wasn't a very good process. It was abandoned a long time ago. And the reason it isn't a very good process is it turns out in
this particular case that it changes a solution. That's a wild one, isn't it? The change is a solution and therefore, in this particular instance, you're running solutions because you're only asking for self-determined changes. And if you ask for self-determined changes, you're asking for the same thing as, "How many times have you solved problems in your life by changing your activities?" That would have to be the auditing command.

"What change have you brought about in your life in order to resolve your activities?" That is really – if you're going to run a process on the thing, that would be the process you were running. Okay? Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes, that does, thank you.

All right. Yes, Reg.

Male voice: on assessing for change, should that be done in session? As it does come under section O which we were told to do out of session – out of Model Session.

Yeah, well, it's out of session.

Male voice: You assess out of session, then.

Yes. That's – there's no – there is no particular reason to do any part of the Preclear Assessment Form up through and including O in session. There's no particular reason to do it.

I don't know how some people manage to miss goals and terminals with the rudiments out, but evidently rudiments out, they miss goals and terminals. It might work out that with rudiments very far out in doing this out of session, it might work out that the individual is unable to give you the number of self-determined changes that he might, he might not be able to find the change. But if that condition ever occurred, why, you should let me know about it. But in case of doubt and where you feel absolutely the pc is insufficiently in-session to give you a proper list, well, it's your pc; go ahead and do it in Model Session. Okay? Right.

Yes.

Male voice: Ron, in doing the command, "What is unknown about the problem?"

What is unknown – doing the command, "What is unknown about the problem?"

Male voice: Right. The pc scans the whole track when he's doing this. Is that correct?

The pc scans the whole track when he is doing it.

Male voice: or can do this.

Well, he doesn't scan it. That's an old technical term.

Male voice: I mean, he's – he's – he's – looking at the whole track.

Well, he picks up pieces of the whole track. That is absolutely right. You want that answered?

Male voice: Well, what I want to know is what – what's the – what's happening here? I mean, with a problem that's reoccurring many, many times.

What is happening here with a problem reoccurring many, many times?

Male voice: That's right.
You mean how much track are you running on this pc.

Male voice: This is true, I don't...

All right. Well, you get this – I'll try to straighten it out for you. You get an auditing command, any auditing command – any – which is a statement that the pc is to do something; unless you modify the command itself, there can be no understood about it. In other words, everything in an auditing command is implicit in the auditing command. If you want something in the auditing command, you have to put it in the auditing command. We cannot arrange before we run the auditing command that the pc is only to recall that particular zone or instance of his life while we are running this process, see.

We'd go back to this and we would say, "Well ... " here's – this is dead wrong. "All right. Now, you and I understand that we're only running this lifetime. Is that correct? So none of your auditing replies are to be outside of this lifetime. Fine." You see, that violates the rule of the understood auditing command. Because then he is always running the first command you gave him. And of course, you've set up a problem in the session. And you won't get very much result in the running of it.

Every time you have the pc understanding something about an auditing command which is not stated in the auditing command, you are running the pc on a perpetual problem. He has to come back to the beginning of the session every time and remember this, you see. And then he does the auditing command. You're actually processing on a time via.

So that you get this rule, this inexorable auditing rule, that everything you want the pc to do must be implicit in the auditing command. You must say so every time.

All right. The reason I'm going into that is one has to cover these points now and then, not that you don't know it Bob, but here's what it amounts to.

This particular problem that the pc has is located by you as prior to a change the pc has had. And, therefore, must have come immediately after a confusion the pc has had. And we are apparently, at first glance, only addressing this small section of track.

Well now, if we wanted him to stay in that section of track, we'd have to give him a command like this: "What is unknown about that problem you had in 1955 ... ?" (something like that). "About your father and mother and wanting to leave them?" See, now it would have to be terribly implicit. It'd not only have to date, it'd have to have the substance of the command, it'd have to have everything in it.

All right. Now if you ran that just that way, you would get an interesting result. You would get the problem out of that section of track. You would get it out of that section of track.

But there's the old rule about basic-basics, that the first time something occurred has more weight and is more easily run than any other time it occurred. That's the basic-basic on the chain. Any similar circumstance repetitive through a person's whole track has a first time it occurred. And that first time that it occurred we called basic-basic, you see. That's a basic-basic on this chain of occurrences.
We have no guarantee this is the first time he thought of this problem, so it is perfectly – not only feasible, but it is best that the pc wander all over the track on that problem, because we will actually go picking it up anywhere and everywhere. It not only is riding back then but is riding up in present.

There's another reason for this. He will get the illusion of wandering all over the track, because problems are timeless. And if you tried to run a problem with an imposition of time on top of it, you would have trouble. So it basically resolves down to this: That it doesn't much matter whether it's best that he stay in 1955, the moment of the problem or not. Your ability to make him do so is almost – well, you just couldn't do it, that's all. So you'd have to let him do it. He would do it inevitably because this problem probably isn't resident in 1955, but has been coasting on forward now since 1720.

And although you're apparently running a change of 1955, you find yourself suddenly running 1720. And you've already run into this. Well, he will try – tend to wander to the beginning of the chain. He will tend to go backwards on the beginning of the chain and the only reason we're running it is to knock the chain out. Now we want to get the chain out so that when you get the confusion out of that particular zone and area immediately before it, the problem isn't hanging up.

So what we're actually doing is running the problem so as to get him all over the track so we can get the prior confusion. But we only want the prior confusion of 1955. If we didn't run the problem off, we would have no chance of getting only the prior 1955 confusion. He's going to go all over the track while you're doing a Sec Check. And you don't want him going all over the track. You want to know what he did do to his schoolmates or whoever it is that's in that zone.

So by running the problem permissively and letting him wander all over the track with the problem which he has stated, you then are able more or less to keep him in that space of time immediately before that first time he says the problem occurred. Because the problem always occurred earlier. Okay?

You get two types of run out of this thing. It's quite interesting. You get a whole track run and then you get a present lifetime run. And it wasn't basically – I won't pretend a bunch of knowingness here. It wasn't basically designed this way. I just knew you had to get the problem out of the road. And then in running it, it's obvious that people go all over the track to run the problem and that's fine. And if you find if you try to get the Security Check done before you get the problem run, I think you'll find you're going to have trouble. And the reason why is the problem is prior to the zone of confusion. See, it's going way back. So you wouldn't have much of a chance getting out the zone of confusion.

Apparently, from what fragmentary data is to hand, it is much, much harder on the pc to run the zone of prior confusion if the problem isn't well run.

Something that's quite interesting. I don't know if you've noticed this. You haven't – maybe you haven't tried to do the prior confusion. Oh, yes, you have. Yes, some of you have done the prior confusion. You had a hard time slugging at it. Well, if you had any hard time getting the prior confusion, that was because there was this lousy problem hidden in there, see? And the problem wasn't about to surrender. Does that answer your question?
Male voice: Yes, yes, it does.

All right. There's another point I've got to make here about problems. There is something else. There's always something else. But you have a permissive type of auditing command on the problem run in a Problems Intensive is sometimes not feasible on a pc who is poorly, who is rather introverted on the subject. If the pc is too introverted on a subject in general or if it's an apathetic sort of a problem or if it is a problem which seems to take in or could easily take in many people, a one-command Problems Process is not good enough.

I'll give you a direct idea. This has turned up several times here. But a problem something on the order of "What am I going to do with myself?"

This is not – this is not a strange problem, you see. "What am I going to do with myself?" This has turned up.

Well, "You – what don't you know about doing something with yourself?" or some such command as that comes out of it. And the pc has been so introverted on the subject that it is not a permissive command – "What is unknown about doing something with yourself?"

And he just runs it from his side. He just says, "I – I – I – I," and the next thing you know he's in a stuck flow. He never thinks of it being unknown to anybody else. His ideas never extend into that zone and he already has spent years of saying to himself, "What am I going to do? What am I going to do? What am I going to do? What am I going to do?" And he's on a stuck flow of "I," don't you see? Here's your stuck flow. Here are flows lifting their ugly heads.

And it just never occurs to him that when you ask him the problems question, "What is unknown about doing something with your life?" to say, "Well, it was unknown to my father." See, he never says that. He always says, "It was unknown to me. It was unknown to me. It was unknown to me. It was unknown to me." And he's just going on running the stuck flow.

It's already stuck. Now all he's got to have to do is invent a couple there and he's really in bad shape promptly. See, he's got a stuck flow and you're compounding the stuck flow.

So in such a case, it is actually necessary to put a second leg on the auditing command. "What didn't you know about doing something with your life?" Or "What was unknown to you about doing something your – with your life?" "What was unknown to others about doing something with your life?" Not a terrifically model command, but it gives you the idea, you see. "What didn't you know about doing something with your life?" "What didn't others know about doing something with your life?"

And if this is an introvertive type thing, such as that particular type of problem, you'll rip up an automaticity on "What did others know?"

All right. We – give you an example. Here's this girl and she wanted to be a painter. And her parents said, "Well, that is just fine. And the thing which you really ought to be in life is a housekeeper. And we're going to teach you to be a housekeeper."

And she says, "I really want to be a painter."

And they say, "Housekeeper. Housekeeper. Housekeeper. Housekeeper."
So she finally says, "Well, all right. Housekeeper."

And then they say, "Well, dear, we have been very, very mean to you and you wanted to go into the field of the arts so we will let you study millinery."

And she said, "Well, uh – all right. Uh – uh – all right. Yes, yes, I'll study millinery," and so forth.

Well, so she goes ahead and she goes and gets a book on millinery and she's all set and she's getting herself briefed up and then her mother says to her, "Well, you know, there's a nice opening over here someplace. There's a nice opening over here on a drill press operator and I really think you ought to study drill press operating." And what it is actually – ask yourself this: What would happen to a pc that every time he gave you a goal on an assessment, you said, "Oh, no. Here is a much nicer one"?

If you did it in the most pleasant tone of voice, there would be a small splash heard and that would be the pc going into the soup.

Well now, a person who is – has one of these occupational, particularly, problems – you see, "What am I going to do with my life?" something like that – has really only got a problem because other people had an opinion and their idea of what they should do with their lives was directly contrary to the mores that other people were expressing. And the other people, of course, being many and not – it wasn't their life, gave them varied things to do and all kinds of alternates and lots of contradictions. And it made a ridge, see.

Here was a ridge. Pc wants to go that way; the other people all sort of want to go another way, don't you see? So we ask this pc the question, "What didn't others know about doing something with your life?" And he gets up brrrrrrrt.

And he thinks, "Oh, yeah." And he thinks of one person, he thinks of another person. He thinks of another person. And they all had different ideas. Or maybe none of them had any idea at all. So any time he tried to get any answer to this, "What to do something with your life?" he ran into "I don't know." "Well, you just make up your own mind about it." And of course, they could surround some youngster with that and you would get the immediate result of nobody knowing what to do with his life.

He'd not know what to do with his life. And others wouldn't know what to do with his life. And anything to do with his life was unknown to others and was unknown to him. You'd get the same result if you had fifteen other people with fifteen other ideas about what he should do with his life, all of them in contradistinction to what he wanted to do with his life and you see what kind of a nonsense you're building up.

One, is you're asking him to go into a valence of other people's unknowingness (they didn't know what to do with his life) and two, you're asking a terrific conflict to occur which would build up a ridge. It's a ridge of disagreement. You see what I'm talking about?

So you get a two-sided auditing command then and it dispels this. Any auditing command may have inherent in it – I will make it very plain and state it for the ten thousandth time – has inherent in it flows. There's a potentiality of flows.
You run a girl on the subject of jewelry. And, well, let's say that she's been successful on the stage or something, was always getting jewelry presents, you see. Jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents, jewelry presents. And you know, one day she can't have any jewelry?

If you ask her to hand you a ring for its inspection also, she's liable to start screaming. You see, the jewelry has only gone in one way. See, there's a one-way flow of jewelry from out there to in here. You got the idea? And it's always gone from out there to in here. And it's never gone from in here to out there.

She'll eventually wind up with boxes of jewelry under her pillow and she won't be able to separate herself from jewelry and she also won't be able to wear jewelry. A lot of rich women have tremendous quantities of jewelry all locked up in a safe.

And you say, "Well, why don't you wear it to a party?" or something of this sort.

"Oh, no." They never think of wearing it. You know? But they've got jewelry, but it has to be hidden. Well, it's some kind of a stuck flow. Now, to resolve that you'd have to say, "Recall being given some jewelry" and "How far away from you could you move a piece of jewelry?"

This – it wouldn't matter ... You wouldn't ask them "How could you give away some jewelry?" You see, this is a – this is an antisurvival action to them. It's counter to games condition which is why it won't run. And you'll start an avalanche of jewelry. You start asking this and you'll unlock the ridge on which it's held up on. And you'll get a brrrrrrrt. And all of a sudden, jewelry just starts flying in from everyplace.

You'd have to be a pretty clever auditor to get one of these avalanches triggered. But you can sometimes trigger an avalanche. And it'll be an avalanche of jewelry or an avalanche of cars or an avalanche of mountains or an avalanche of something. The person's had too much of it, don't you see. And they have – it's been a stuck flow and it's kept coming in. And then pretty soon it just stacked up and when you start to run it again, why all the facsimiles of the inflow all turn on on automatic. And you have avalanches. And that's what an avalanche is.

You can also get an out-avalanche on some item. Well, take a person is lecturing. If he's lecturing and he's pretty aberrated and so forth, why, you just, "Get the idea of lecturing. Get the idea of lecturing. Get the idea of lecturing," and all of a sudden he gets visual manifestations of words pouring away from him toward others. You get the idea? But because it's across games condition, you wouldn't audit it.

Flows. Flows are part and parcel of every auditing command. And if the pc is running an auditing command up from A to B and the next time he answers it, the flow is from A to B. And the next time he answers it, the flow is from A to B. And the next time he answers it, the flow is from A to B. All of a sudden, he can go into a black occlusion.

Everything will turn black. His pictures turn off. All kinds of odd things can occur simply by having this one-way flow. And that's why we call it a stuck flow.
Now, if you have him answer the auditing command from B to A, B to A, B to A, all of a sudden the occlusion goes off and he isn’t occluded now, suddenly. It’s quite mysterious. Stuck flows. You’ll see these things register on your E-Meter. A stuck flow starts sticking the needle. In fact, all needle sticks are stuck flows. When your needle sticks up, why, you’ve got a stuck flow.

Now, you’ll see this in a fellow’s withhold. This individual is withholding. He's got something. He's done something minor. He's shot the king of France or something. And he's withholding it. Well, that is a nonpermitted flow. So of course, everything that goes in against it sticks because there must be no backflow on it of any kind whatsoever. He regrets the backflow. He should not have ever backflowed the bullet in the first place, so he's withholding it now. So he holds this fact in.

Now, everything you offer him about the king of France flows in, and – but nothing can come out on the subject of the king of France, don't you see? And you'll see that needle go up. Stick. You'll see the tone arm rise and not go back down again. He's got a withhold, he won't... – you know?

And the more you make him conscious of it, the more he becomes conscious that he had better withhold it. So the more you flow in any question toward him, why, the more he holds the question in, see. And he keeps packing himself up finally and he's squashing. And you can just see it register right over here on the tone arm. He just squashes himself with the withhold. Got the idea?

Now all of a sudden he says – gives up because you're clever and you ask the right questions and you say suddenly – you say, "Well, did you ever murder a king?"

"Oooo-oooh-oooh." [snips fingers several times] He can't withhold it, see. You triggered it. "And well um ... " And you say, "What's that?" you know, in an authoritative voice. "Oh, that has to do something about..." "which king was it?" "Oh, well, I murdered the king of France." And you'll see him go down – see the tone arm go down. Well, you've reversed the flow. That is why you see that manifestation occur. The most that an E-Meter registers is stuck flows.

Now, an oscilloscope – stuck flows or not stuck flows. An oscilloscope properly rigged up on somebody shows the direction of flow. This is really weird. You can set up an oscilloscope – a one-hand electrode – and you can set up an oscilloscope and you can ask this fellow to "Get the idea of getting – of receiving some candy. Thank you. Receiving some candy. Get the idea of receiving some candy. Thank you. Get the idea of receiving some candy. Thank you. Get the idea of receiving some candy. Thank you." And you'll see the oscilloscope start moving in one direction. Zzz-zz-zz-zz, zzz-zz-zz-zz. You'll see the sine wave move, move, move, you see, from left to right, left to right, left to right, left to right. And you say, "Get the idea of receiving some candy. Good. Get the idea of receiving some candy." And the oscilloscope is moving over from left to right, left to right, left to right and then slower as you keep asking to get this idea and slower and slower. And stick. And the sine wave will be right there on stuck. And it won't move in any direction. And you say, "Get the idea of receiving some candy." And it just kind of gets a little more rigid.
Now you say to him, "Now, get the idea of throwing away some candy." And you'll see this thing still stuck. "Get the idea of throwing away some candy." Still stuck.

"Get the idea of throwing away some candy." Tremble, see, on your oscilloscope.

"All right. Now get the idea of throwing away some candy," and you'll see the sine wave start drifting from right to left, the opposite direction and you'll see it going from right to left. Very slowly.

"Get the idea of throwing away some candy. Okay." And then it'll speed up and the sine wave will go from right over to left faster and faster and faster. And finally it's just whizzing. And then as you keep asking, "Get the idea of throwing away some candy," it will slow down and it will stick.

And now, you have to say to him, "Get the idea of receiving some candy." And now you'll get it going from left to right again. And that is a stuck flow. And it's one of the weirdest things you ever cared to watch.

The reason we don't use an oscilloscope: (1) they're terribly expensive and (2) they register, all those formed up so far... Reg was good enough to get me some experimental scopes and we had a lot of work done in this particular direction. But they register terrific body phenomena. The pc wiggles his nose and oh, the oscilloscope just goes crazy, you see. And somebody four feet away from the pc moves his shoulder and the oscilloscope moves, you see.

But you can have the pc's case right in your lap, you know. You can say, ah – you could – big withhold is the fact that just yesterday you robbed a bank or something. And you could say, "Well, ah – did you ever rob a bank?" And you get the tiniest, faintest, tremble, see it's very, very faint, it's extremely faint. But the pc just wiggling his ears causes the thing to go mad.

The E-Meter's quite valuable. It doesn't do this. It registers the mind before it registered body motion. Body motion is registered much less than the mental reaction on the way this E-Meter is built. But on an oscilloscope – those that we have so far worked with – why, the body reaction, the movement of the pc's finger or anything of this character registers wildly on the scope. And yeah, nobody could read it. I can read it but with a microscope, you know. I mean, what are these little vibrations. That's the difficulty.

But you'd set up an oscilloscope anyway, in spite of these limitations (and tell the pc not to breathe anymore than necessary) and you can watch these flow phenomena. Now, you don't see them on the E-Meter. An E-Meter goes up whether the pc is flowing in or flowing out. The stick occurs, the E-Meter does not tell you the direction of flow, whether it is in or out. Now, if you draw a map around a pc, you will figure out how many kinds of flow there could be. How many directions of flow could there be? Oh, you get lots then don't you? You get not only in and out and – to another, in and out from another – you get all these various patterns. But you'd also get up and down and back of you and away from you and on your right side and away from you and to you and on your left side and away from you and to you.

You get all these things and if you were putting up mock-ups you would use these things. But the basic 5 bracket that you use is the most common and the most important flow...
directions. And that's why you use that 5-way bracket. That's what's known as a bracket. It's a 5-way flow pattern. It's from the pc out to somebody else, from the somebody else in to the pc.

Now, there's another little one of the other person's flow pattern is more important to the bank, you see, than many other directions there could be around the pc. It's important to the bank that the pc flows in and out. This is most important. But next in importance is another person's outflow and inflow. And then, next to that is somebody else's outflow and inflow to the other person. And then there's, of course, the internal flows and ridges inside the person the pc is confronting and then the flows and ridges internally inside the pc.

So you've got these various patterns. You could work them out. They're the most important patterns. And if you only run two ways of a flow you could sooner or later run into one of these – the third one. You go too long on the thing, such as you run on a long Prehav run, you can start running into the third one. You'll see the interchange in flows around the person the pc is confronting in the bank. And that person's flows can jam and you will get a jammed E-Meter. In other words, if you don't run enough flows and directions, you'll get a stuck up meter.

Now, this applies, of course, in running any process. But what do you care, doing a limited process? Very limited. You are only going to run it for a few minutes. Something like this. You can't get anybody in very serious trouble.

But is there anything that you could get somebody in trouble with? Yes, you can overrun a flow. And now you get a stick and a kind of a – of a break-up that is known as a blow-down. You can run a flow too long in one direction and eventually it'll blow up. Something will happen. It's not necessarily good for the pc. But you can overrun a flow. And that's why I say when you're running a Prehav level you're overrunning all flows. You know, you can run them too long. There's nothing left there to run and therefore your tone arm is no longer moving. And you know you better come off of it, because the more you run it the more stuck it's going to get and you're not now doing the fellow any good. All flows are exhausted out of a certain zone or area or on a certain subject, so therefore, you get off of it.

So, all flows can run out and leave something else there. Well, you're running a, "mean to a mother." See? And you're saying, "Now, when have you been mean to a mother?" "When has a mother been mean to you?" "When have you been mean to yourself?" "When has a mother been mean to herself?" "When has somebody else been mean to a mother?" "When has a mother been mean to somebody else?" See, you're just – here's lots of flows, don't you see? "When has a mother been mean to others?" "When have others been mean to Mother?" You see? It can go on and on out – oh, I don't know, you can get it up to thirty-two commands without half trying.

And then you could make all these positive and negative. You can really get complicated. "When have you been mean to Mother?" "When have you not been mean to Mother?" "When has Mother been mean to you?" "When have – when has Mother not been mean to you?" Get the idea? "When has Mother not been mean to somebody else?" "When has Mother been mean to somebody else?" "When has another been mean to Mother?" "When has another not been mean to Mother?" Well, you get what we're doing here, you see. You're getting the
negative flow and the positive flow at the same time and you're getting all available flows that might stick up the case at the same time.

And you can just get... Well, it's something like the Ensign goes out and he takes his sextant, you see and he takes the eye piece of the sextant and he polishes it all up with a dirty handkerchief – he can't see through it, you know – and ruins the glass on that, you see. And then he takes the shades that go across it and he sees there are about ten shades in this particular sextant. So he pulls them all down across the eyepiece, you see, so that you can't see anything through it. And then he takes the thing and he adjusts it to – on the backwards limb of the sun, you see, so he's got to shoot over his head toward the sun, you know. And then as he's fishing around – it's evening, you see, so he can see the horizon and the sun and the stars. Sun's going down, you know and all this sort of thing.

The sun is too low on the horizon. He finds that's very difficult but there is some position that he can get into that he can see it very, very well. And he gets a beautiful shot. And he marks it all down. And he reads the vernier with a magnifying glass, you see, reads it down to the last second. He takes his time – Greenwich Mean Time – he takes it on the finest stopwatch you ever heard. He takes that down to the chronometer, you see. Compares it exactly. Then he starts looking up in his mathematical tables, you know. And he gets dozens and dozens of figures. And then he crosscorrects these things and he figures everything down absolutely perfectly. He scorns the air almanac because it's too crude. He's got to have the nautical almanac, you see, with everything. And he figures it out down to the last second of the day, the exact geographical position. Puts all these figures down; he's filled up the whole table full of figures, you see. And he's all set, you see and he takes – he takes a very sharp pencil, you see and he takes it and puts it right down exactly on the chart and he says, "We are exactly right there." And he says, "Well, that's a job well done," and pats himself on the back. And the only difficulty was, he didn't shoot the sun, he shot the truck light. [laughter]

Now, you can very easily do that, you see. You can very easily do something beyond the necessity to do it, you see or beyond the need of the situation. You can figure out the mathematics of it, you see. And you could figure out the mathematics of these flows down to a thirty-two command flows. See, thirty-two flows, thirty-two commands and then positive and negative on each one of these flow lines, you see. And that would give you sixty-four consecutive commands that you would have to give before you go around the next time. You get the idea?

Well, that's just opening up book after book and figuring out the nautical almanac, you see and getting it all figured, tight, tight and all perfect, you see. And you spend so much time doing this, you don't notice the pc has long since been out of session and has forgotten what the terminal was and has no longer any interest in it and so forth.

You get the idea. The – you see, the mind is actually capable of a considerable resurgence and you cash in on that all the time. You give the mind a free look at present time. The mind is free in present time. That is to say the person hasn't got a present time problem out in the society someplace, he hasn't got an ARC break with the auditor, he's freed up as far as present time is concerned, his auditing room is okay and he's being audited. All right, he gets with that freedom an ability to as-is. He does have a certain ability, don't you see. And this
takes care of a tremendous number of rough spots. He can take care of a lot of omitted lines. For instance, you can run a 5-way bracket and you wind up just fine. He'll get all of it. See, it will all come loose. You get the level as flat as is necessary in order to resolve his case. You get the present time problem resolved, you see, sufficiently, so that he can be in-session. All of these things are sufficiencies, they're not absolutes.

And auditing is not an absolute practice. If it were an absolute practice you would really be in the soup. Well, if every bad experience he had ever had in the last two hundred trillion years had to be audited out as an engram, it would take you the next two hundred trillion years, of course. Because a fifteen minute engram, quite ordinarily, if it's not on the goals-terminal line takes 4 or 5 hours to audit. So you get your multiple. So if you want to audit him two hundred trillion years, then assume that it has to be the absolute of everything ever – bad that has ever happened to him has to be audited out. Well, this makes an impossible look, don't you see. So auditing becomes impractical.

But nearly everything bad that has ever happened to him is going to blow if you pull out certain pins. Well now, that is the cushion on which you're operating, you see, that if we get this and this and this adjusted with the mind, then the mind is capable of readjusting. And it's the capability of the mind to resurge which is your biggest stock in trade. And the mind resurges to the degree that the rudiments are in and that the pc is in-session. In other words, you get somebody who is not quite in-session and you will notice that he won't as-is things easily. You grind and grind and grind and grind and grind and grind and grind and he just doesn't seem to be running anything and nothing seems much to be happening and so forth. Well, that's because you actually aren't operating now with the ability of the mind to resurge. This has been cut down to nothing By what? Well, by some present time problem and so on.

The reason you're running a Problems Intensive is to make the mind resurge sufficiently so that when you run the goals chain, you will – you will do ten times as much work in the same amount of auditing ordinarily. You see, you save time by freeing the mind up so that it can do these things. You got the idea?

I notice some of you looking a little blank about this. But flows – flows are pretty hard to get across to an auditor. I'll tell you that this has not been easy to do. So I give a talk on it every once in awhile. But it's usually not too well telegraphed.

Best thing you can do is go out and play with a garden hose for a while. You know, have somebody squirt it on you and you squirt it on somebody else and then have them squirt it on a tree and ... You'll eventually get the idea. Then you'll be hung up on this one probably: "Well, what is it that is flowing?" Well, the reason you're having a hard time with it is you don't realize the mind is full of particles. You think the mind is full of thoughts. Well, if there was anything wrong with the thoughts of the mind there would be nothing wrong with the mind. How do you think these thoughts ever connect up with anything?

Well, the thought gets connected with the particles and the particles get connected with solids. And the pc tries to think and runs into solids. And you audit him and you run into particles. And if you think there's nothing in the mind, put away your copy of Mary Baker Eddy [laughter] and start studying Scientology. You're actually, noth – there's nothing wrong with the pc's thinkingness. There's nothing wrong with his thoughts. It's the fact that his think-
Ingingness gets joined up with the creation of energy, space, time manifestations. And these things get all mixed up with thinkingness, so that he can't think a thought without getting a mass. Or he can't think of a mass without getting a particle. And he can't think of a time without getting a space.

These things are all mixed up and he cannot differentiate amongst these things. He can't differentiate amongst most of the dynamics, when he gets to thinking in the reactive bank. And the reactive bank, of course, is all dynamics associated with or identified with all dynamics and the sixth dynamic in particular identified with all dynamics and the seventh dynamic then identified with all of the reactive mind. And if you wanted to draw a map of the reactive mind, that would be the identifications in it.

You see, thinkingness only goes haywire when an individual is no longer able to differentiate where he should or associate where he should. He's no longer in control of differentiation or association. He gets identification. "Mama is monster. House is jail. Horses – beds."

And then he'll get up into verbal identification. You'll find out there are a lot of people around who have these semantic identifications that *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* was built on. Had so many of them around that I specialized on it. Semantics of it are quite interesting "He rowed a boat. He r-o-a-d a boat. He r-o-d-e a boat. What did he dode with the boad." These are identifications.

And he – we found an airline pilot one time. .. You can do some interesting things with semantics. But they are either not very lasting or very, very pervasive. But they are terribly interesting and you can produce very fast phenomena with semantics. Over here in England, if we'd specialized more with semantics than we have, HASI London would do better. But HASI London has to suffer along because it's compared with the rest of the world, don't you see? And you find more semantic identification, probably, in HASI London than elsewhere.

But you get some kind of a situation like this. An airline pilot came in – I think he was National or American Airlines – came in, we audited him for a little while. All we did was look for the phrase that gave him a compulsion to have accidents or why he was flying. And this is what finally turned up, is a statement of his mother's. Well, actually, he had run a garage and he'd failed and he'd run this and he'd failed and he'd finally gone back to flying and he hated it. And he just couldn't figure out any part of this. But it was one phrase of his mother and the phrase was identified with many things, you see – with pain and so forth. But it then became identified with all things and the phrase was "He was no Earthly good." So reactively this worked out that he ought to fly.

We cured a case that had leukemia one time. It was just one phrase in the bank that was causing the leukemia. Just one phrase was all that was identified. And that is "It would turn your blood to water." He was a little kid, sick and his mother just said this all the time. And the auditor heard the mother saying this sort of thing and simply got the kid to repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it. That was the end of the leukemia. Blood was water and that is leukemia.

But you could make some interesting stunts this way. Old semantic auditing; identifications of words with words – there – these things are very, very interesting. But an auditor
has to be very clever and he very often isn't successful and he fails many times and some people – just impossible to drill into their heads and find out what it is that is associated.

If you could run engrams on everybody, with semantic association, we'd probably still be doing it, but you can't so we'd have to look for more basic things. You see, Dianetics ends right about there; doesn't go much further than that. It has to do with the engram, identifications that are associated with the engram and an understanding of semantics. And then it takes off from there and the first real departure is the discovery of overt acts, 1950, end of 51 – that everybody was running motivators, motivators, motivators and the only thing that made it come free was getting the overt off. That's as early as 1951. I don't know if you knew it was quite that old.

But just exactly how to apply all that and how to get it simple and how much importance it had in the mind and so forth – it took many years to level this thing out so that it was functional.

But this flow situation can be overdone by the auditor. You see: positive-negative. Thirty-two directions of flow. "Get the idea of giving something to somebody behind you." "Get the idea of somebody behind you giving something to you." you know. There – well that's a flow line. "Get the idea of not giving something to somebody behind you." "Get the idea of somebody behind you not giving something to you." "Get the idea of somebody under you giving you something." "Get the idea of you giving you something – giving something to somebody under you."

Well, we're just getting – it's getting ridiculous, you see. We've over-enumerated the whole problem, you see. The mind is more capable than that. The mind could actually take care of many of these things. If you get the pins straightened up somewhat, the rest of them will straighten up, don't you see? So, you can use a 5-way bracket and get there.

Well, the only real mistake you can make, of course, then is having so many flows that you really never get a chance to get down to the root of the problem. It's all goes into the mechanics and then you'll find you've shot the truck light, the pc isn't even in-session.

And you can make a mistake the other way. And that is to undercut, that is to under-number the flows. You find the pc always runs something from out there in, always runs something from out there in, always runs something from out there in. Your E-Meter is going to start getting a sticky needle. Your tone arm is going to start going up. You won't know what in the name of common sense is happening

Now, of course, he has withholds. So, crudely, you could get off a withhold and stop him from doing this. But you should understand why the E-Meter acted that way. The E-Meter acted that way because he was running everything as a motivator, everything as a motivator, everything as a motivator.

"Oh, well, yes. Yes, I did have trouble with my family." You'll find in the Problems Intensive. "Yes, they beat me and they beat me and – then... My mother beat me a great deal and when she got tired, my father would beat me. Then they would both beat me and then my older sister beat me and then they all beat me. And that was – that was times, of course, when
they weren't swearing at me. They used to swear at me awful badly. And uh – and uh – then I had an Uncle George and he kicked me; he kicked me."

Well, after a long sad dissertation somewhere down along this line, you're going to find this E-Meter will keep going up, tone arm keeps going up, the needle starts getting sticky and so on. Well, he's just going motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator. Well, of course, that's just one flow. Them out there was hitting in toward him here, you got the idea? And you've got an inflow, an inflow, an inflow, an inflow, an inflow. Well, he's been going on like this for years. It's not just in the auditing session. You're just going on letting him do what he has been doing for years and years and years. He's told everybody about how they beat him and how they kicked him. And of course, this is just more in, more in, more in.

Well, in view of the fact they didn't do half of these things or didn't do them at all, he's not going to run anything out that really isn't there because, in the first place, what's holding it pinned is the fact there's never any flow going the other way. There's no reverse flow of any kind. He never mentions what he did. Well, he did – he did outflow. In fact, the outflow is basic on the chain.

So until you trigger this outflow, none of the inflow will release. It's quite mysterious. You trigger – it looks to him like, well, it was what he did and he really should have been guilty in the first place or something. It looks – it looks moral to him. But in actual fact it is not moral. It's the fact that he started an outflow along a certain Tone Scale level, you see? He decided to be mean and nasty and he gave out a heck of a lot of overts. And he opened the gates wide open, because he made a line on which an interchange could occur. And having made this line on which an interchange could occur, now he can be inflowed upon on mise-motional levels. Well, for some reason or other, every time he starts to get off his outflow line, the inflow line attracts his attention and he can only pay attention to the motivators. So he says motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator-motivator and he never gets well.

Now, you say, "What did you do? What did you do?"

And he says, "Well, not very much. In fact, I've never done anything." And your needle gets a little higher and it gets a little stickier. And you finally – say, "Well, at one time, the actual fact is, when my father was beating me – he had me down on the floor and he was beating me with a two-inch thick stick. And he was beating me very hard. And I did, I had an overt: I frowned slightly." [laughter] And we – and we move upstairs on that gradient and we eventually get his overts off and the beatings disappear, which is all quite mysterious.

And that is simply based on this one horrible fact that a thetan was never inflowed on, until he himself had outflowed. That is a basic rule. A thetan was never inflowed on until he himself had outflowed. And that, you can mark your stars, is right.

I'll give you an example. Well, you come along to this new planet. Now, how is anybody going to know how to shoot at you? Figure it out. How is anybody going to know how to shoot at you? They don't even know you're there till you outflow. See, you're totally invisible till you outflow. So you have to outflow in order to get an inflow. So basic on the chain is always the outflow. You aren't visible until you outflow.
Therefore, you get an awful lot of social codes of the best and safest thing to do: Never say anything and never be anywhere. That's safe. See, that's good and safe. Of course, you never do anything and you'll never see anything and nothing will ever happen. That's true too; nothing will ever happen. Nothing ever? Not for millions of years, nothing will ever happen. You see how it would be? You would at – never at any time outflow in any direction.

Well, the police, evidently, in many areas think this is just the thing. Because the only two things that are ever punished in this universe is communicating and being there. If you will be there or communicate, these things can be punished. If you want to evade punishment, and if there mustn't ever be any punishment of any character, of course, obviously if those are the two things that are punished – just never communicate and never be there. You won't live either, but that's all right.

Many people solve it this way. Somebody that you think of as being in apathy simply has solved the thing that way. He's got life solved. It's all taped; it's all taped. He'll get along just fine if he's never there and he never speaks. And he goes around and he gets a reputation for being a good listener. And he gets a reputation for this and he gets a reputation for that. And after a while they know he's there. And then they find out that he's inoffensive. And he's very easy to inflow on. So they kick him! [laughs] And that invalidates his solution.

His solution only applied to while he was out here in space someplace, you see. But where he adopts this as a halfhearted modus operandi for existence it won't work. Yet you'll see it taught as a social code. You'll see in schools they're always teaching some young boy, or they're teaching some young girl. Lot of girls wandering around have this down pat: "All you have to do is listen to a man and not quite be there and never really be on time for appointments, you know. Be a little – a little bit late; joggle it somehow." That keeps a man anxious. They have ways and means of explaining why they do this, you see. There's lots of rationale about it.

Actually, all they're doing is solving life by not communicating and not being there. And then one day, somebody gets mad at them and knocks their head off. Well, why does somebody get mad at them. Well, they get mad at them because they're not there and they're not communicating, of course. [laughter]

All right. Well, I just wanted to go over this with flows, because here you are going into Problems Intensives and all of a sudden you're having to put together auditing commands and you find that these auditing commands are somewhat dependent on the subject of flows. And being so dependent, you must pay some attention to it. This is something an auditor should always pay some attention to when he's putting together an auditing command. One is clear the auditing command. Make it – sure that the pc understands it. Make sure that the pc can answer it or get the thing squared around or spoken or worded so that it can be understood. That's clearing the auditing command.

The next is registering the auditing command on the meter, which is almost clearing the auditing command, but not quite. Let's make sure that this is something that makes the needle move. Let's not just dream up some oddball version of an auditing command and never inspect it on a meter. You should always look over your meter with regard to an auditing command you're going to run.
And the next thing is, is every time you give a command get it answered. Now, those are the things to know about commands, basically: That you've got to get it answered, get it understood, get it runnable, make sure that it registers and make sure that when you speak the command, finally, it is all set, all squared away, you know what's going to happen. And when you speak the command, you do get that question answered.

Yeah, it's a pretty hard one. But part of putting together the auditing command is making sure that you don't set up a stuck flow situation. You're not going to run a thing like, "Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you. Think of beating your wife. Thank you." After a while, the tone arm is going to rise, the needle is going to stick. And you're going to say, "Well, that's flat." Yeah, well, as far as it went, it's flat. It's flat into a ridge, that's what it is. You've made a ridge. He's out, out, out, out, out, out. The games condition of it is violated, of course, because beating your wife actually is giving her something. It really is, you know.

You'd be surprised. That's why war is degrading: soldiers are always giving each other things. You start to run it and you test it out and you'll find out that it'll run just that way. "Be nice to the enemy, give them some bullets." Now, if you could run a war – if you could run a war so that it was a total inflow war – that is to say – that probably wouldn't work either. But so that you never gave the enemy anything – if you could run a war so that you never gave the enemy anything; never any bullets, never any mock-ups, never any signs of soldiers or anything like that, why, that'd be fine. That'd probably work out all right. But you'd have to – it'd be a peculiar kind of a war you'd have to figure out in order to make that come about.

But otherwise, there sits the machine gunner. Holy cats! You ever figure out the amount of weight of a belt of machine gun bullets. Well, he's just handed them gratuitously to the enemy. He's giving them away and eventually will feel degraded. Then he explains it all to himself on a religious basis. He says, "Well, actually, thou shalt not kill and here I am out killing and therefore, because I'm doing that and these actually are this and so on and that... " and figures it all out. And, actually, it's – the most fundamental of it is, is he's giving something away while in a games condition. So he must be losing if he is giving away. And he figures it out that he's losing the war if he's fighting the war, if he fires any bullets during the war – 'cause, it's total nonsense, but that's the kind of the way this flow thing figures out.

Then he'll have thoughts about it and it is contrary to certain mores and then that gives him efforts to withhold so he is firing bullets while trying to withhold them. And then he's got a lot of things explained to himself as to why he's fighting the war and they have nothing to do with him. So he's fighting the whole war on an irresponsibility. If he kills any man, that's not his fault, it's the war, you see.

All of these things start adding up and you get so many lies and so many curves and so many vias that the whole thing becomes quite degrading after a while.

But the – an auditor shouldn't run a counter-games-condition process if he can possibly avoid it. If it's all give, it's contrary game conditions. You can have it all receive and not be contrary games condition, but it's contrary to flows. So these things you have to keep in mind in putting an auditing command together. So you want to get some kind of a grasp of
exactly what they are and put the auditing command together so that flows will balance and the pc can understand it and so that when you finally haul back and let go with the auditing command, it can be answered, it will be answered and you are going to see that it's answered and that's it. And then don't wind up at the end of the session finding out that only 25 percent of your auditing commands were answered. You gave twenty-five questions, you must have twenty-five answers.

If a question is missed, you could even go back on this basis. This is important enough so that you can ask a pc – you know, the out – the end rudiments are out, see – and, "During this session, is there one auditing command you failed to answer?" Almost important enough, you see, to be an end rudiment. "Is there one auditing command or more that you failed to answer to your satisfaction," and so forth "in this session?"

And all of a sudden he tells you, "Yes, there was. Yes, there was," and your end rudiments go in. You see, it's as magical as that. But we count on the auditor making sure that those auditing questions are answered, so we haven't added it into the end rudiments yet. But it's actually important enough that if I were recomposing end rudiments I would probably put it in there.

All right, well, I've talked a lot here. Tried to give you some answering of that, you woke up something. But I've had to hand out a couple of two-way flows on problems, already – two-way flows. You know, I had to have a double question for the problem because the problem was so gauged that the pc never would have reached the other side of a flow. It never would have balanced itself up in the run. You see, you can use an auditing command wording that the pc will run all sides of the auditing command. Like "What was happening during that period?" Well, you've now asked him – any flow that comes up, he will tell you about, don't you see? "What was happening, during that period." But now you say, "What were people doing during that period," you've probably got him out of it, see. So you've deleted it down. So if you said, "What were people doing" you'd also have to say, "What are you doing?" See, "What were you doing during that period?" you know. You'd have to balance it up.

But there are wordings of auditing commands which go as a total. You get a wording of the auditing command so that it will take up any flow that comes up. And there are quite a few of them. "What is happening?" Well, or "What was happening?" "What was unknown?" should be one of them, if it isn't such an introvertive problem.

Also, I should mention to you, before I forget it, that O/W also runs that problem. You know, you could – you could assess it out for some people and run O/W on the people, you'd still run the problem. You could say, "What part of that problem were you responsible for?" or " ... have you been responsible for?" That would run that problem. Any one of the old Problems Processes would run on the Problems Intensive problem. We're just running the best one which is "unknown," you see.

Pc couldn't get an idea of "unknown," you always have "forget." That's the lower harmonic of "unknown." "What has been forgotten about that problem?" "What have others forgotten? What have you forgotten?" if you wanted to broaden it out. "Forgotten" is always the lower harmonic of "unknown." "What didn't you know? What didn't others know?" "What shouldn't have been known about that?"
You – any – there's lots of versions. You remember all the versions I gave you on how to run an engram with "not-know?" There's a lot of them. There's all the versions of "unknown," "not-know," "forgotten," "they forgot," "shouldn't have known" – all of these things. All these types of wordings actually could be run on that problem, in trying to clear it with a pc, you see and the pc can't get the idea of unknown. Well, you have other choices. It isn't good enough to just leave the problem unrun. You've got other choices. There are many types of wordings and flows and so forth you could run a problem with.

Because I pointed out that in a Problems Intensive, your basic goal is to run the problem – not to word it; your basic goal is to run it, you see. And the reason you have that goal is you wish to clear it. So, therefore, if you're going to run the problem, you should run it in such a way that it will clear. And if you run it on a stuck flow, of course it won't. And if you run it with the pc unable to do anything about it, you won't.

Yes.

Female voice: on this running a problem, do you use the terminal ...

Hm?

... or the terminal's name?

Oh, you use the terminal, terminal's name. When you get a problem now, in that particular bracket, you aren't doing an assessment. You shouldn't be assessing for any terminal or terminal's name in the problem. But if there is a terminal inherent in the problem, you just use that. The whole question of getting the problem in a Problems Intensive is getting the pc's statement of the problem. It's a rather limited run. You get the pc's statement of the problem. Now try to make an auditing command out of it as close to it as you possibly can that is an intelligible auditing command. It's very simple. What evades you is the simplicity of it. That is what will evade you.

Female voice: He wanted to please a person.

Hm?

Female voice: He wanted – the problem was how to please a person – a particular person.

Well, what did he say? How to please, I wa ... ?

Female voice: How to please ...

"How to please Joe."

Female voice: Yeah.

All right. But now, the way you would apply this. The person gave you the problem "How to please Joe." All right. Now, the way you apply this rule is the simplicity. Always go in the direction of the simplicity. "What was unknown about pleasing Joe?" But we make sure that the pc understands that, that it registers on the meter, that it is answerable and that it doesn't violate too much of two-way flow.
Now, that doesn't necessarily violate because you haven't said, "What is unknown about you pleasing Joe?" You – all you ask is, "What is unknown about pleasing Joe?" Well, the flows will come into it, but it'll still clear, probably. But you hear the pc say, "Giving him this. Giving him that. Giving him something else. Giving him something else. Giving him something else," and you know right away – now what's going to happen here? His tone arm is going to go up, up, up, up and then the needle is going to stick. So, you're running – actually running into a stuck flow in some fashion.

Now, you could simply stop the thing. You know, just casually – just end the process momentarily, without upsetting the pc. I do that – I do that very wordy. There's a – there's a whole ritual that I use connected with this. I have a whole boxed-in ritual. It's very – it's done with a surplice, you know. And you get this surplice on and you do this big ritual, see. And after you've burned the incense and everything else and interrupted the pc and gotten him out of session utterly, you go through this ritual. It has to do with wardrum chants and so forth.

Now, I say – I say, "I'm now going to add another side to this," and give him the other command. And he usually never notices it, he just answers it. We're going along, "How would you please Joe? How would you please Joe?" "And, how...? What's unknown about pleasing Joe? What's unknown about pleasing Joe?"

"I wouldn't know what to give him. I wouldn't know what to give him. I wouldn't know what to do for him. I wouldn't know what to do for him. I wouldn't know what..."

And you say, "Well if it's all right with you, now, what we're going to do is just add this other command." And, "What isn't known about Joe pleasing you?" And, "What isn't known about you pleasing Joe? Thank you. That's good." And the pc thinks it's all right and it goes along. I did it so it must be all right. You don't get him out of session either.

I – it curls my hair sometimes when somebody uses a piece of ritual to blast a pc out of session, get him totally disoriented, get his agreement on something new, clear a brand-new auditing command with the pc, use the next twenty minutes or so, something like that, getting it all straight (what pc? what session?), when all he had to do was just add the other leg of the command.

What in essence is he trying to do? He sees his tone arm is going up and the thing is going to go "stick." And he says, "Oh, oh yes, oh yes. The flows are out. Yeah, well..." And he just adds the other flow; says, "Well, I'm going to add this other command. All right. Here it is," and bang. Or something on the order, "It won't upset you now if I add another command." You know, subtle. [laughter] You'd be surprised how often a pc settles right down when they know you mean business and you're getting auditing done.

If your intention is to get auditing done, not to follow a ritual or go into nonsense, boy, you'd be surprised what you can do with a pc. You just tell them, "This is the session. This is what we're trying to do man," and give them the auditing command and they stay right with it, bang, bang, bang.

And the pc tries to give you a bunch of this and he gives you a bunch of that and so forth and you go around and you run an ARC break and you go on and run another ARC
break and then you give him another command and then you run another ARC break and you give him another command ... 

Well, if you're going that way with a pc sometimes, try this one. Try this one: You give him an auditing command and the pc has an ARC break, give him the next auditing command. The pc has an ARC break, give him the next auditing command, make sure it gets answered. And he has an ARC break and give him the next auditing command. Make sure that it gets answered. The pc says, "Well, all right," and goes on and runs it to the end of the session. You can hardly find a trace of it in the end rudiments. Because you're sitting there giving the pc a session. The pc is in-session, *clank!* He's in good solid control and the pc is really worried, because he doesn't think you're going to give him a session. That's really why he's worried. *That's* what worries him. And when you go – plow straight on, giving the pc a session, the ARC breaks vanish under the realization that he's having a session.

That's always the better way to go about it. Pc blows session, leaps out of the chair – if you're not smart enough to be between the door and the pc always, as standard practice, you should get different ideas about pcs. If the pc is nearer the door than you are, what chance have you got of stopping a pc who blows session? None!

On several occasions pcs have blown session on me and have *always* found me between them and the door. They never, ever found me getting up. They never had a chance to get out of their chair, usually. If they did get out of their chair, I'd whirl them around, put them back in their chair and give them the next auditing command.

And they'd say, "Yow, yow, yow, yow, yow!"

And I'd say, "And the next auditing command *is* ... Answer it!"

"Oh! Oh, well, if that's the way you're going to be about it." [laughter] Bang! That was the end of that ARC break. And, by George, on the end rudiments you sometimes will look in vain for the incident. It's not buried, it's not occluded. It just didn't bother 'em.

But this would have bothered 'em: "Well, did you have an ARC break?" "What did I say that upset you there?" "What were you thinking of at the time you tried to blow?" Well, the pc will keep on blowing. Why? Because the pc is short of auditing The pc has an ARC break because he is short of auditing. The pc is having difficulty having auditing. Anything that goes wrong to a pc in a session is registered on the basis of a scarcity of auditing. Just mark that down.

I don't care how complicated you want to make the statement, it adds up to that – and of course, is best remedied then by *giving* the pc auditing. All protests by the pc are from the basis of not receiving auditing. He doesn't think he's receiving auditing.

And you just think over the number of protests you've made as a pc, the number of protests that you've heard as an auditor and they all add up to this: "You're not auditing me," see. That's all they add up to. Or basically, more fundamentally on the raw public or something like that is, "You couldn't do me any good." In other words, you're not auditing me. Boy, scarcity of auditing is fantastic on people who don't know anything about it. But do you know it's just scarcity of auditing? That's what's odd. It's scarcity.
Some guy goes on and on about how terrible Central Organization is and how awful it all is and how terrible the HGC is, and so forth and how the auditors never audit anybody. And he goes on and on and on and on and on and on and on and then he winds up and says, "Besides, they charge too much and I can't afford to have any auditing there." Interesting. Fascinating.

But there is your basic protest. And in handling all such commands or handling any auditing situation, the best answer is always to give auditing.

Now, I lost your question in the run. I hope I did answer it in passing. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you, Ron.

All right.

Okay. We got time for one more question. I did want to talk to you about flows again and about commands, putting them together, because you're getting into this strata of the Problems Intensive and you're going to have to have some oddball commands, believe me.

You're trying to security check somebody and they never security check on doing anything "Doing something to Uncle Harry? Oh, no, I never did anything to Uncle Harry."

"Well, what did you do really to Uncle Harry?" or "What do you think you do?" or "What was a bad thing to do to Uncle Harry?" and so forth.

And you find out, "Well, I had an unkind thought about him." And that is a hell of an overt. And this is the pc's level of overt to Uncle Harry, so you have to, right that moment, start – it's actually, you start a kind of an auditing question, "What unkind thought have you had about Uncle Harry?" You see?

And this will run and run and run. And all of a sudden you'll find out that this doesn't run anymore, although they have more unkind thoughts about Uncle Harry – or what is this all about? And then you'll find the other side of it, is you've run into a stuck flow. You're running a stuck flow, see, unkind thought that he didn't tell, didn't tell, didn't tell, didn't tell, didn't tell. You get the idea, didn't tell, didn't say, didn't say. And you're just ripe for one – "Did you ever do anything to Uncle Harry?"

"Oh, I never did anything to Uncle Harry. I just broke his golf clubs one time and stuffed mud down the barrel of his shotgun. [laughter] And, of course, that was reasonable in view of all of the things he used to think about me. Oh, yes and uh ... oh yes, and broke his razor and uh – yes, as a matter of fact ran his car... oh, that one. Oh, well, wait a minute." Now we find it, see? They wrecked Uncle Harry's car. They ran it into a telegraph pole and that was it. And it wasn't even insured and he couldn't even buy another car. And it was a fantastic situation. This is all buried under the unkind thought.

But you could overrun one, don't you see. You could overrun an auditing flow line. And you have to pay some attention to that, because there's no ritual I can write up that'll get you over it. Because sometimes it runs and sometimes it doesn't run. Pc – you can sit there on Black and White on a pc who has a field and if you run exactly the right flow the field will go white and then you reverse the flow, the field will go black. It's the most mysterious thing you ever saw. It's easy to do, you – you should see some of these phenomena that associate them-
selves with flows. It all goes together with putting together auditing commands. You have to be doing it, that's it.

Okay. Time for one more question. What is it?

Yes, Reg.

Male voice: What uh – would be the criteria for the length of a Problems Intensive – of uh – of this Problems Intensive?

The criterion of what now?

Male voice: of how long to run it.

How long to run a Problems Intensive?

Male voice: Yes.

That's total tone arm. Tone arm. Now, a tone arm going flat can go flat from two sources. That's why I'm being so insistent here about flows. A tone arm can stop moving because the flow is out. But if you're running a proper auditing command, getting it answered and so on, the tone arm will move normally and you just run it with the twenty minute test on the problem. It's a good thing to get that problem out of the road and to get that real good and flat before you go into your check. And how long to run it – you run it exactly against the tone arm. Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Well, I was wondering, is there another problem going to come up when you flatten the first one?

Oh, but you never run the second problem.

Male voice: You don't run it.

Oh, no, no, no.

Male voice: You can't run the confusion uh – with the – with the uh – change stuff.

Well, you're going to run the one problem. You're going to run that flat on the tone arm. When the tone arm is no longer moving, then you're going to do an assessment of people in the confusion immediately prior to that situation. All right. Now, having done an assessment on all these people, you're going to wind up there with one person and you're going to run some Security Check on that person.

You're not going to admit of anything else happening. Nothing else can happen. The pc thinks of eighty-five more problems, that's just tough. They're simply under the heading of cognitions. You say, "Fine." The pc says he has a problem with that person. You say, "Fine. That's dandy." And you just go ahead and run your Security Check on that person. As soon as that person no longer reacts on the needle, you run another assessment on that list and you run that person flat.

Be prepared about that time to find an unknown personnel suddenly leaping into view who is the central character of the whole ruddy lot. Put that person down and that person assesses this time and run the Security Check against that person. And you'll wind up at the other end with this list here in a state where you can read off these names and you don't get...
wild needle reaction. In other words, it's not a charge situation now. It's not a charge situation. And so you just leave it; you just leave it.

And now, you go back, you take a – you file that P section and you get another completely new P section. If you have done a very poor O section, which is to say the changes on O are not self-determined changes but other-determined changes, something like this – and you just got a whole bunch of occurrences, operations and that sort of thing – you have trouble getting a new assessment that will make any sense to you. So make sure that O section is okay. But then you just reassess the O section and do a brand-new P form right straight across. You only want one problem. You only want one set of people. You can add to that set of people, you can't add to the problem. Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Well, yes, Ron, except for there – I am asking how it will be intensive. How will we keep running problems on this individual. Uh – I've got the one incident run right through and ... All right. All right. How long do you want to run this?

Male voice: Yes.

Okay.

Male voice: What's the criterion there?

The criterion, far as it's concerned, is the pc has many difficulties. As you assess these one after the other and go down the line of his O section and you don't get anything in the way of an assessment, you're through. In other words, these things are no longer troubling the pc. These changes which you have assessed are no longer troubling the pc. Then you are through with that intensive. That's how long you would run it. Now, how many hours that would take to run would be too difficult an estimate.

I originally planned this as a twelve-and-a-half-hour run. That's how long it would take me to run one. I don't know what it's going to get into, because I've seen three sessions to do O – an O list just done at the end of the third complete session – all of which should have been done at the end of the first session, see. So I wouldn't say. I dare say that on a rather difficult pc an auditor auditing fairly rapidly – I'd say twenty-five hours should cover it fairly well.

But that isn't the last you're going to see of this Problems Intensive, you see. You – this isn't the last you're going to see of this. You're going to do – after that you're going to run the Prehav level on the terminal and you're going to run those terminal – the terminal on those levels and you're going to get some of those out of the road. You're going to straighten up some of the engrams that you run into. You're going to run some more levels and then you're going to do this thing on the whole track. It's almost identical with the form. And it's not much change. After you've opened the fellows track up one way or the other, you say, "Well now, what self-determined changes have you had in your lives?" [laughter] And you do an O session – section on that and so on. Probably have to be some other wrinkles connected with it. But that isn't the last you will see of that.
And it never pays to use up too much time on a person's present life. One, it doesn't pay actually to audit a pc too long who can only remember their present life and who has never seen a past track facsimile and so forth. Your Problems Intensive will actually blast that open. Get a goal, get a terminal, do a Problems Intensive and I guarantee you that he will be looking at the past track.

All right, now to open up that past track, level runs and then engram runs and some more levels. Now, you're going to have a lot of past track open and then you could do a much more effective Problems Intensive. You think this first one here is effective and produces "Wows!" on the pc. Well, wait till you do one of these whole track ones. Yeah, that's pretty wild.

For instance, I don't know, I ought to get somebody to do one of these present life Problems Intensives on me, see how it goes. Because, in the first place, I haven't been able to stay in that zone and area. I can't think of a single problem I've had in this lifetime. They all – all are somewhere else. They're old friends, these problems. [laugh] Does that answer your question Reg?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.
You bet.
Yes.

Female voice: How does this new rundown affect the routines?
What new rundown here?

Female voice: This O and P. We're doing this on uh – this time – lifetime and we're going to do it on whole track as well.

What?

Female voice: This O and P section.
You mean, this new – this Problems Intensive we're doing now?

Female voice: Yes.

Has nothing to do with whole track.

Female voice: Yes, you said we're going to do it against the whole track – Problems Intensive.

Ahhh. You – come on, come on, come on, twist your brains around here. Listen. "Eventually" means when a pc is ready for it, we will do a whole track Problems Intensive. But if a pc isn't ready for it and you're just at the beginning, we'll do a present life Problems Intensive. This doesn't mean that eventually we're going to change our minds and on all pcs we do whole track Problems Intensives. See, there's a difference here.

What we've got, essentially, is a progressive opening up of track. And you'll find that the pc somewhere on down the line, after you think he's going to go Clear and everything is very nice, will all of a sudden jam. Well, this mystery of his jamming is the fact he's run into a new problems chain of some kind or another and you have opened up a new circuit.
you're running through a new series of hidden standards. And therefore the pc doesn't go Clear. But I've been studying, here, the barriers to Clear. That doesn't influence it at all. Okay?

**Female voice:** Doesn't influence the Routines – 1, 2 and 3 – at all?

What routine?

**Female voice:** Routines 1, 2 and 3.

**Another female voice:** We're only doing Routine 3 and Problems Intensive now.

**Female voice:** Okay. Thank you, that answers it.

No. Routines are routines. This doesn't influence any of those routines. Routine 3 is exactly what it is, which is, actually, Goals and Terminal Assessment with Security Checking and Prehav level runs. That is exactly what Routine 3 is. It's never been anything else and it's not going to be. A Problems Intensive – a Problems Intensive is actually a broad method of doing rudiments and Security Checks. And you shouldn't look at it as anything else but a method of doing broad rudiments and broad Security Checking and that's all it is. It looks like a brand-new package, but if you investigate it very carefully it gets the rudiments in and gets the Security Checking done where it'll do the most good. Okay?

**Female voice:** Thank you, Ron.

Okay. Now, by next Tuesday, I trust that some of you will have finished this Problems Intensive and you will have that all straightened out and that'll all be going on swimmingly and you'll be getting on to your Prehav level runs – by next Tuesday.

I have a certain impatience about this and I have news for you: The number of problems a person has is in direct proportion to the slowness that he audits. The number of problems a person has tells you exactly how fast he will work in life. If he has quite a few problems he may get hectic and work hysterically fast, but then he will eventually slow down. He'll tire out. But the number of problems a person has, determines his speed of accomplishment. And if you want anybody to speed up in life in general just care – take care of his problems, get his stuck problems out of the way and get those things all squared up and you will find that the individual speeds up in doingness in life. That works, by the way – that's quite a handy thing to know. You see that a workman or an executive or something like that, just can't ever seem to accomplish anything. Well, he has problems.

**[Editor's note: The tape ends here abruptly, as does the original master recording.]**
Okay. Here we are and this is the 24th of October 1961, and a very interesting day it is. The reason I'm late is I've been building a fireplace, and if I start making little errors here and talking about, "Well, the flue goes over here" or something, you'll understand this.

Now, you are embarked upon an interesting activity just now. Not all of you, but the bulk of you are running your terminals on a new series of commands. And this new series of commands is a very well thought out hydrogen bomb. And I can't tell you at this moment that there will be exactly no change in this particular series of commands, but I have been working on nothing but this command package for about two weeks. I'm just trying to smooth these things out.

Now, this very well may shorten clearing. Do you think it will?

*Audience: Yes.*

Because I have told you many times that auditing was a third dynamic activity, and so it is. Even more importantly, apparently, most aberration, as we learn in a Problems Intensive, stems from group mores.

Now, how would this be? It'd be basically that there was an agreement. And if you look at the Reality Scale, you will see that an agreement ranks high on the Reality Scale.

Well, a group is a multiple agreement. And as an individual agrees to and then disagrees to, he runs a one-two contradiction on his own postulates.

In other words, he says, "I agree," and then suddenly he says, "I don't agree." When a person becomes a member of the group, he *agrees* to certain things and then finds that he cannot uphold these certain things, and then of course disagrees to these certain things. Now, this is one of the highest levels of the Reality Scale. This is very high on the scale. But having agreed to and then having disagreed to, he of course does not then as-is, ordinarily, his original agreement. All he does is disagree to.

So he finds himself in disagreement with himself. Well, it was his agreement, wasn't it? And now he disagrees to this. So now he is in disagreement with his own agreement, which of course is the – apparently the first and foremost invalidation of a thetan. He invalidates himself by agreeing and then disagreeing to his own agreements.

In between the agreement and disagreement, we get a further set of agreements and activities, all of which are less in value but nevertheless bring about a complexity. He agrees to be a member of the I Will Arise Burial Society of Birmingham. And he agrees to get hisself buried. And he agrees to pay twenty-five cents a week from here on out until he's buried. And he doesn't get buried, and he hasn't got the twenty-five cents. But he also finds out that the
treasurer of the organization doesn't spend this on tombstones as he's agreed to do. He hears some kind of a rumor or something of the sort, that he spends it on new Buicks.

And then he finds out dat the last few brethren dat was buried – dey was buried face down. [laughter] And dey wudn't wearin' no coffin. So he now disagrees to pay his twenty-five cents a week, and he disagrees that it's a good thing to be a part of the I Will Arise Burial Society. And now he runs up a whole series of overtures. He goes around and tells all of his friends that they must stay out of the I Will Arise Burial Society.

All right. So we're busy running this fellow, and he tells us motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator. "Dey took dis twenty-five cents, and dey put it in dey pockets. And dey didn't put anybody in de ground proper." And he tells you all of this. "They did this to me. They did this to me. Actually, it was seventy-five dollars, nine hundred dollars," or something of the sort. It doesn't matter what.

And he tells you motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, see? Well, to free up this whole situation, you have to somehow or another uncover the – something on the order of the original agreements or activities.

Now, it so happened that the I Will Arise Burial Society had a great many social activities. And after they joined, they had a right to go to all of the funerals. And the I Will Arise Burial Society always provided all of the beer. And they provided a band and it was supposed to be quite an affair, you know?

And actually, as we begin to sound this particular activity with this group, we find out that for something on the order of twenty-five cents a week over a period of five or six years, this fellow averaged a funeral party a week, and at every funeral party drank fifty cents worth of beer, you see. And frankly, the I Will Arise Burial Society ceased to exist for economic reasons. They were burying people too proper. That was the trouble, you see? And they exceeded their exchequer.

Well, what have we got in there? We've got a whole area of motion – enjoyed motion. The individual enjoyed himself during that period of time, mutually, with other members of the I Will Arise Burial Society. In fact, he was, at one time, completely unable to differentiate what was his decision and what was anybody else's decision in the I Will Arise Burial Society. Dey was dancin' and dere was lots of beer.

And during some of those beer times, it was totally impossible to differentiate who was decidin' what. So we get an unknown area. We get a mutual action area. And all of these things have to do with a little group that came and went and disappeared because of financial insolvency. And we find our pc absolutely certain that he will never be buried. And we've got half the pictures he's got on the track of being – of dying on a point of land, you see, that is out in the open and just lying there with his bones being picked upon by the vultures. And he's got it with full somatics, you see?

And we've got pictures of him floating as jetsam, flotsam on the high seas with the seagulls scratching his eyes, you see. There he is, stone dead. No, women float face up, that's
right. Anyhow*, scratching the back of his neck and so forth, and there he is decaying into a cadaver with the fishes nibbling upon his face.

And all of these are very interesting pictures. And I'm sure that we could be very elucidative on the whole subject of how these pictures came to view. And we all agree that this is a horrible circumstance: not to be buried. But we begin to look at the chain of "not being buried" on the track, and we find out that he practically never got buried.

Well, we've cracked through a barrier here which has been in existence for – let's see, 1948 to 1961. Why, if the thetan was making his own pictures, why was he making that particular type of picture? Yeah, why was he making this? What was his proclivities for morbidness? And we find the answer in the fact that he can no longer differentiate between his actions and other people's actions. That's one of the first things we find out. He cannot differentiate. He can't tell what happened. He doesn't know what he did, and he can only condemn what they did. And he is not sure who was cause. That's what it all amounts to. Who was cause of any of these communication lines or actions. Who caused these lines?

Well, you find somebody dancing in the I Will Arise Burial Society Hall, and there's a tremendous crowd of them, and they're all dancing and they are dancing faster and faster. And all of a sudden there's a tremendous crash, and all of the beer barrels which are stacked up roll on the floor because the combined efforts of the crowd move too surgingly in that direction.

Who caused it? Well, he gets a we caused it. Oh, isn't that interesting? We caused it, did we? Now, that's fine. There's actually only a very few of his motions were contributive to the beer barrels going out on the floor, but which motions? Well, he doesn't know.

And he gets confused with his causes. Then he doesn't know who caused what. And one day at a particularly violent funeral, there was a fight. And he was in a tremendous fog because of too much beer, and when all of the smoke cleared away of de fight, dere was de brother lyin' on de floor, and he wasn't breathin'. Who killed him? Well, he doesn't know who killed him. In fact, nobody ever finds out who killed him. The I Will Arise Burial Society sort of killed him, but there is no motion caused by any mass called the I Will Arise Burial Society. That is a bunch of motions individually caused. And the fellow after that begins to wonder if he maybe didn't kill that brother dat was lyin' on de flo'.

Some commotion occurred. And he doesn't remember what he did. And it could be that he killed somebody. But certainly he was a member of a group who killed somebody – that he knows – but where he was at the exact instant of the death of this brother is not something he can tell you. In other words, he's getting interiorized into the motion of the society till he can no longer differentiate between his motions and the motions of other individuals in that society but begins to call them "our motions." There is no "our motion."

All motions are, of course, caused individually, fundamentally and basically. All motion is individually caused. There is no collectively caused motion. That's where the governments of Earth are going astray left and right. They say the people, the people, the people, the masses, the masses. And you'll find people right up here in the Council House not ten miles away, five miles away, I'm sure will tell you that we must protect the people. And every peo-
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clearly, as an individual that comes up to the door, gets a kick in the teeth, because they're not the people, you see.

Every individual is himself, and the government doesn't want anything to do with the individual. The government can only be concerned with people in the mass. And each person as an individual moving in to ask for assistance in some category is immediately told that he's not the people and that he shouldn't think selfishly for himself this way; that it's for the greater good of the greater people.

And you'll find there are people in government like this. You would be amused some day as you begin to look it over. The people, the people, the people, the masses, the masses, the masses, see? And they shoot individuals. And they have never realized that this thing they're calling the people is made up of nothing but individuals. And if you shot every individual that you found in the people – now, I'm not talking of the Russian cultism of individualism; I'm just talking about this identity, a single identity, not a people identity – if we shot every single identity we found amongst the people, we of course would have no people. Isn't that correct? All right. The government goes on the basis that you must only take care of the people, and you mustn't pay any attention to the single identity. Well, of course, then they're governing nobody, are they?

See, there we get a condition where all motions are confused with all motions to a point where nobody can differentiate what his motions are. And the third dynamic, attainable for the preclear, is the most fruitful source of this confusion of mutual motion, you can call it. The confusion of mutual motion. The individual doesn't know what he did, who he did it with or which was his effort that contributed* to the motion. And he's no longer able to tell about this and he defends himself from this confusion by backing out of it. And he says, "Well, it was all bad, and here I am outside of it. At least I am still an identity."

And a thetan has gone through this on and on and on. Actually, the dynamics give us an excellent picture of this. The sixth is exclusively a co-motion undifferentiated. All the collective, undifferentiated co-motions of the past become what we call matter, energy, space and time of the sixth dynamic. That is what the sixth dynamic apparently is. It is the cumulative effect of undifferentiative, mutual motions. Nobody can say what he did.

And a builder gets through building the building, he stands back and he's in a bit of a fog about it. And there were five thousand windows put in this building, and he knows he put some windows in. Which windows did he put in? Well, he might be able to count them up, and he might not be able to, so he – but he takes a defense from the effort of not as-is-ing it. He takes a defense from not as-is-ing it. He doesn't as-is it. He simply says, "Well, that was our activity." Well, now, that's a very innocent action and it doesn't have very much to do with anything. And, of course, life was made up of "our" activities. But it's only when these things come a cropper. We built this bridge. And then the first locomotive that goes across it caves it in. Everybody says, "The company built this bridge, and they built this bridge." They instantly deny their own co-motion.
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Well, they've forgotten their individual contribution. And then they have denied their part of the co-motion. And then they say they had no part of it, and that is about the cycle that these group things go.

Now, if we were processing this fellow from Birmingham, and he was trying to get squared around on the I Will Arise Society, and he has this terror of being buried – of not being buried. And every time we get anything like it, we find these pictures of burials, and we find all sorts ... Well, we don't know any background history of the I Will Arise Burial Society. We don't even know he's ever been a part of it. It happened in an earlier lifetime. It doesn't even exist now. It is just a lost piece of co-motion on the track. That's not commotion, you know, I mean it's just co hyphen motion. Cooperative action.

And we've got a pc who is terrified of not being buried. And if we trace this down very carefully, we'll eventually run into the I Will Arise Burial Society.

He has so many overts against the I Will Arise Burial Society and such a tremendous dependency on being buried by it, that, of course, he can't be buried if he's not a member of it.

Well, he was a member of it three lifetimes ago. And he has a terror of not being buried.

Well, now, if we were trying to chase down every phobia that a person had on the basis of find the phobia, find the group, run out the co-action, get a redifferentiation of the individual's responsibility toward and for the group, all of these things, we could probably do it, but we would also have this fascinating thing: that at any given time on the track – at any given time on the track – an individual is a member of two or three groups at the same time. Member of the family, he's a member of the society, he's a member of the business he's connected with. I mean anything like that, you know? Even if he's a bum, he's a member of a group called bums. He's at least two or three groups, you see?

All right. Now, how long has he been on the track? About two hundred trillion. And I'd say that it was about three groups every twenty-five years would be the most conservative underestimate of the situation. So that is something on the order of twelve groups a century times two hundred trillion less one hundred, you see? Less two cycles.

So, it's two trillion times twelve, or twenty-four trillion, and you would have to do this twenty-four trillion times. Now, how long are you going to live? Could you afford the number of E-Meters that you were going to wear out during this period?

Now, if you are going to be able – to be able to differentiate or get the individual to differentiate every single area and point and action of the track where he had come a cropper because of co-action, it would be that kind of an operation. If you were going to take each one of them individually apart, it would add up to something like twenty-four trillion.

You see, every time he died, he deserted the society. Just take that. Every time he died. He left a group. He had overts on the group, too. Dying was also an overt on the group. All kinds of wild computations will come up on this line, but it becomes an unauditable situation is all the point I'm trying to make.
And it's a good thing that we're assisted by a thing called automaticity. All overts and withholds are preceded by co-action – which is an interesting thing in itself. There must have been co-action for a later overt and withhold to occur.

All right. Let's be much more down to earth here. There's a husband and a wife, and they have a fight. And she decides to leave, and he decides to leave. Perfectly routine, daily situation all through the societies. Some kind of a small vestige of this takes place, you see. Well, how come? How come? Well, they are a group. They're a group of two. They have mutual actions which are also flanked by nonmutual actions.

Well, just get the idea. She takes care of the home and he takes care of the business. She cooks food; he eats it. He earns it; she buys it. They're almost duplicative but not quite. Now, if we look this over, we find out that there's an ample opportunity here to have mutual action and a great deal of different actions all going on at the same time, which makes it rather confusing.

An individual has – is evidently duplicating somebody else while not duplicating anyone. Wife's wearing powder and paint; he isn't. He's shaving; she doesn't. You get these differences? And all the time we have an appearance of mutual action, we have tremendously different individual actions going on.

Well, this thing could very well add up, just as itself, to a bunch of overts and withholds because the mutual action is always being interrupted by differences. The differences exist. So they speak of these differences, but of course it's just overts and withholds and that sort of thing. But there were mutual actions.

Now, you can straighten out these people by running the O/W or you can free the effect of the O/W by differentiating the co-action. And that is the basic discovery which I am telling you about now.

You can knock out the co-action which preceded the difference of action.

Now, we take this fellow with the I Will Arise Burial Society and we start processing all the parties and good times he had, and we'll find out that it'll rather automatically discharge all of his overts against the I Will Arise Burial Society. And we think it's because, well, he looks at the good times he had and to where he understands the situation, you see?

Well, there's truth in that, but the co-action precedes the other and you're running a more basic action than the O/W. But the co-action is something he cannot face. If he is withholding himself from the group, he of course can't even remember the co-action of the group. There's many a fellow saying, "Oh, well, I belonged to this terrible space opera society, and everybody dressed like spiders, and we all went around strangling people. They were terrible, and I finally got down on the whole thing, and I left them all. I didn't want anything to do with them, and so forth." And we run this down a little bit further, and we find the withhold is, is he is no longer a member of the group. He was withholding a group member from the group, namely himself. That's your most fundamental withhold.

All right. So, as long as he is withholding himself from the group, he also withholds his memory from the group, so he really can't tell you what the group was all about.
All right. But we can get him up now to confront the idea that he's done something to the group and he's withholding something from the group, and he's done something else to the group, and he's withholding something else from the group. And something sort of goes bzzuh. Well, he gets, you know, a little freedom occurs. Well, he's in close enough to the thing now to be able to observe.

So now if we ask him about the co-activity of the group, he would be able to tell us. And the next thing you know he would look it all over and say, "Well, I don't know. Us spiders, we just tramped all over the universe and we kept doing this and that and we'd jump on a planet and we'd eat it all up and it was marvelous and we actually had a lot of fun, if truth be told," and get rather nostalgic about the whole thing, and tell you all about what they did. And you go, "Well, what about these overts and withholds against the group?"

"Well, it's nothing in particular."

"Well, how about your not being a member of the group right now. You're withholding a body from the group."

"Well, that's not very important. Groups break up, and groups come and groups go. I'm just not a member of the group now." And there's no reaction on the needle.

You see the approach? The fellow is so far outside of it that he couldn't touch the co-action to begin with it. So, an initial approach to the situation is not "find the co-action." It's sneaking up on it.

You ask – you can ask about the co-action, and he'll tell you something about it. And then you have to get a withhold off or an overt off or something, and then he can tell you more about the co-action, and then you get another overt or a withhold off, and he can tell you more about the co-action. And you get another overt, withhold off, he tells you more about the co-action. And all of a sudden, he realizes everything they did do, and that group blows. Do you see the progress made?

Well, these mechanics are inherent in the processes which were issued to you that have to do with groups. A body of agreement has been violated and thereafter will remain aberrative. And there's where you get the packaged I'm-supposed-to's. There's where you get the packaged postulates. There's where you get the whole-cloth personalities. We call them valence, and so forth. They were enforced by group mores.

You'll find some young girl who is a member of a family, who didn't have any great avidity for family life perhaps, but she was a member of the family and she was going along. And now we find her years later in terrible condition.

And she says, "The family chopped us up." – Chopped her up. And the family chopped her up, and the family did this, and the family did that, and the family did something else of the sort.

And we'll find that even the memory of that family causes her pain. What's going on? Well, she can't as-is it because she can't get near it. Because she's got overts and withholds on it and is withholding herself from it, of course, she cannot approach the actual situation at all. So she really can't tell you what went on in her family.
And it's quite common for somebody to say, "Well, my mother beat me everyday and twice on Sundays and my father used to take an ax to me every Tuesday." And then to find out as you run the situation out that nothing like this occurred at all.

His father once threatened him with an ax, and his mother quite customarily used to duck when the preclear threw schoolbooks at her. I mean, this was about as close as we had to the situation. Well, why are we so far from the situation? Actually, the individual is withholding himself from the area of the situation in the physical universe and in his mind at the same time. So the mind, you see, is approximating what he is doing.

Now, let's take another activity. Let's take a speedboat driver. He drives speedboat races. And we find this pc wouldn't go near a speedboat. If you put him in a speedboat, why, it'd go off both sides of the harbor. There's no telling what would happen if we put him in a speedboat because he doesn't want to go anywhere near speedboats. And we say this is a peculiar thing. This man sees speedboats and he gets sick at his stomach. "Well," you say, "but that's natural. You get seasick in those."

No, it's not natural. No, these things have causes. What activity was he engaged in. What is that group all about? I'm afraid it's something on the order of "We are a group who are at total odds with one another and who, when we tangle, tangle with violence."

Speedboat 27 running into speedboat 34 – seldom do it quietly. The co-action of the group is crash. Otherwise, they're in total contest with one another so they're not an actual group. But the collision of the group is the co-action of the group. So you ask this pc, "What is the mutual action of speedboat racers?"

"Wrecking speedboats, of course."

Well, he doesn't want to be any part of that group because the whole mission of the group is to wreck speedboats. That's the way it looks to him at first, you see? There couldn't possibly be any other differentiation other than speedboats. What is a speedboat racer? A speedboat racer is a member of a group who wrecks speedboats.

Then we get him a little closer into it, and we get him over and he sees the individuality of the whole thing, and we see how it's running, and it all of a sudden begins to run. He can look at the situation.

But his first look at the thing will probably be "I don't want to have anything to do with the process you are trying to run on me." That's probably the first entrance point.

Because he'd say, "Well, I've been sitting here for generations perfectly happily withholding myself from anything to do with speedboat racers, and then you, you son of a aarr! you come along and you say, 'Associate with them that speedboat racers.' And I thought processing was to make people feel better." And look at me now. [laughter] You done it."

Well, what are you actually asking a pc to do? You're asking a pc to stop withholding himself mentally merely because he's withholding himself physically from a zone of co-action and motion. You see, he's withholding himself mentally as he withholds himself physically.
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You're processing a grown man. He's no longer a member of his family. Well, he's no longer a member of his family or he has some difficulty with his family. All right. And there he is. He's withholding himself mentally from his family, so you ask him to think about his family. It's almost the same as asking him to go back and join his family as a full participating member of the family. He doesn't know that he wants to do this. In fact, he wouldn't consider it wise. So you'll find all sorts of weird dodges being used by pcs not to run this process. Computational dodges of one character or another.

Now, why do the rudiments have to be in order to find a goal or terminal. Why?

Well, it's because you're asking the individual to walk very closely to the fact of an identity from which he is actually withholding himself. He's withholding himself from the identity and being the identity. He is not executing the goal while executing the goal.

You're asking him to look at something he is in the middle of. Now, as you start to run groups, you normally ask, "What group co-motion are you still in the middle of that you are now having nothing to do with?" And this appears very confusing to him.

Nevertheless, it works out and it works out very well. There is nothing very esoteric about the way the process works. You should know, however, this one sequence of there's an agreement to join or to be a part of or to agree to the mores of or the activities of or – and all groups have mores of one kind or another – followed by co-action, followed by overt, followed by withholds and more overt and culminating in a total withhold, physically and mentally, from participation with the group of any kind whatsoever.

All right. I'll repeat then the steps that you go backwards on it. You could security check the individual on this group, and he would walk a little bit closer to the group. And then you've got these overt and his withholds off, don't you see?

Now he could be asked about the co-action of the group. And pretty soon he would get a recall of a co-action and be able to differentiate his own actions from the actions of the group.

Now, the next step above that, of course, is not something you necessarily, I don't think, would have to process. It certainly could not be processed originally, because look at the barriers that'd intervene. And that is his agreement to join the group.

That should fall out of the hamper sooner or later in processing. You've walked this group backwards, in other words. But there's the way you approach it. The pc is being a tank driver. That's his terminal – tank driver. Well, you can't even find his terminal at first, but he's right in the middle of it.

Well, the rudiments have to be in so he can look because he's going to need all the attention he's got in order to look. And the rudiments have to be in to run these things because you're going to ask him to run O/Ws and you're asking him to get the co-motion of tank drivers, really, by getting the O/W off. We get the co-motion of tank drivers.

At each point of this, you're asking him to confront just a hair more than he would be comfortably accustomed to confronting, see? There he is, perfectly safe. He's just got a busted
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neck, arthritis and three 88 millimeter shells through his brisket. There's nothing wrong with the man. He's a perfectly normal human being. Sits there and gibbers.

And there he is, comfortably, and they'll even tell you this: "Well, I have left that a long time ago. And I no longer have anything to do with it. And I don't know why you should ask me to look at these things which I considered so unpleasant at the time."

You'll hear this out of more pcs when you start running into this sort of thing. "I am not sure I want to go on with this" is the total expression. And the common denominator as you start to clear somebody of all his ARC breaks, all of his computations, all of his figure-figures, all the reasons he should blow, all of everything is "I am not quite sure I want to get any closer to that group of spiders." That's what it adds up to, you see? But it expresses itself in various ways. He says, "Well, I don't want to get Clear. I don't know if I should go along with this. I feel fine the way I am."

He'll show up for the next session, but he's always kind of telling you this all the time. He expresses it to you as a member of your group of an auditor-pc, you see. He expresses it to you as "I see no reason to go on with this because it's all been unproductive of great unhappiness in the past, and I am trying to escape all that, and the main reason I am being audited is so that I can escape all that. And here you, you traitor, are turning me around and pointing a long, bony finger on the backtrack and I'm not sure I want to look down over that fingernail because it's just been just a little bit grim."

"Now, this cough is perfectly easy to understand. It's caused by bacteria. These holes in my stomach – they've been perfectly diagnosed as ulcers. My eyesight – well, everyone knows that when you get along in life, when you get up to twenty-one or twenty-two your eyesight starts to fail. And of course, with the world in the state that it is in, you can't expect anybody to be – to be happy, so naturally I'm unhappy. But I've been getting along somehow, and I don't see any reason why I shouldn't be permitted to go my own unhappy if somewhat aberrated way because I have everything explained. There's no mystery here."

And you say, "Well, what are your goals of life?"

Ah, well, this is great, see. You've just come up there with a roan horse, all sleeked up, ready saddled, and it's pointed on the out trail, see. It's up that-a-way, see. And he's come from down this-a-way. And he is not about to go down this-a-way again. But goals, "Oh, future. [snips fingers repetetively] Ah, now, future. Oh, well, let's get out of here. Good. Future. Well, my goals are ..." Brdrdrdrdrdrdr!

And you sight it out and you find out which goal sticks. He says, "That's sort of funny. I didn't really realize that was my goal. But it is, you know? Hadn't thought about it for a long time. That's it."

"Well, now, who would ..." you ask him. "Now, give me a list of people."

And he gives you a list of people. Very interested in this list of people somehow or another. There's a sort of a compelling horror. [laughter] There's the bird looking at the – the bird-staring-at-the-snake sort of a fascination about this terminals list. And it finally narrows down right straight on the head of a very unlikely thing, which seems to explain it all. And he's there all right. That's perfectly correct, you understand, but he really didn't expect that he
would land there. "But, of course, it is perfectly obvious why he is there, but no, it – on the other hand ..." so on.

They never seem to tell you that the assessment is wrong. They will sometimes tell you they don't like it. They sometimes are quite pleased with it, and it very often explains many things to them. But they hope, more or less at this point, that you will go off and let them sleep quietly. Because now you've got this roan horse, and you've turned the roan horse around and you say, "Now, just go back down the trail there and go around that pile of rock."

The guy says, "Well, I just came from there. And you know what's on the other side of that pile of rock. We all know there's a bunch of vultures. And if I go around there again, why – be the end of me."

And you're liable at that moment to get the most remarkable series – the absolute, most remarkable series of reasons why they don't want to become Clear.

And now begins the most critical period in processing. Oh, they go along with the goal, like a shot. They go along with the terminal like a shot. They themselves want to get Clear, that's for sure.

But the fact of facing back to the group and that group and that group and those people and those locations of the track and that activity and what they did then and what happened to them someplace else – oh, well, now, that's another thought. That is another thought. That is something else.

Yesterday was something that should remain buried. It was okay as long as we could skim along the edges and skate along the corners of the pond and never fall in. That was all right because that was fancy figure skating, but it was very safe. But we go out there, and we're liable to have anything happen to us. And the most critical period of processing is immediately after you begin to run the goal and terminal, particularly with a powerful process. And that can be wicked. That can be very wicked.

In the first place, if you have the wrong goal, and if you have the wrong terminal, you'll throw the pc in over his head and it'll take some real experts to bail him out. So it is not a light thing to attempt.

There is only one goal. There is only one terminal available. And now we have given you, if this works out all right, a surcease from your nervousness about the assessment of the Prehav Scale. That was a little bit tough to do. Of course, the goal and terminal is the critical things to do. That is really something. You have to find the right goal. The right goal can only be found with the rudiments totally in.

You have to find the right terminal. The right terminal can only be found with the rudiments totally in.

All right. Now, our period of departure from that point begins what could be some very trying times. In the first place, the pc does not want to have anything to do with what he has left. And he does not know that – if he has to cross over that again – he wants to get Clear at all. So you can look for all manner, apparently, of ARC breaks, rudiments out, this and that, figure-figures, ducks and dodges. You can look for all kinds of ducks and dodges. He doesn't
want to go back there. So there's all kinds of this and that. He doesn't know that the price he will have to pay isn't too great for the prize of being Clear.

After all, he's still alive as aberrated. He doesn't know that he'll be still alive after he gets through with all that.

Why doesn't he know this? Because it's well proven. He died last time, didn't he? He got hurt last time, didn't he? Well, he's certainly going to be hurt again. And you get the "mustn't duplicate" situation and you get other things coming up.

A pc can also begin to slide out from underneath a terminal up into degradation. And this is one of the more alarming facts of running terminals, and one of the things which is very discouraging to an auditor. An auditor really has to understand this in order to survive much of it because the pc looks so pathetic. The pc comes up to degradation. The pc is no-place. The terminal is everything. The pc isn't there. And the pc's first awareness is in gooey, ulnyah and degradation. It very often happens this way. It isn't necessarily usual, but it does happen this way.

The worse off a pc has been in life, the more interiorized the pc has been inside the terminal, the more liability you have in trying to pull him out of it because he comes up through a degradation band and he doesn't know that he wants to go on at all because it is too doggone grim.

Somebody can get degradation practically dripping off of him. But all of his escape-ments are reactive. All of his mechanisms to escape are reactive. And you mustn't lose track of that fact. Those are all reactive. By keeping the rudiments in and keeping the pc being audited and pointed straight ahead on his line, you will succeed. Why? Because actually the pc, what there is of him, at the time you begin to process him, is with you all the way. And the objections are reactive objections, and if you Q-and-A with these reactive objections too much, you stop the pc's forward progress. And that is basically what is the most critical period of auditing.

Given the right goal, given the right terminal, right now with the process you are running, the first six to eighteen hours after that point will be the most critical period of auditing. Once you've got them over that jump, all right.

Maybe they won't have any trouble at all. Maybe they'll just come through it like a dream. That they come through it easily doesn't mean nothing is happening. It just means you're lucky or your auditing is very smooth or your altitude as an auditor is very high or the ARC which you've generated is carrying the person through rather easily.

And this looks fine. It goes through very smoothly. And there is no dynamite happening. There's just lots of motion, there's lots of cognition, and lots of this and lots of that. And everything's going along very swimmingly. And the pc doesn't necessarily go into any degradation at all. Doesn't necessarily do so, but don't be so alarmed if the pc does because degradation is the lower harmonic of apathy. You know what I'm talking about when I say degradation? It's really gucky. It's the lower harmonic of apathy.

How can a person be more apathetic than apathetic? By being totally degraded. And it is the first emotion that a pc encounters on his road up. The first emotion encountered on his
road up – if he is below the point – is degradation. And then he comes up through some other unnamed oddball emotions up to apathy.

When he's up in apathy, man, he's way up. Of course, the pc goes through a band between degradation and apathy of dying. The band of death lies straight across the line. A thetan is easily below death. Easily. In fact, most aberrated people walking around are a bit below death.

And when you bring them up, they get odd ideas about dying and things of this character. Well, what is this? This is just en route from degradation to apathy, they pass through periods of dying. Obvious. It's just a band on the Tone Scale. That's all it is. It's just the individual goes through this before he comes out of it.

Now, it'd be very fine if you could take him from totally dead, totally insensate, totally unfeeling, to total enthusiasm with no gradient. Be wonderful if you could do that, but I think the only way you could do it is get an electronic cap and put it on his head and implant him and have him be totally enthusiastic, and of course you haven't cleared him. You haven't freed him. He's even more down there than he was before, but you've given him some kind of an implant of [in a chanting voice:] "You now feel enthusiastic about everything".

Well, if he's going to go up through degradation and up through death and up through apathy, remember, he'll also go through grief. Well, he doesn't have to cry to go through grief, but he'll go through grief, and he'll go through fear, and he'll go through anger, and he'll go through the lot. He'll go right on up the Tone Scale. And there's a sort of a hurdy-gurdy goes on which you must understand.

Did you ever see one of these little counterbalances whereby you put some pennies or some sand in one bucket that is up in the air, and the bucket goes down and the other bucket goes up. You know, there's two buckets over a pulley, you see, and as one bucket goes down, the other bucket goes up.

Now, the up bucket, as you start to process the pc, is the valence. And he is as overwhelmed as, of course, the valence is high-toned. That's a rule. The pc is as overwhelmed as the valence is high-toned. It's a direct rule. Although valences can have chronic tones of their own. You'll find this on the Prehav Scale.

The rule is the higher the valence is on the Prehav Scale, the more the pc has been overwhelmed by it. Works reversely. The more – or the higher the valence is on the Prehav Scale, on the Tone Scale actually, the worse off the pc is underneath.

So if the one bucket valence is way up, inevitably the pc is way down. And they swap positions. And in the process of processing them, you find out that the position interchanges, that there is a period when the buckets are even. Just as you lower one bucket, the other bucket comes up. There will be a period when they are both level. And that's a very schizy situation.

The pc is not in his valence and he is not out of his valence. And the valence is not there – it's not effective but it's not ineffective. The I'm-supposed-to's are not working very well, and the pc has not begun to function yet very well. And these two buckets pass each
other on the counterbalance, and the valence sinks out of sight and vanishes, and the pc goes on up to the top. That is essentially what happens with a valence.

That demonstration, by the way, of the Tone Scale is not inept. It is very factual. You draw two buckets connected with a piece of string, one bucket at each end of the piece of string, and hang the center of that string over a pulley, and then plot a Tone Scale back of each piece of string as it drips down – you'll get the exact operation that occurs. The Tone Scale – the valence goes down tone, down tone, down tone, down tone, down tone, down tone – What valence?

And the pc goes – what pc, see? Then, "Oh, I'm so degraded. Oh, terrible. I feel awful – very degraded. I don't know whether I'm ready to go on with this sort of... Is it always this bad?"

And then they up a little bit and they say, "Well, I want to die now. I've seen everything, I've done everything. I've done everybody. There's nothing left," and so on. And then they go up to a point of "Oh, God, what's the use?" That's better than dying, you see, but it's just, "Oh, God, what's the use."

A little bit later, why, you see, the bucket has gone up to a point of "It's so sad. It is all so sad. Everything is so sad. Is there anything in the world that isn't sad?"

And then it goes up to a point – "You know, this is pretty scary stuff to be going through. Are you sure you know what you're doing?"

And then "God damn it! What do you think you're doing?" You know? And then "Well, we can leave this now. I haven't – ha-ha. Actually, this doesn't bother me any now. I'm not worried about it. We can leave the whole thing" And that's a wonderful invitation to an auditor. These are all wonderful invitations to an auditor to do something else, but particularly this one – "It's flat now." [laughter]

The pc tells you, so it must be true. And they strike that boredom band. And more processes and engrams have been deserted by auditors at the boredom band than any other point. And they go up to the boredom band, and then the person says, "It isn't bothering me now." So the auditor says, "Well, that's wonderful. That's a good time to leave it." They've just struck boredom.

You go a little bit further, and they will become conservative about it. "Well, it probably is all right if I am careful." And then they will get enthusiastic about something else. And they've come out of it.

The valence goes down the same course. Now, this fellow is a gambler. The valence is a gambler. And you have at first a serene gambler. Nothing bothers him. All pervasive. Nothing worries him. Not a successful gambler – just nothing worries him, you see. He's very serene about it as he trumps his partner's ace. And down goes the bucket a little bit as you process this. The next thing you know, you have an enthusiastic gambler.

Now, this is what's weird. You've got an enthusiastic gambler about the same time as you have a dead pc. And these two things give us an odd view.
And then it goes down a little bit more, and you have a person who says, well, they're bored with gambling, and they don't think they will gamble anymore now, as they pick a packet of cards out of their pocket and start to deal you a hand. But it really doesn't interest them, and they can really leave it alone. And they now know that they can leave gambling alone, and so forth. Leave life alone. Leave everything alone. They'd still deal you a hand, however. While not being interested in what you have.

Then they go down, and you get an angry gambler, and you would then, about the time, you see, you have got an apathetic pc, you've got an angry gambler.

And then pretty soon, why, you have a weeping gambler. You don't see every level of the Tone Scale. Very often in processing, they're passed by fairly rapidly, or they don't express themselves or manifest themselves very cleanly. And you see a skip. Go from for instance, boredom to fear, and there'd be no anger.

And then the pc – about the time the pc is getting sort of griefy about it all, why, the gambler is sort of scared. And that is an interesting time to process him because you've no stable high tone. There's no stable high tone to fall back on.

The valence is now frightened. And the pc is weeping. Well, which can the pc be, you see? The pc is weeping and his normal escape from it would be to be a serene gambler, but the gambler is now afraid. So there's just no place to hide along about that point.

And the pc really starts really unloading about this point because he finds out that if he's gone this far, there is no backtrack that he can reverse on in processing. He's got to face up to the lot.

Next line of action, of course, is the gambler just sort of fades out of view, and if you looked around a little while later you might find a degraded fragment left. And then it sort of disappears. The pc meantime has gone on up the Tone Scale.

Now, after this interchange of the counterbalance on the Tone Scale has taken place under the action of auditing, tell me, now, what happens? What should you do? How would you know whether or not this interchange has taken place? How do you know if that valence is flat? If your rudiments are totally in, and the tone arm is getting no motion, the valence is flat. But you make awful sure that you sweat hard over those rudiments. Zzzzzzz. Get them really in before you make a final check and make up your mind. Because the most fruitful source of fouled up cases is unflat valences, next to wrong goal, wrong terminal.

Now, what occurs here. What occurs? You've got a valence flat. You've checked it out. You've had another auditor test it very carefully on the pc. Check the pc for rudiments. Get the rudiments in. Check the terminal very carefully. It is apparently no longer active. Rudiments are in, and it's not active.

The pc is not Clear. What do you do now? You do it all over again. You do everything that you did before, step by step, the whole works. You do the lot. Except please don't take so long at it. Because if you take thirty hours to assess each new goal and each new terminal you're going to find on the pc, thirty hours for the goal and fifteen hours for the terminal, you are getting up into astronomic figures, because at the end of it they will blow it something on the rate of fifty an hour. So, you see, your plot of time is – starts being thrown.
Your next assessment is done exactly the same as your first assessment was done. You get the original list, and you try to add any new goals to it the pc now has. You get the rudiments in with great thoroughness and you assess that list and try to find a goal. And that time, you probably will find one.

You take that goal and you do not use any old terminals list at all. You simply go over this situation with the terminal – what terminals, cause, effect – and try to find the terminal that will hang up and will register. And you assess that exactly the same way as you did before.

Now, you take the terminal, fit it into the commands which you have been given, or in the old way, the Prehav Scale ... And there are a lot of pcs, by the way, that you will have to run on the old Prehav Scale run, children particularly. Children, you won't be using any other than Prehav Scale. So, the Prehav Scale has not disappeared out of your lives. We simply upgraded some of it.

And the individual's terminal is then assessed on the Prehav Scale and you run that level and so here we go. And it's all perfectly okay.

Same way as before, except don't expect that to run very long. Don't expect it to run long. Don't expect it to run forever.

I don't know. It'd be a wild guess. You couldn't tell how long the second terminal is going to run. There'd be no guessing it at all. But it should be much less than the first terminal took. But, of course, many other things could happen. And if it starts taking long or as long as the first terminal took, you should really get in and check your rudiments, and check your – do a Security Check and find out what in the name of common sense is going on here because his rudiments out. There is a difficulty here that had to do with rudiments, not to do with the other.

Now, you run that one flat and you do the same thing all over again. All in the twenty-minute test of the tone arm. And you just keep doing this over and over. The only trouble is, you will very shortly get into this kind of a situation: It is utterly, completely impossible to do an assessment, but the thing that you have to face up to is you have to keep trying. Because the "keep trying to do the assessment" is actually auditing. And you'll just blow them by the bucketload. You'll blow goals, goals, goals, goals, goals, goals. You get a goal and it stays in, out, thuu-thuu. "We got that goal. That goal's staying in. Thank heaven.

"Well, we got that goal staying in. All right. Now, how is the terminal now? How is the terminal? All right. Let's get a list of eight, nine, ten terminals. Oh, we got these terminals. Now, if we find one reacting there – oh well. Are there any more terminals?"

"No, there are no more terminals."

"Are there any more...." you can't get any reaction. No more terminals. And the guy hasn't got any more terminals for that particular goal. You go back and you look at the goal. It isn't reacting, so you get the rudiments in with the greatest of care, you see. Because two reasons the thing can be reacting, you're always in the bind as an auditor.
It isn't reacting because the rudiments are out or it isn't reacting because it's flat. Until you get to be a flat-out expert on it, you won't sometimes be able to tell which, so you have to make sure that those rudiments are in.

And you go back to find the goal which you just found and it's gone. And it's like trying to shuffle quicksilver. It just keeps disappearing. And the tone arm settles closer, closer down to Clear, and the needle begins to float more and more. And then the needle does nothing but float. It's totally free needle.

Needle is totally free. You have to be terribly quick at that particular stage of the game. You have to be fantastically fast to get any kind of a read at all. The pc is – the pc isn't stabilized as a Clear yet, see. The pc's just a borderline Clear. And he's got a stomachache so you sit down and you try to find a stomachache and give him an assist or something or find something. And trying to get the needle to react enough to find any kind of a confusion that would give him a stomachache or anything that's left out... It's just straight on the fly. You can't – it is not possible to build a meter that will react little enough that will still react on the reaction. I mean, if you cut down the reaction of the sensitivity enough, you wouldn't get any reaction of any character whatsoever on the thing that was wrong. And the thing is just defeated in all directions.

But that's perfectly all right. There's nothing really wrong with that.

You merely have to be real fast. You have to watch the needle very carefully, and you suddenly see that at a swing of the needle, it did a slight hesitation as it went by you. Got it. You got that engram. It has to do with murdering eight babies and [laughter] being operated on and so forth. And then you have the pc look it over, and you're going to straighten it all out except now it's gone. And it's still there. And the pc can put it back and confront it and handle it, and so forth.

Well, what do you want to know about it? The name of the doctor? Well, it was Jones. And you're not getting any reaction on this thing There's no reaction on the pc. Oh, a pc has still got pictures. That's all it says. It blows.

And that is about the way it goes. That is the way the thing rolls on up the line. Now, we just speeded and accelerated this enormously, but at the same time we have done this, we have taken away one of the tests which you had. The test is the Prehav level.

If a terminal is wrong, or if a goal is wrong and the terminal is wrong – of course, the goal is wrong, also the terminal usually is wrong. But if the terminal is wrong, and you give the pc a run on the Prehav Scale, you'll have maybe ten levels alive at the first assessment of the Prehav Scale. And you give him a run on the Prehav Scale, and then if you've got – less levels are alive or react on your first assessment, chances are your terminal is right. And if there are more, your terminal is wrong. And you are forewarned from running that terminal any further. It isn't necessary for you to run the terminal any further.

You've got to go back and check the whole thing over again. But you haven't got this now that you're not running the Prehav Scale, that you're running a packaged process. You have no prevention whatsoever from running a bad terminal. And let me assure you of this: that if you run the wrong terminal on a pc, with this particular process particularly, you will
just foul up his bank like fire drill. That will be one awful mess. And I just cannot warn you too much about it.

It gives us an administrative problem. How in the name of common sense are we going to be absolutely sure that everybody who is run to Clear all over the world is always run on the right goal and the right terminal. Because this has been invariable now. It's very solid. It's leading right straight through to clearing. How can we guarantee that every one found will be the right one. How can we guarantee this – because there's not even now a secondary test to find out if it's the right one.

There is a point of skill. There is a point of skill and excellence. So you can only say, never run a goal and terminal unless it's been checked by an expert who has been well trained at Saint Hill. That would be the most conservative thing that you could – possibly could do about it. I mean – I mean, the most sensible thing you could. I can't see possibly how we could do anything else but that, because let me let you in on an interesting datum that maybe you don't know. We have had a lot of people arrive here – a lot of students arrive here – with their goals and terminals already assessed.

And let me tell you they have been assessed with the greatest of care in the best possible spirit. And they have been 100 percent wrong. And if run, they just would have spun somebody right into the ground. Food for thought, isn't it.

I'm not exaggerating or trying to tell you how important Saint Hill is. I'm telling you a point of danger on the road.

Running the right terminal does not react the same on a pc as running the wrong terminal. The misemotional states the pc gets into is not an index of wrong terminal. Misemotional states will only occur if the right terminal is being run.

What you get on a wrong terminal is a rising tone arm which eventually sticks and doesn't blow down. You've beefed up the bank, and that's what a wrong terminal will do on a run.

Now, there are other things that can make the tone arm do this, too. The rudiments can be out, and the tone arm will do this. So, if your rudiments are put in, then you have an opportunity to sort out the goal and the terminal and make sure they're right. But there's a terrible danger – I'm not exaggerating this – in actually running very long a wrong terminal. It is very dangerous.

The whole bank goes solid, and although it will key out in three to seven days if the fellow just – you just leave him alone, see. Three to seven days, why, it'll key out. He'll be feeling all right. Any psychosomatic he's got is going to get worse. But not with any misemotion about it. It's simply going to get worse. The pressure in his chest is going to get harder. The pressure on his head is going to get worse. That is all. It's just going to get worse, all the way around, and the tone arm is going to come up and stick because the bank is getting more solid.

If you are running the right terminal, you generally get more and more action and a looser and looser needle and more and more misemotion. You get emotional changes if you are running a right terminal. And if your pc is crying and everything and you're just having a
hell of a time because you haven't got a big enough mop, and if it's just terrible what's going on in life, and it's all so grim. And you say, "Well, it must be the wrong terminal," come up and see me sometime. I have some antique dueling pistols. And you can load them up with ground glass and other bits of razor blades so I can shoot you. I have to add that preventive just for one reason because we have had cases of auditors who ran from emotion.

You know, the pc is getting too emotional so let's change the process. There must be something wrong because the pc's getting emotional.

No! That's the reaction. No, if the pc isn't getting emotional, there must be something wrong. It's just exactly the reverse, you see? The pc sits there, "Yeah, well, the Rosicrucians, they read things. Yes. I left them. Yes. All right. Good. What is my problem? Yes. No."

And this goes on by the hour. And there's never any cognitions. He never sheds any tears. He never says, "What do you know!" You got the wrong terminal.

So there are ways to tell. There are ways to tell that you've got the wrong terminal on the pc. But the best way to be absolutely sure that you have the right one is the best way. And that's to get the right one in the first place. And make sure that it's the right one before it's run. That's the Achilles' heel right now of Scientology on Routine 3 is getting the right goal and the right terminal. Because I've just packaged you up a set of processes that perhaps will have to be downgraded or rearranged as we run into cases and so forth, but for the usual case should blow it straight on through.

And you don't have to worry about Prehav Scale if this continues to work out properly. May run into some bugs, but I don't think so. I've been working on it here for months, actually, and just for the last two weeks have been doing nothing but orienting this set of commands. And it looks to me like they're pretty well oriented.

You could add to them. There are quite a few commands you could add to them. And you get a 15-, 30-, 40-, 60-, 112-command bracket. You could go on and on and on. And what you're trying to strike is the intermediate, whereas you give the effective commands which are adequate so they won't hang up the case.

All right. Do you understand a little bit more of what you're about now with regard to this? You say, "Well, what – where does this leave a Class II Auditor?"

It leaves a Class II Auditor right where he is. Security checking and running problems. You say, "Well, what happened to all these Problems Intensives?"

Well, nothing happened to these Problems Intensives. You can still do Problems Intensives. But I have learned this about a Problems Intensive, and you taught me: that after you found the problem, just as you've been going about it, you don't dare run the problem. The problem is simply an index and an indicator to give you the area of confusion immediately ahead of it. And you do nothing but Security Checking after finding the problem. And you never do a repetitive run on the problem of any kind. You disregard the problem.

You find the problem – find the area of change, find the problem. And then, disregarding that, list the personnel in the area of confusion immediately ahead of that and do a Security Check on them. And that is how you do a Problems Intensive.
I'll write all this up on a form. It's all going. It's just fine. It'll just work dandy, and everybody will be pleased with it, and a lot of cases make a lot more advances than they're making now. People will be set up so that they can be assessed and cleared that never have been before. All this is very valuable. But just at the present moment, why, this doesn't happen to be for you. You're on your road to Clear. So don't strike any barricades. Just go right on through, will you?

By the way, by the way, you can always talk to me. Did you ever realize that? You can always talk to me. You never realized that? Well, you always can, you know. The least way you can do so is send me a note. I always see all of them. This works for people all over the world.

I see an enormous amount of correspondence, believe me, and although I sometimes snarl at people on staff for sending me a note or letter, and I sometimes don't see letters and so forth, if they're just totally routine and that sort of thing, if somebody really has to, I generally – I generally listen.

And before you drop yourself off London Bridge, I can probably – I can probably give you some pointers on waiting on tug schedules so that you won't... [laughter] so if it gets too horrible, why, you can write me a note or have a word with me. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.
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In just a second you're going to clap louder than that, because I'm going to relax the problem of your having to pass examinations in order to have auditing, on the condition that you go on and get your noses to the grindstone and get them passed. [applause, laughter]

So you don't have to worry about that now. Don't look so spooked. Now you can run out all of your unkind thoughts on it. [laughter]

Okay, what is this? The 26th of October?

_Audience_: 25th.


Well, now having given you some good news, I'm going to give you some good information. But the main thing that you had better know about goals, terminals, runs and that sort of thing, probably has not been made abundantly clear. I have been on this particular track here for some time and the lecture I'm giving you is pretty much of a hallmark in this particular line. I mean, it's pretty much of a high-water mark, because there's a great many things have been resolved that had been a question for a long time.

You see, when you're attacking life head on, the doors open and the highways go out long and white quite regularly. But sometimes you know that there're some dark woods behind you. And now and then, why, as you're going up a well-known road, why, you all of a sudden find out that that wood is not a dark wood anymore, that you've gotten some data which wrapped up some little bit of something. In putting together the jigsaw puzzle of life, in trying to piece out what it is and what it is all about, you have a problem not unlike having a jigsaw puzzle with an infinite number of pieces and it's almost infinite.

And when you first look at this problem, as when I first looked at it many years ago, it was just a potpourri of odd pieces. And the funny part of it is, they didn't even look like they would ever fit together. None of the pieces were made to fit to any other piece. In other words, it was a brand-new thought that it could be fitted together, in one piece, not in eight thousand different islands.

Now, philosophy in past days has tended to compartment life and you have all sorts of compartmentations. And philosophy has never actually attempted a total view. It has been a bit beyond them and so they compartmented things up. They do various things and we've used some of these dodges ourselves in the past. I've used some of them as we've come along. I've – well, take Spencer, Herbert Spencer. He said that there was two zones of this and that and
he broke down various things; but within the framework of this and that and conditional to this and that, you then had a rule. You get the basic thought that goes behind this. You have things like the knowable and the unknowable. And that's an awfully interesting word – unknowable. Oooooo.

Well now, more to keep people from worrying about it than any other reason, I have used that analogy in the past, but that was more to keep people from worrying about it – not that I thought there were unknowables. I just said that there were areas that you didn't have to know all about before you knew the answers to the situation.

And tremendous reservations ... Kant, for instance – he not only compartmented it into the knowable and unknowable, but he said that there was transcendentalism and "You, you little worm, you, you-you-you rat – we're all calm up here on the philosophic clouds, you bum, you stupid jerk. [in a quivery voice:] It's mostly all unknown to you and always will be and nobody will ever know anything that has anything to do with anything that is important, so just go on and be stupid and be happy about it."

I don't know exactly where he got this particular notion but I suspect it was his bank. [laughter] And as we look at this huge, piled table of pieces of jigsaw puzzle, we get some of them together. And it makes a little bit of – more of a picture and we get some more of them together and it makes a little bit more of a picture. And then it turns up a yellow piece. And we've got a picture and it doesn't fit in any part of the picture we have got, so we put it over here on the side and we say, "Someday we will know about this yellow piece, but right now we're not going to worry about it particularly because the picture is making sense."

And we go on and we make more picture and we understand more of it and then all of a sudden there's a green piece. And it's a hexadiagonal shape and it fits nowhere. And we take this green hexadiagonal piece and we put it over here with the yellow piece and we say, "Well, we're not going to worry about them for a little while."

After a while, you've put enough pieces over here, green, purple and pink, that didn't belong in the proper picture that you stir them up a little bit and all of a sudden they go clank, and then they become – and they go together of themselves and then they go clank, and go into the main picture. Every once in a while we make one of these forward surges. Well, this is one of those occasions. This is one of those occasions.

I can tell you a flat fact. That is to say this is one of these facts that's without reservation. And it's rather startling, because we have done it and we didn't realize there was anything important about this. But we have done this in the past, but it's a fact which becomes one of the fundamentals of auditing.

Now, I must tell you clearly that auditors are divided into two categories, ritualists and fundamentalists. They're divided into these two categories. There is the auditor who, without any understanding of what he's doing, actually goes forward with the ritual and carries through to the end. And he's perfectly happy and he very often gets a result.

But he runs into more bugs than other auditors. This is the majority of auditors. They go down the line and they think that's just fine. And I appreciate it, you understand, because it demonstrates a very great faith in me. But that's what it demonstrates and that's all.
Now, they would be better off – and any ritualistic auditor who is getting results would get more results and be better off – if he knew the fundamentals on which his ritual was based. If he knew the fundamental. For instance, we say "agreement to begin a session." Now, if he knows what the fundamentals of agreement are, he realizes at once that he's got to have a mutual knowingness about what this session is all about.

And regardless of the ritual, his end product is going to be a mutual knowingness. "We are going to do so-and-so and such-and-such and then we have an agreement." And this agreement then precludes the preclear from having an enormous amount of not-know. Do you see this as an example?

So one auditor could just go ahead and run Model Session and everything is fine and run it off to the end and he comes out, he gets a result. It's an attestation to Scientology and the way it's put together that he can get a result under that basis. But how much better, how much better, if he knows he's trying to get a mutual knowingness about what is going on and make a contract and he's a fundamentalist, he's going by definition. What is agreement? You see? Well, agreement is a mutual knowingness, a mutual postulatingness towards certain end products and he knows if that's absent – if a mutual knowingness about what this session is all about is missing, that there's going to be a not-know throughout the session on the part of the pc. It's all going to be a little bit of a mystery, so he's not going to make as fast a result as he would if he were auditing by fundamental.

Now, you can audit by fundamental and use the ritual, you see. You could actually succeed by just using the ritual and not knowing the fundamental, which is quite interesting, but you could succeed much better if you knew the fundamental which underlay the ritual. And also used the ritual. That way, why, you have many more wins.

Fundamentals are quite important and this is one of the fundamentals of auditing which has been missing right up to this date. We could not answer this formerly, but if you have traced through – I think you could trace through the lectures for the last several years and occasionally find a remark by me that I have for a long time studied this particular facet and hadn't yet an accomplished answer to it, a finished answer.

That is, is it better ... I even thought I had it licked one time and it was very close to licked, but it is not quite right. "Can you audit conditions at all?" Now, we've inclined very definitely up until recently, up until now, to believe that you couldn't audit conditions very successfully, that you should audit terminals.

Now, let's clarify this. Let's clarify this. Let's classify terminals. What terminal can be run on the pc? And this is one of these great basic facts of auditing, so flap your ears. The only terminal that can be run on a pc is his goals terminal. And no other terminal can be run with impunity on a pc.

You can run another terminal for a short time. You can run it rather limitedly. You can appear to be getting away with it. Everything can be going along fine, you hope, and all of a sudden the bank stiffens up and the pc doesn't seem to be making much progress and so forth.

That's because you're auditing another terminal than the goals terminal. Now, factually, on the long haul you can get away with auditing these terminals sometimes for twenty,
thirty, forty, fifty hours. You can get away with them for a while – and all this will become very visible to you shortly – but you cannot continue to audit any terminal which is not the pc's goals terminal. The only terminal which can be audited with complete impunity, with total unlimited runs, is the goals terminal of the pc. And that is all that can be run in the way of terminals with perfect impunity. That's a fact.

Nail it down. Give it its proper level of importance because it will solve for you "Why did the pc's tone arm go up to 5.0 and stick?" It went up to 5.0 and stuck – refer to this particular moment and you will know why it went up and stuck. You must have been auditing some other terminal than the pc's goals terminal. It doesn't matter what other terminal. You must have been auditing another than his goals terminal.

So if you were running his goals terminal and it went up to 5.0 and stuck after you began the run of the goals terminal and then it got sticky and sticky and sticky and there was something real wrong running some double-barreled process (such as your groups 10-way bracket that you're running right now) and the tone arm went up and it stuck and nothing happened – ha-ha-ha, there's something wrong with the goals terminal. That is what is wrong. You're auditing some other terminal than the goals terminal.

You are busily, busily, happily clearing up a present time problem on the pc. You're happily clearing this up and all is going well and all of a sudden the tone arm starts going up and it goes to 4.5 and the pc gets very logy and it gets very sticky and starts to comm lag and gets misemotional – a-ha, you're running another terminal than the goals terminal of the pc.

Now, there's two things which can make that tone arm go up and stick. You understand, "go up" is all right. Go up, go down, who cares? But go up and stick. Now, that will happen on a Prehav Scale run and it does for this reason: You've exhausted that particular line and you must get over onto another part of the Prehav Scale. There, it is the Prehav Scale that is doing that. But on the 10-way bracket, if it did this, you've not got the right terminal, that's all. There's something wrong with the terminal.

Withholds can make the tone arm go up and stick. And running the wrong terminal can go up and make it stick. Running the wrong terminal on any process. Now, there's a great temptation to run a present time problem and so on.

You see, this particular class has helped me resolve this and I wish to thank you for it. You haven't suffered for it particularly. Pon was crying the other day and I recognized at once why she was crying and I use her as a particular example. I examined her auditor's form, wondering about this and I found out that she had been run on the ARC break process very hard and very long. And what happened?

She was going up – if you don't mind my using this?

*Female voice:* That's all right.

And she was running along happily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily and everything was going along fine and then all of a sudden started to get a little bit misemotional to the auditor and a little bit upset with things in general. And then they went along and ran the ARC break process a little longer and the tone arm went up to 5.0 – clank!, and there it stayed.
And they kept on running it, but Pon didn't – didn't calm down and didn't feel better. Now, I see today she looks much better and I think they undoubtedly are following the auditor's report directions which I gave out last night. I'm sure they ran a terminal today. And she feels much better. Isn't that right? Probably not much better, because the terminal itself cause...

[laughter]

But look at this. I wish to use this as an example because it's right here in your midst. Now, the ARC break process refers to an auditor and refers to a pc. Ah, those are two different terminals than her goals terminal. These are not her goals terminal. See? That comes under the heading, then, in spite of the fact that it's cleaning up auditing...

It doesn't work like this on every pc, but it'll work eventually like this on every pc, you see. It doesn't work fast on every pc like that, but it'll work that way eventually. And this will become very comprehensible to you when I go out and tell you all about the mechanism involved in this thing.

Well, what happened here, see? The auditor is not her terminal, a pc is not her terminal. She has been run on an auditor and a pc, running that 15-way ARC break process and her attention is being taken off of her goals terminal and her bank is beefing up.

Now this is the Create/Six phenomena. It is right here. The Create/Six phenomena is not involved with creating. And I've known there was a spook back of that and every time I've mentioned that to you, every time I've gone over it, I've had some little reservation. You remember, I've always made a little bit of a reservation – "Well, I don't know why this happens," you know? "It doesn't seem reasonable to me. And it doesn't happen with me and if it happened all the time, why, it should happen. But some people's banks get very solid when they start creating. And so we don't run Step Six."

This has happened enough times, you see, so that we abandoned a process which was not uniformly a bad process at all. Why? Why? And that little question has just stayed around. It's one of these yellow pieces with orange polka dots. Lord knows where it fits or how. Why do some people run Step Six – which is "Create something. Create something. Create something" – and have the whole bank go solid? But just a few people have this happen. And other people run "Create something. Create something. Create something." and as a lot of old-time auditors right here in this room can tell you, you can go on and have them create things and create things and nothing bad happens. They go on and they get well and everything else. Well, why does it only happen to a few?

So if it was create – if create was the total basis of this, why, then – then of course it would work on everybody. Only it doesn't.

All right. Instead of saying, like the ancient philosopher, sitting on his stone – it was probably very unhealthy sitting on stone, but anyway – sitting on stone, he said, "Well, there are different types of people. There are different types of bank. Everything is different, you see and you have to have understandings of fifteen or twenty different classes because, you see, they don't all head under and respond to the same principles. So men are different and thetans are different and it's all different, you see. And therefore, after you get through studying the alpha system, then you have to study the beta system and then you have to study..." you know and here we go, you see?
Well, I don't work on the same principle. I'm perfectly welcome – it's perfectly welcome for there to be great differences, but if you have the answer to life and the mind, you don't have different types of cases and you don't have some cases responding to something and other cases not responding to something, you see. It must be that you're not quite down to the fundamental. It must be that you're dealing with a fundamental which is not rock bottom. You must be up the tree a ways.

Well, in this particular instance, I'd never accepted this create phenomena without protest, even in the lectures when I talked about it. Maybe you can remember my having objections to this, here and there. "I don't know why," I would tell you.

Well, it isn't create. That's why. It's wrong terminal. That's why, huh-huh-huh. Hu-huu., a little difference here, ha-ha. Some people are so stuck on their goals terminal that you take their attention off their goals terminal and the bank beefs up. Or when you were running create on them and telling them to mock up things, you were having them mock up things other than their goals terminal, which were off their goals-terminal line and it distracted their attention off their goals terminal, so bank picked up.

So we get another fundamental here – not from that angle, this is from another angle entirely. This is empirical. I've watched this and watched this and watched this and I noticed that banks become solid and the pc gets more somatics and the pc gets more misemotional about the thing and things get more tough and it all gets tougher and tougher and tougher, rrrurrerr – he's sort of going into concrete.

What is this? Why? It's running the wrong terminal. Running another terminal than the terminal of the pc's goals chain. The pc's goals terminal doesn't do this. And it is the only terminal in the case that won't. There is just one available terminal in any case, one available terminal and that is the goals terminal of the pc. There is only one goal. There is only one terminal. And if you run that terminal, no matter what you do in the way of a process, the bank will not beef up. It'll not become solid. But if you run any other terminal longer than its basic tolerance or until the pc notices you're running it, [laughter] why, he gets cast in concrete. You know, I mean, he gets misemotional, the engrams get tougher, you get more screams, the circuits suddenly start acting up, and so on. The case gets rougher.

Now, usually in from three to ten days you will get a drop out of this. If he doesn't get any auditing for three to ten days, it'll just disappear. It's not a particularly dangerous condition, beyond the fact occasionally in Dianetics or Scientology somebody has suddenly had weight added to them in the process of processing.

*Why? Why?* Running something else than their goals terminal, that's all. Every time you saw increased weight by reason of auditing, it was because the bank was becoming more solid; it was manifesting itself on the body line and you were running something else than a goals terminal.

That will be good news to several Scientologists. [laughter]

Let me call to your attention that the – I must say this in defense along this line – this fantastic situation where every person is walking around with a different valence. All from the
same source, but every person has a different valence and it is usually different than the identity he is.

It is true that the terminal, running a terminal – this is perfectly factual – is much superior to running a concept, but the only terminal that can be run is the goals terminal, which is the added statement on the end of the line which makes it completely factual and useful. You audit against a concept and the pc's havingness will go down or something else will occur. You must audit – if you're going to audit for a long haul or do anything permanent for a case, you must audit a terminal. But what terminal? It is only the goals terminal of the pc that is available for auditing. If you don't know that terminal, you cannot run any terminal. I cannot say that too emphatically.

Don't run any terminal if you don't know the goals terminal of the pc. You can do almost anything with the goals terminal of the pc. Let us say the goals terminal of the pc is a "motor machinist's mate." Unlikely terminal. "Who would be a motor machinist's mate?" Anyway, his goals terminal was a motor machinist's mate.

Well, I don't ask you to experiment in this particular line, but you possibly could do something like this: "Mock up a motor machinist's mate. Thank you. Mock up a motor machinist's mate. Thank you. Mock up a motor machinist's mate. Thank you." And then nothing would happen. Nothing would happen bad to his bank. He would get the total kickback of his terminal. Oh yeah, he'd be very upset, but it will be emotional upset from the terminal and that upset will reduce and discharge and it'll run out.

Now, why wouldn't some – I go clear back to 1950 – why wouldn't some engrams run and why wouldn't other engrams run? And why, when running some engrams, did they just get tougher and tougher? And why, when running other engrams, they got softer and softer? Now, why?

Well, because the engrams that ran out were on the goals-terminal chain and the engrams that weren't on the goals-terminal chain wouldn't run. Now, I've already shown you here in the – just a few weeks ago that an engram that lay on the goals-terminal chain ran like hot butter. If you knew anything about running engrams at all, it just ran out and swamped up. There was not any great difficulty about it. It ran easily and the pc felt much better afterwards.

But if you ran one which was off the goals-terminal chain, as some of you knuckleheadedly did ... You know, I mean you're doing a Goals Assessment and the pc all of a sudden gets an engram and you say, "Well, Ron says it's all right to run engrams" and you all of a sudden run the engram and you made no progress and something happened with the Goals Assessment and everything would start to blow off and little jets of steam started to come out of the pc's ears and it didn't work. You had your hands on an engram that wouldn't run.

Why wouldn't the engram run? Because the engram was not on the goals-terminal chain and did not contain in it a terminal of the pc's goals chain. In other words, his terminal wasn't in the engram, so it didn't run.

Now, how we got away with running as many engrams as we did, Lord knows. This bug sat there all the time. So some engrams ran and some engrams didn't run. You get a per-
son early enough on the track and you usually run into his goals-terminal chain, so we went basic, basic, earlier, earlier.

The "earlier" principle still applies, perfectly valid. You use it today on the prior confusion to knock out a hidden standard. Marvelous. It'll work. You get the prior incident that underlay all the incidents. The first time the individual ever had an overt against Dianetics and Scientology, you can park his whole case until you find it and then the rest of the chain blows. That principle is right there. But lying right alongside of it there's another principle. And that is, in running engrams, if it is not on the goals-terminal chain of the pc and does not actually contain his terminal and is not directly related to his terminal, the engram will not run. And that's all there is to it.

That terminal which is not the goals terminal of the pc, that item in the bank which has nothing to do with the goals terminal of the pc and so forth, have only a very limited run and if run too long at some point in the line – either at once or twenty hours from now – will all of a sudden find the bank going solid. Fantastic, isn't it?

I know some people hearing this and some people thinking about this and looking at this, are saying, "My God, we've been walking a tightrope." Yeah, we have. We have; we've been walking a tightrope. There was a fundamental there, which was a goofy fundamental – an oddball fundamental of some kind or another.

It wasn't much of a tightrope. I had the ends of the thing pretty well nailed in. They were well set in concrete. Very few have fallen by the boards, but nevertheless there was that spook factor. And now we discover it. Well, it's a good time we do. This is our first year of clearing, where we're doing very wide clearing. We certainly better know this now.

All right. Then if you can't – for heaven's sakes, if you can't run anything but the goals terminal of the pc and if you can't neglect running the goals terminal of the pc and if you can't run other terminals on the pc, then how're you ever going to get a rudiment in? How are you ever going to get a rudiment in? Because they contain other terminals than the goals terminal of the pc. Oh-ho. Well, that's horrible, isn't it? And how are you ever going to clean up any present time problem of long duration if it's not on the goals-terminal line, huh? Becomes impossible, doesn't it? Huh? Isn't this fantastic? Well, fortunately it's not impossible. We'll go into that in a moment. [laughter]

I looked at this with a ghastliness before I brought it up here. All right. [laughter]

Let's go into the basic and exact mechanism and I'll show you the other mechanisms. Let's go into the basic, exact mechanism of why the bank acts up and won't erase if you run something else than the goals terminal of the pc. All right. Let's take this object. Let's take this object here. All right. And this object we will say is the goals terminal of the pc and this object over here we will call an other terminal, other terminal.

Now, you're all of a sudden – to see why life becomes practically unlivable and why, also, the people who have been going around spreading these nice quiet philosophy, like "It takes living in order to live your life out. You have to do some living, you see, in order to erase it totally." Oh, yes, that's around, you know. "Processing isn't enough." You hear this occasionally. "Processing isn't enough."
We get some old mystic philosophy or something – somebody will say, "Well, you have to do some living, too, you see." And now we get where they get this "living, too." "You have to go out and live because it'll spin you in every time." Now, I'll show you how this all amounts to.

All right. Here we have the pc valence. This is his goals terminal, this is the valence that you plunge for and that you assess so crudely and so circuitously for with the valence acting up and the rudiments out and you eventually find it. And outside of Saint Hill they occasionally find one, once in a while. They haven't found a right one yet but they find otherwise. All right. That's actually just – that's just – put it under the heading of a dirty crack. That's all it is. It's true, but that's ... [laughter]

I just had a lot of cable traffic today on exactly this subject, back and forth, bang-bang- bang- bang- bang, all on this subject. "We can't find the pc's goals and we can't find the pc's terminals. And there are no ways to find the pc's goals and terminals." And it can't be because the rudiments are out. I mean almost. Wasn't this bad. But I took it in that frame of mind. I just chose to be annoyed and superior. [laughter]

All right. Here's a thetan. He's in the middle of this thing. And this is his terminal and there it is. And the basic postulates on which this goes in are quite interesting. And as soon as you know this, by the way, you could probably, by using fundamentals and a little bit of Straightwire, occasionally make a case go bzzut-blunt-voom! You know, not clear him but make him feel awfully odd. [laughter]

The basic is this: As long as the thetan – he knows this – keeps his attention on his goals-terminal valence, as long as he keeps his attention on it, it is all right. Everything is all right. This is introversion deluxe. As long as he keeps his attention on his goals terminal, everything is all right. The bank is only normally psychotic, and these various things occur.

Now, to this and appended to this goals terminal we have innumerable considerations, packages, personalities, postulates, circuitry and machinery. It's all a complete package. Here it sits. There have been others. There have been earlier ones. But I'm talking about the one which is now available to the auditor and which can be run with impunity and which you find with your ordinary and general run assessment. As long as he keeps his attention upon this valence, he's okay. All is okay. The bank will not misbehave; it'll just be normally nuts. He's taken care of. And that is built into the machinery in which he is operating. That is the built-in strata on which he is functioning. And as soon as he puts his attention on any other terminal – now get this – as soon as he puts his attention on any other terminal, he's doing something that is not quite right.

He is rigged so that the valence in which he is will assert itself. The punishment mechanism is that the valence gets more solid and more assertive and more it, the second that ... The thetan, you see, punishes himself by the basic built-in mechanism and the basic fundamental of the valence that if he puts his attention on anything else then the valence is going to do something extraordinary; it's really going to act up and it's really going to call attention to itself All right.

So he puts his attention over on this other object and instantly this valence, his goals-terminal valence, goes "Woof-rrrrruuum-creak, ummm-UMMMMM, MM-MM,

[laughter] "All right. Calling operator, electric-current switch panel, mysterious current passing through temples. Numb feet, numb feet, calling up numb feet." [laughter] There it goes. The whole machinery goes into action as soon as he puts his attention on another terminal. Now, you thought I was talking about auditing, huh? Oh, I'm not. I'm talking about day-to-day living. Oh, oh. Isn't it fantastic that the more terminals he is asked to put his attention on the worse he will get. And we have just found a big hole in the road called life.

I'll go over that again. The second he puts his attention on any other terminal than the one he is interiorized into, it acts up and he gets his head knocked off one way or the other. And that applies to life.

So when he sees a streetcar conductor, if he were to see the streetcar conductor, the bank would start acting up because this terminal is what we call the bank.

An interesting thing. I have found – I've found Lucifer out today. This was the rig. He goes up to see the bank manager. If he puts his attention on the bank manager, his terminal doesn't even have to be anything related to the bank manager. If his – he, by the way, would be fairly comfortable, comparatively speaking, if his terminal were to be an arch bank robber and it wouldn't be quite so bad putting his attention on merely a bank manager. If they were slightly related, why, it might not be so bad. But his terminal is a washman and he puts his attention on a bank president, you know? The bank president startles him: the bank president says, "Well, all right, I'll give you an overdraft and extend your loan" – depending on what country he's in – you know and it startles him.

You know and for a second he looks at the bank manager. Just for a second, you see, he puts his attention actually on the terminal called bank manager and his bank goes creak, creak, creak, creak, bing! One of these pinball machines you see in these penny arcades, you know, because he put his attention on another terminal.

The pc is drifting along in-session, being well interiorized in running and all of a sudden the auditor drops the E-Meter. Now, just the mechanism of attention sliding off of what the pc's doing is, of course, a shock and a surprise, but that doesn't account for the repercussion that very often occurs.

The pc is well interiorized into his valence because he is running and all of a sudden his attention is shifted over to another terminal, whether it's E-Meter or auditor or – it doesn't matter what. Over to another object or terminal. His attention is shifted outside of this goals terminal.

It could happen to him in life, but in view of the fact his attention is fairly comfortably relaxed on his goals terminal, one way or the other, on his bank in an auditing session, it's just the magnitude of shift. You see, he's more interiorized and it exteriorizes him harder, so his bank goes crunch! clank! Gets solid and acts up.

All of the mechanisms by which he prevents himself from becoming other than this goals terminal go into action and punish him back into becoming the goals terminal. Interesting mechanism, isn't it?
Life, you see. He goes – he sees a fellow student. He feels nervous around this fellow student, you see. He feels nervous. Now, he'll feel as nervous about a fellow student as the fellow student is appearing. A person is as nervous about any other terminal than his goals terminal as it appears or manifests to him. It's a direct proportion.

In other words, the more he is forced to put his attention on another terminal, the more nervous he gets, of course. It works out quite easily and simply.

So here's his – here's the pc and his goals terminal. He's going along just dandy, just fine. He's living totally interiorized. And as long as he never sees anything and as long as he never meets anybody, as long as he never really notices anybody, as long as he never talks to anything or notices the physical universe in any way whatsoever, as long as all this is occurring, he is all right, he thinks. Now, that he can gradually become familiarized with his surroundings or gradually familiarized with other terminals is just marvelous. It just comes under the heading of familiarization.

But if you familiarize him along the line and then suddenly familiarize him rather too suddenly about something of the sort, the whole goals-terminal structure, which is being violated up to this point, will go in again, clank.

Life is an aberrating activity. Well, there are other terminals in life. Now, you wonder why people don't see well. Well, if they don't see well they don't have to see any other terminals and if they don't see any other terminals of any kind, why, of course, their bank doesn't beef up. If they see any other terminals their bank will beef up.

They're teaching themselves this lesson all the time: "If I look not at something else, if I put not 'mine' attention upon any other terminal, I won't get this cotton-picking backache." They know this reactively.

Now, everything in Book One applies. It's how the fish protects himself from being eaten and how he uses restimulators and all that sort of thing. But the one restimulator and the one mechanism that he used is not sufficiently delineated. It's in Book One. It tells you all about it in Book One, 1950, but it doesn't press it home. And there's one factor missing in that book: that there is only one such terminal. And there's one consequence missing in the book: that if he puts his attention on anything else in the way of a terminal, to some slight degree it's going to mess him up.

Well, I just level with you. There's the data. There's the data.

You get out and board a bus, the conductor comes by – click, click, snap, snap – he wants your pennies. You get along just fine if you just hand him the pennies, you see. You see, don't really notice him, don't pay much attention to it, you know. It's perfectly all right. But if he then goes snap, snap with one of these punchers, you see and your attention goes this way, you say, "Damn that," you know? You get – you get about what the borderline is. There's apparently some tolerance and probably the tolerance varies from person to person to the degree that they've been forced to look at other terminals. And they can tolerate quite a bit from another terminal before they go booey. They can tolerate quite a bit. They can talk to people. They can go to parties. They can talk to people. They can act around.
But, actually, life is not peculiarly life that has nothing to do with the mind. That's the way it's mostly been regarded. But why is it that people, as they go along in life, quite ordinaril
gy go to less and less parties. People ordinarily become less and less gregarious. Well, naturally.

I don't think bodies wear out. I think the thetan's – not the body's – the thetan's goals terminal beefs up. And when it beefs up to a killing point, that's it. And that's age. I think this mechanism is that pervasive in life. So you see it's pretty, pretty fundamental fundamental, isn't it.

All right. Well, this puts us in a bind, ladies and gentlemen. It scraps every rudiments process you've got, just like that. Not possible. You can't put rudiments in, obviously. It violates this rule. Obviously, you can't audit a person because the second that you put his attention on you, the auditor, why, the goals terminal beefs in and he gets worse. So obviously auditing is impossible. Obviously, you can't clear up the minor difficulties of the individual if it involves running other terminals. That leaves you with just, of course, a Goals Assessment, a Terminals Assessment and a goals terminal run, period. That's what it leaves you with as effective auditing. That's the lot, as far as effective auditing is concerned.

So the importance of Routine 3, in those characteristics, could not possibly be overrated. We've come back onto the highway and all of a sudden found out there's just one road there. Mess up that road and you've had it. Uruuh! That's a bum show, isn't it?

Look, you can't run the auditor out, because he's a terminal. So if a fellow had too many bum auditing sessions he would have had it, right? Finish him. You may as well think this through in its most gruesome [laughter]... most gruesome lines. I'm presenting it to you with as much crepe on it as possible. If you find some places on it where I haven't hung any crepe, why, you supply them to yourself. You can see that it's a closed channel.

A person who's had a lot of bad auditing, of course, that's ruined him. It's obvious there's no recovery from anything, except by his goals terminal. Yeah, but his rudiments are out so nobody can find his goals terminal and he's not at Saint Hill; he's being audited by somebody who read a – read a short leaflet on it.

So this gets very interesting, doesn't it? That's as narrow a view as you can get. Now, can the view be expanded at all? Now, these long yards of black crepe, festooned about, give us this other aspect. Is there any slightest peepholes of light shining through the funeral crepe? Are there any? Yes, yes.

Here's another bug. Here's another bug datum, another interesting bug datum. It's a purple piece with cross-diagonal orange and blue slots. It's shaped like a biscuit cutter, dissected and made into a tolahedron. And it's ridden along with us for a long time because every once in a while an auditor has sat down and run fifteen or twenty different processes on a pc, all of them figure-figure, think-think processes and the pc's got a tremendous case gain. Next time we try the same processes or anything like these processes, nothing happens.

Did you know this bug factor occurred? You must have run into it yourself. You must have asked somebody to think of being well, sometime or another, you know or something like that and ran this for a little while and something wonderful happened with the case. And
then you got hold of another case and you said, "Think of being well" – with great confidence, you see, you did this; enormous confidence – "Think of being well," you know. And the fellow says, "All right, so what?" [laughter, laugh]

But this funny looking piece is this: that cases have recovered on conceptual address; they have recovered from running concepts. When I first dreamed up Concept Processing, way, way back – I guess it was – I don't know, 52, 53? 52.

A bunch of psychiatrists and chiropractors and a whole bunch of birds, they – next year or something like that – they read all the bulletins carefully, backwards and, God, had something like "conceptualism" and so on. And they just took this original material. Actually, for – at one time, I think only four or five years ago, they were running two or three hospitals in the United States and this is all they were doing. They were doing it all messed up and backwards and they weren't getting much in the way of results. But it – there was something there.

And I didn't know how much there was there. And fortunately – fortunately, I knew basically that it was only a terminal proposition and I knew you couldn't do anything unless you did something with a terminal.

But it was – it's taken a long, long time to sort out what terminal and to find out how to get that terminal and how to run that terminal well. That's taken a long time to do. And if we'd stopped with conceptual activities, significances, we never would have gotten anywhere; nobody would ever clear on significances, but you can make people feel better.

The reason you can't clear on significances is, of course, significances are part of the package of the valence and terminal. They're the valence that the pc is in on his goals-terminal line, see? His considerations can be shifted around and it doesn't do very much. It's processing the terminal. See, but you can shift the terminal's considerations somewhat. Don't think you can't.

One of the ablest of these processes is old Rising Scale Processing. This can change a terminal package around faster than anything you ever heard of. But it doesn't get rid of the terminal, but it doesn't beef it up; it doesn't get it upset. And you can audit it.

And you can lay this one down, not for very permanent results, not for any broad wonderfulness, not for any spectacular thing – merely a miracle here and there. Depending on the good sense with which you pick out the concept, you can audit concepts on a preclear. You can audit concepts on a preclear as long as they do not in any way hook up with a terminal. That is the basic rule. You can audit concepts on a preclear as long as they do not in any way hook up with a terminal other than his goals terminal. That can be done – and that's fairly fortunate for you.

But here's the limiting factor from an auditor's practical viewpoint. Not that it limits this, but the auditor, trying to apply this, is going to every once in a while goof. He's going to think he's running a concept or a significance when actually he is running a terminal. He'll say, "Let's see, we can run concepts and significances so it'd be all right to say, 'What does your mother think? That sounds good. All right. What does your mother think? Thank you." "What does your mother think? Thank you ... Thank you... "
Tone arm starts up, you know. "What does your mother think? Thank you." Tone arm goes on up higher. "What does your mother think? Thank you." Tone arm gets up to 6.0. "What does your mother think? Thank you." Tone arm sticks. "What does your mother think? Thank you." "I don't know. Ron said that you could audit concepts as long as they weren't... connected with any terminals. Uh, oh, wait, wait. Oh, oh. Oh! I've – I've been ... Oh, oh, oh, oh! I'll have to run this out in my next Security Check because I've been running his mother. I've been running a terminal on the pc, you see. And because I had think connected with the terminal, I for a moment, you see, didn't realize there was a terminal there." Now, that's a very gross one. That's a very gross one.

You can – you can duck one like this and you can say, "Well, what would – get the idea of running away from things," you see. "Oh, that's good. That's an easy concept, see. Doesn't put anybody's attention on any terminal." And the tone arm starts up, it starts up and it starts up. And the only thing it is, it's got a terminal mixed up with it, see.

Now, you can get away with running "you," because this covers, to some degree, the goals terminal, see? You can run "you." But you can't run anybody else, not on a pc on a concept. All right.

And you can – here's the next big, broad basis of it: You can security check terminals. Why can you security check terminals? Because the person's overt and withholds from the terminal in a limited sense were when his attention got pinned on another terminal than his goals terminal and if you can separate his attention at those points on the track when they have been pinned against other goals terminals, you of course are less activating his goals terminal. You are picking out times on the track when his attention got onto other people selectively and pinned and stuck on other people and you're picking those points off. And not running any repetitive process or fixing his attention on the terminal and – in any particular way, but by getting his attention on the things that pinned his attention in the past over onto the terminal, he therefore feels better.

And that's why a Security Check works. Hasn't anything to do with God and sin. Has to do with broken mores and attention pinned on groups and it has to do with all those things, that's for sure. But I'm talking about just why would coming into the church and confessing that you just murdered one of the choir boys last night, for immoral reasons, produce a tremendous case gain, as they claim? See?

Well, his attention – he's got an overt and he's got a withhold which pinned his attention on the track on another terminal than the one he's on. You weren't saying, "Think of murdering choir boys. Thank you. Think of murdering choir boys. Thank you. Think of murdering choir boys. Thank you." Eventually, the only thing that's coming through to the pc is choir boys, choir boys, choir boys and his bank start – is likely to get solid. See, he's liable to get a high tone arm and get very upset and that sort ...

Now, why does the high tone arm occur on a withhold? Why is it accompanied by a high tone arm? The person is withholding something and so forth. It's because at that point on the track their attention is pinned on another terminal, other than their goals terminal, so you get a high tone arm. You got that one? All right.
Now get the idea of a time track and the individual at intervals in the past has had this mechanism violated by life. Life has demanded of him that he take his attention off his goals terminal and put it on another terminal. And of course those are best expressed under the heads of overts and withholds. So there's the points where his attention is on other terminals.

So if you can just knock out those points delicately – flick, flick, get the overt off, get the withhold off – he frees from that terminal and his attention is no longer, at that point of the track, violating his goals terminal, so he feels better. So knowing that rule you can security check with impunity, as long as you don't put his attention on too many terminals.

That is to say, let's not sit down and make a list of 8,795 people and then let's say, "Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother" – and all of a sudden the pc's tone arm starts up, up, up, up, up, up. Of course, it's the auditor who is putting his attention on the mother.

See, the auditor is not disengaging his attention from Mother in the past; the auditor is putting his attention on Mother in the session. Now, you get the two differences there? That's a very delicate difference. We can say, "All right, now, what have you done to your mother?"

"What was that?"
"Well, I did this and that..."
"Have you ever withheld anything from your mother?"
"Yeah." Plang. "Did that and so forth."

"When was that?" Plang, you know. Boom, bang. "All right. Now, have you got any other withholds from your family? All right, that's fine. When was that one? All right." You know. Just – you could run almost regular Security Checks.

As long as you don't say, "Well now, what sort of a person was your mother? Now, was your mother very mean to you, one way or the other? Now, was your mother a big woman? Was your mother a small woman? Did your mother talk loudly or talk softly? Exactly how did your mother ... And all of a sudden it gets to be a word Mother to this fellow, with letters about six feet high, you see and it's all massy and bulky and he feels very crushed in and starts to feel sort of solid and sort of upset.

You've just taken his attention off his goals terminal, that's all. You've stressed the other terminal too much. You get the idea?

So you can get the overts off and the withholds off. Oh yeah. Well, this takes off the times on the track when their attention got stuck on the other terminal. And as long as you don't get this other terminal pushed in to a point in the session where their attention is being fixated on this terminal which is in violation of the goals terminal, their bank won't get solid, they will recover and they'll feel fine. Okay?

I gave you all the rudiments processes that are effective processes here several lectures ago. They are very easy processes actually. The basic process is this: "What's your attention been on lately? Thank you."
"What has it been on?" Not "What could you look at?" You see, "What could you look at?" is a violation of the goals terminal. "What has your attention been on?" I just give you that as the fundamental form. "What has your attention been on?"

You could spot where his attention had been on things and the rudiments would clear up. So here's a fundamental way. This is actually part of a lecture of some two or three months ago.

You've got a present time problem. All right. Don't run problems because problems bring up terminals and the person then finds himself facing a terminal and then you'll find the problem doesn't run because it's not his goals terminal and you're going in circles. So you don't run a present time problem. You merely spot the problem, when he has had it before and try to get the earliest time his attention was on such a problem. You just sort of backtrack it and pull out the earliest pin and let his attention just come on up to present time on the thing. And you'll find out that the problem has discharged without running terminals in connection with the problem.

You understand, rudiments have not been unsuccessful because they are not run very long. You're not putting his attention on this terminal over any long period of time, so you've gotten away with them. But recognize, we can recognize now that we have gotten away with something.

And you can continue to get away with this and you can go on running rudiments processes the same way you are running them without running into too much trouble. But here and there you're going to run into enough trouble to cause us to gradually graduate it over to merely this "What has your attention been on?"

All right, let us take an ARC break. All right. How would you clean up an ARC break? You would say, "Well, do you recall any other AR – any other things there that were bad that you didn't – you know, was – your attention was on saying something to somebody and you just couldn't say it and so on? Do you recall any other circumstances like this?"

"Oh, yes, yes."

"Oh, well, got another one? Oh, yeah" – boom. "Got another one?" – boom. "Got another one? Yeah, that's right."

"Oh well, I see what's wrong in the session now," the pc says. "I've – I've been trying to tell you something and I couldn't tell you," see? His attention is still stuck on trying to communicate to the auditor or something of the sort, see.

Find out where his attention got fixed in the session and unfix it and of course he'll feel better because it's not in violation of his goals terminal. Simple. So if you just specialize, in rudiments, in unfixing the pc's attention where it is fixed, then he will feel better.

You see, wherever his attention was fixed on the past track on another terminal than himself, he violated his goals terminal, so it's a little aberrated point on his track. He feels a little bit funny about it.

It's amazing the amount of – number of terminals that pcs can actually look at without spinning in. But if you take auditing, with all of the heavy-drill mechanics back of it and try
to make them face up to a terminal in auditing, wow, wow, wow. It gets to be pretty wild. I mean, you keep bringing up ... Well, let us say that you have taken up his mother, you have run his mother; and it was perfectly all right; and it worked out all right. And you ran his father and you started running his father. And this had nothing to do – you never assessed this fellow and you've run his father and you were just going to clean up his whole family, you see. And you ran his father and you ran his father and you ran his father.

And, I don't know, the tone arm seemed to be getting up and the case seemed to be getting sort of sticky. So you ran his father, so you ran his father, so you ran his father, so you ... The case seemed to be getting awful sticky by this time and you couldn't quite see what the devil was happening on the thing and you sort of knocked it off. And you decided, well, you couldn't do very much about that. And you just skipped it after a while.

And three or four days later it was all right. You asked him about his father and he didn't seem to be particularly upset, so you let it go by. Have you had that kind of thing happen? Well, that's what's the back of it.

You're putting his attention on Father and his father was a wild violation of goals terminal. So was Mother, but you see it's Mother plus Father made quite a lot of violation of goals-terminal attention, you see and by the time you'd gotten – some pcs you could get fifteen family members or something like that up the line before they finally went clank!

So Sec Checking can be done. Disengaging attention fixed in the past can be done. And goals terminal running can be done. Everything you have learned about prior confusion becomes terrifically valid if you omit the problem running. Don't run the problem because you immediately and at once run into groups and other people and other terminals.

All right, that's what I learned from you. I watched your tone arms going. Boy, you sure had a time. That's why I changed you over quite rapidly on to running your goals terminal so swiftly, on almost the identical process. Of course, it was a good thing. You got used to the process, got used to the form, got used to auditing it and it didn't do anybody any particular amount of damage, except one class member, and she's recovered today, so that's all right.

And there is the view of the thing. Don't – just in the interest of not goofing, just in the interest of having nothing funny happen in the session, just in the interest of everything going along smoothly and the pc never having any ARC breaks – if you want to have no ARC breaks with the pc, keep his attention on his goals terminal and run him on his goals terminal. Never put his attention on the auditor and never let his attention go on anything else but the goals terminal, pockety-pockety-pockety-pockety-pockety-pock.

Now, there's another mystery on this I'd better tell you about, is why did it take one of thirty-six or more of thirty-six Havingness Processes? Some pcs ran on one Havingness Process and some pcs ran on the other Havingness Processes. One of the thirty-six Havingness and one of the thirty-six Confront Processes do not violate, for some peculiar reason, the goals terminal of the pc and therefore, remedy his havingness and let him move on the track. For some reason or another they're all various combinations of commands and it sort of lets him walk through a gate.
So you ask one pc, you say, "Look around here and find something you can have." He can't run it. The thing gets stiff. Why does it get stiff? Violates – "attention must be on his goals terminal." His attention must be on his goals terminal, you ask him to look at the wall. Oh, no. Well, you've asked him to look at the wall in this particular way and that's no good. So you finally ask him, "What emotion does that wall have in it?" or something like this. Oh, he'd tell you that. That's easy. And for some reason or other this doesn't violate his goals terminal. It's where the concept of the havingness and the concept of the confront are matched to the now-I'm-supposed-to packages of the goals terminal.

And where these things are exactly matched – where the havingness is matched to the goals terminal and doesn't violate the principles of the goals terminal and where the confront doesn't violate the goals terminal and matches its principles, then that havingness and confront works like a bomb on the pc. You only find two or three or four of those processes will work on each pc. And there's thirty-six of them and pcs work on all different ones.

Now, what's variable in cases? What's variable in cases is the goal. What's variable in cases is the terminal and the now-I'm-supposed-to's that go around that valence. And these can be infinite. You can have the most complex sort of a valence. Think of your own valence just at the moment – did you ever see so many complex facets to anything in your life as that valence?

Well, people really don't understand what a bank president is. They really don't. He does this and he's now-I'm-supposed-to do that and he's now-I'm-supposed-to here and he's now-I'm-supposed-to there. And for practically every answer and facet of life, the bank president has an answer. That's marvelous, absolutely marvelous. And as long as you don't violate any of these particular principles, you can live a happy life. At what cost? Well, just the cost of you, that's all. Of course, you can't be a good bank president, either, because it takes more than I'm-supposed-to to be a bank president.

But somewhere in those Havingness Processes – somewhere in the Havingness Processes, somewhere in the Confront Processes – there's one or two or three or four that work. Well, they don't violate the terminal. They're not necessarily what the terminal would do or not do, but they are not in conflict in some mysterious, alchemical way, with the now-I'm-supposed-to's of the valence. And so you sort of found a little hole in the picket fence it went through. Well, that's very good.

Now, we're also, then, in contest with looking at other holes and for other holes in the picket fence in the way of how do you do things with a case. Well, most concepts would be functional as long as they're strictly concepts. They'll patch up a case a little bit.

Of course, you can't change this valence around. No, the valence is in in concrete. You can run the valence out, but you can't change it around. But running concepts you can make somebody feel better and you can alter something of their considerations. And remember there's a thetan there, too. And concepts are a hole in the fence. Because it's all right to put his attention on an idea, but it is not all right to put his attention on another valence.

Therefore, you have innumerable people able to absorb or pay attention to or have concourse with ideas that cannot have any concourse with masses. They cannot observe mas-
ses. They can't do anything with masses or people or something, but they can do something with an idea.

Well, a hole in the fence is that the – an idea is not a violation of the valence terminal. Now, *unpinning* attention off violations of the goals terminal in the past – you see, times when his attention has been fixated over on another terminal... Of course, that was a violation of the goals terminal, so you're patching up that; you're of course freeing his attention on the backtrack. And that's done by Security Checking.

So Security Checking is a wide hole in the fence. Now, there's another hole in the fence, is that you can run any problem by picking up the zone of prior confusion and sec-checking it. His attention stuck on the problem because his attention was already stuck on violations of the goals terminal prior to the occurrence of the problem. So you can always get rid of a present time problem by finding the incident of prior confusion.

I did this the other night with Mary Sue. Just the most mysterious thing you ever saw. You get used to these sort of things – takes it in stride. I was thinking about this and I noticed that after you – after you left, she was wheezing and sneezing and so forth. She was sitting in the other room and there was no heater in there and she was very cold. And I noticed that she put on – as any Texan would – put on a wool sweater and then she put on a coat over the wool sweater and then she put one of these driving-sports-car, heavy-padded jackets on over that, you see and she was looking around for a couple of shawls or something. [laughter]

And I said, "What goes on?" She says, "I'm cold." So frankly, she was under a very heavy pressure to get her reports done, don't you see? And I was standing in the door talking to a lot of you, you know and I was slowing her down, you see. So time was sort of stopped. But her attention, you see, was rapidly snapped over on to the group standing in there holding the door open.

Now, you said, "All right, now, all you have to do is get off her overt thoughts of why don't they go home and why doesn't Ron shut the door and why doesn't it get hot in here and why doesn't somebody turn on the heater?" You know, this sort of thing you would have said. "That's the thing to do and that's all set."

Well, I just made a nice interesting little two-bit test out of it and I did all that. And she was still sniveling and she was looking around for four or five more mackinaws and shawls, Texas fashion and so forth. And then I found that while reviewing your sec checking earlier, she had become just shakingly furious with a couple of incidents where a lousy job was being done and it was the prior confusion.

Everything blew straight up. She took off the mackinaw after throwing me out. I actually [laughter] ... You get this as an incident? If Suzie will beg my pardon. But you get that as a very homey fundamental little piece of nonsense. See?

The apparent O/Ws that would directly cause the situation had – and the exact problem had nothing whatsoever to do with being parked on the track. That was all much earlier. It was actually an hour or two earlier than that. And then some other incidents had happened and made the earlier incident key in. It was just the prior confusion to what the pc was saying.
And she didn't have any recall of having done this other thing at all. She wasn't thinking about it at all. The second it blew into view, [snips fingers] that was it.

So actually you haven't lost anything. You have a faster method of getting rid of a present time problem than you had before, when you get a Sec Check of the prior confusion. Just find out who was there earlier and did the needle move while they were there earlier and find out what they did earlier than the time they are worried about. If they're worried about eight o'clock, find out what happened at five. They are very stuck in a fight with their wife as they come into session and you say, "There's a hell of a present time problem. We've got to get rid of this problem and so on, in order to get on with the session." And you say, "When did this fight take place?"

And they say, "Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho. It's been going on all evening. It started about supper time."

You say, "Good. When was supper?"

"Well, supper was at six-thirty."

"All right, that's fine. What happened at five?"

"Oh well, that was before the argument with my wife, you see. And this has nothing to do with the present time problem. Because my present time problem with her – she didn't have dinner ready and I had to get back here for the session and so forth and we had a fight."

"Oh well, all right. Well, what did happen at five? Where were you at five?"

"I was down at the lumberyard."

"Well, all right, so you were down at the lumberyard. Who was down at the lumberyard?"

"Oh well, nobody, but there were those-" Clank!

"Who was that? What was that? What occurred then? What did you do?"

"Oh, well, I completely forgot. As a matter of fact I fired the foreman." "All right," you say, "thank you very much. Do you have a present time problem?" You won't get any action. You didn't even discuss the fight with their wife. Anything the pc is worried about is pinned by an unknown prior to the fact. That is the rule. Anything that the pc is worried about is pinned by an unknown prior to the fact. Any present time problem is fixed as a problem by a prior occurrence, prior to the occurrence or subject matter of the problem.

I've told you for some years now that any time a pc blew on you, they had had an ARC break for at least an hour – half an hour to an hour and a half. And maybe when I get your goals terminal all run, maybe you'll notice what's happening to the pc and be able to put your attention on the pc without caving your own bank in. [laughter]

So, you clean up an ARC break. How do you clean up an ARC break? Well, the pc goes clank, blump, thud, tone arm goes up, things get sticky. You say, "Do you have an ARC break?"

"Well, yes."
"What happened?"

"Well, you muffed that command." Hm-hm. All right.

Now, let's use the attention — "What was your attention on?" sort of a thing. You get the idea? "When was the first time your attention was distracted from your auditing, from being audited, that you can pick up now?"

"Oh well!" And bing, bing, bong, thud, boom, boom, pick up two more, bang, bang, another one, boom, that's it. They're in present time, no ARC break. If you don't believe it, try it sometime.

Or it was the fight they had before the session that you didn't pick up as a PT problem. But the ARC break is hanging up and is an ARC break because of a prior enturbulence which is not now in the consciousness of the pc. Anything that is wrong with the mind is unknown to the mind.

You needn't make a full fetish out of that and say, "Well, if the pc says he has a stomachache there is no need to believe him at all, because the pc knows nothing about his case." You see, you could carry this out to a ridiculosity. But if the pc said he had a stomachache and then told you where he got the stomachache and why he has the stomachache, you should realize that this has exceeded the knowingness of the pc, because if he knew where he got the stomachache, he wouldn't have one. But you still use where he got the stomachache and when he got the stomachache, so that you can get a few hours earlier than that.

Fellow says, "I had a nervous breakdown." All of a sudden, why, it's most — you see, you're all trapped into this as being the most logical thing in the world. He said, "I — I was sitting at my desk and," he said, "my business was semibankruptcy and — and everything was going to pieces and all of a sudden my secretary stuck her head in and screamed at me, 'Your father has just died in a convulsion and uh — his will is bankrupt,' and uh-uh—and so forth and that's why I have this nervous breakdown."

Well now, you must believe that the pc has a nervous breakdown. That's perfectly fact. He can observe that. But why he has the nervous breakdown, when stated by the pc, is a violation of this fact. He still has the consequences of a nervous breakdown. If he knew where the nervous breakdown came from, he would not have the consequences of a nervous breakdown.

So you take the fact that he is suffering from a nervous breakdown — all right, that's fine. And you take the fact of when he thought it started and what he thought began it, in order to get a bit earlier than that and find out what did begin it and start it. It'll always be earlier and always be unknown to the pc. That's how life hangs up.

Now, couple this with the fact that it was always a violation of his goals terminal because his attention fixated on something else. See, his attention fixated on something else, some other terminal. If you pry his attention loose from having fixated on prior terminals, why, you've got the thing taped.

In other words, Sec Checking works, concept works, getting the person's attention off parts of the track it is fixed on, that works. Running terminals — don't do it. Might as well lay
the law down now, rather than soften the blow and try to make myself look very intelligent about the thing. I pat myself on the back for knowing there was a terminal there. Nobody else knew it. Yeah. And now I find out that we've got a firm grip on the terminal. We know that there is a terminal there that is the terminal we're looking for.

And I can impart to you this oddity that apparently, now that the checks are all in, some of the variations of auditing, the ARC breaks of pcs, a lot of "Why does the tone arm go up and stick?" – a lot of these answers are rapidly satisfied by the fact that his attention mustn't be on any other terminal than the goals terminal. And it's only by taking his attention off the goals terminal, by running some other wrong terminal to the case, works.

I'll give you an oddity. Do you know that many Dynamic Straightwire – not very many, but enough to make it interesting – Dynamic Straightwire terminals that were found for runs in yesteryear are the goals terminal of the pc. Isn't that interesting? They're sometimes worded just a hair different or something like that. It's quite interesting that auditors here and there just picked right out off the cuff, you might say, by doing a Dynamic Assessment and actually would arrive with something which was a near throw on it. One instance – the Dynamic Assessment gave the food of the terminal, which the Goals Assessment found. In other words, it was right on the line. It wouldn't have been damaging to have run it.

Did a Dynamic Assessment and let's say – well, this wasn't it – but "chop suey." For some reason or other the only thing that could fall out of the hamper on a Dynamic Assessment was chop suey. And we assessed the fellow and we find that his goals terminal was a Chinaman.

You see, they're – they're matched up here and there that closely – There are probably other methods of crosschecking whether or not the goals terminal is right. There are safeguards of this, having become sufficiently important.

Mary Sue just proposed a safeguard. She says, "Well, why don't you do a Prehav Scale assessment, then do a run on the 10-way bracket on groups and problems on the goal. Not do the Prehav run, you see. And then go back and do another Prehav assessment and see if a lot of new levels have suddenly come live, as a crosscheck."

There are probably a lot of these crosschecks could be used, one way or the other and you'd know very well whether or not you were running the pc's goals terminal. But the best run is, is the pc interested? Is his case running? Is it fairly easy to keep the rudiments in? And does the pc say, "Oh no, I never want to get Clear"? Is the pc getting upset with life? And is the pc saying, "Oh, I never want to be audited again; this is just too ghastly," yet continues to appear for session? [laughter]

There are a number of tests. There are a number of behaviors which are peculiar to the goals terminal.

All right. Well, there have been a lot of snarled spots taken off the line and they've made a much neater picture. You possibly will feel a little bit confused. Some of your data you may feel you now have in crosswise, it's been unstabilized. That's why I've gone over it carefully to tell you what data is or is not crosswise. And the only thing I'm telling you is that
you have assisted me to the degree of showing me that you cannot run a problem. Can't be done.

We still have the whole Problems Intensive, the whole lot, but we have it in its original version. You go ahead and find it, you find the problem. And you only find the problem in order to find the prior confusion. And then you just sec check the prior confusion and you've got your – your Problems Intensive is just fine. Just omit running the problem. You get in trouble running the problem, but you won't get in trouble taking their attention off violations of the goals terminal earlier, even though you didn't know what the goals terminal was. Do you see that?

So it's the same thing. You do it the same way. There's absolutely – everything is just exactly right. The only thing I've got to change on the form is just that one little line about running the problem. You don't even have to word or run the problem and none of you could do that anyhow, so it's all right. [laughter]

Yeah, you could run it all right, but wording it, that was beyond you, you see.

Okay. So there we are. I've brought you up to date. Some of your cases ought to be running like startled deer. I've relaxed the rules now on which you're being examined, therefore, I expect you to be examined even more frequently, but not under so much duress. The thing for you to do is to get Clear by Saturday and then start studying Monday, finish up the checksheet by next Thursday and you've got it made. [laughter] Okay?

Thank you.
SECURITY CHECKING: AUDITING ERRORS

A lecture given on 26 October 1961

Thank you.

The subject of the lecture today is Security Checking. And this is the 26th of October AD 11. It better be called AD 11, because something new and strange is happening. There are some cases breaking up, in a fine way. Of course, you probably don't think so. [laughter] Do you think anything is happening to cases?

Audience: Yes.

Female voice: Yes.

Oh, you think something is happening to cases. Isn't that nice? Isn't that nice?

Is anything happening to your case? No. Nothing is happening to your case. Is that right?

Audience: Yes.

Tell me the truth. Do you think anything is happening to your case?

Audience: Yes!

All right. Do you think anything is happening to your pc's case?

Audience: Yes!

Male voice: Yeah.

Well, is your goal to make something happen to cases?

Female voice: Yes!

You sure? [laughter] All right.

Okay. I want to talk to you, why things don't happen to cases.

There are certain definite fundamentals of processing which must be observed before a result is obtained in auditing. There are certain safe things you can audit: You can audit concepts, ideas; you can Security Check and get overts, by getting the times an individual's attention was pinned on another terminal on the track; you can find the goal and terminal of the pc and run it; you can run engrams on the goals-terminal line after a long run has established that they are on a goals-terminal line. And that is about all you can do. That's just about all you can do, successfully, to a case.
If you try to do anything else – such as run a generalized terminal (to run "Mother" out of the case while his terminal is "a tinker"); if you try to make him create things which are off his goals-terminal line; if you try to do many other things having to do directly with terminals and running terminals which are not his goals terminal; or if you ask questions too searchingly so that they are repetitive and are newly attracting his attention to a terminal which his attention was not on before – you're going to get a slowdown. His bank is going to become more solid and he's going to be upset.

I'll give you an idea. Your idea of what's wrong with the pc is he's having trouble with his father. Well, your idea stems from the fact that the pc has told you repeatedly that he's always having trouble with his father. So you say, "If I could just get Father out of the road, then we're all set here and we will therefore run Father." "Now, what have you done to Father? What have you withheld from Father? What have you done to Father? What have you withheld from Father? What have you done to Father? What have you withheld from Father?"

You see, it sounds almost right. Sounds just like you're going to get away with it and everything is fine. And then the pc doesn't recover and things look a lot different to the pc – all bad. You see that?

Because you're saying, "Father, Father, Father. Your attention on Father? Put your attention on Father. Put your attention newly on Father. Put your attention – brand-new attention – let's search for more things which you have done to Father." The guy has already given you everything he's done to Father, you see? "So put your attention on Father. Put your attention on Father. Put your attention on Father." And of course, that means "Take your attention off your goals terminal. Take your attention off your goals terminal." That's the one thing he must not do.

At no time must he take his attention off his goals terminal. He knows this. This is the one thing he knows better than he knows that there's air and sunshine. He never found that out yet that there's air and sunshine. But he does know that there is this terminal, "a tinker."

Of course, he knows it so well that he doesn't know it at all. It's buried completely down in the further deep reaches of the coal mines. Yet, it is nevertheless there and it is reactive. So we can say bluntly what some of these oddities that we have run into occasionally – we've piloted our way through them; don't think that we've just been making mistakes left and right, and front and center. We've had things that prevented any casualty from occurring along in this line.

But let's take a look at what you could do that would be wrong. Let's take a list of wrongnesses that an auditor can pull: (1) he could disobey the Auditor's Code; (2) he wouldn't know his business; he – (3) he audits a pc with a screaming present time problem; (4) he audits a pc when the pc knows he can't communicate with the auditor – which is Clause 16 of the Auditor's Code, after all, goes out of two-way comm, but that's a particularly serious one. And he could run the case with tremendous withholds on it, and of course, this is another violation of Clause 16. It's a violation of the Auditor's Code to run a case with tremendous overt undisclosed on the case, because the pc is not in two-way comm with the auditor. So that would be dead wrong. And the other dead-wrong thing he could do would be to pick a terminal at random and run it ad nauseam. And that's – that's dead wrong.
That's the first time you've heard that that was dead wrong. This is the first time we've known that was dead wrong. Before, we said only do a terminals by assessment and only do this and only do that. These are little preventives which kept very much bad from occurring, but now I can tell you broadly that you just shouldn't fool with it. You just shouldn't run any terminal but the goals terminal of the pc.

All right. Now if you can't run any terminal but the goals terminal of the pc, where does this leave you on the subject of Security Checking? Because you've got to find out what he has done to his mother and what he hasn't done to his mother and what he's withheld from his mother and so forth. Is that running a terminal? No. It is not running a terminal as long as it's run against the E-Meter and you're only asking for it every time the meter falls. Because every time the meter falls, the pc's attention is stuck on that other terminal and it is a violation of his attention being off his goals terminal. And every time your meter falls on a security question, you have located a time and zone on the track where the individual has violated "attention must be on the goals terminal." This is the basic modus God-elp-us of the pc. This is the stuff of which he is built. His attention must be on the goals terminal.

So every time you get a knock on the meter, and you say, "Have you done anything to anybody? Have you withheld anything from anybody?" – you actually find a knock on the meter, you find a reaction on the needle; it immediately says his attention is stuck in violation of the goals terminal. That's for just Security Checking. That isn't the – what's back of every fall you ever get on a meter. But that's the violation of the goals terminal.

So, on an E-Meter, where you get a needle reaction, you have a violation of a goals terminal. Now, if you leave him in a violation of the goals terminal, you have an upset pc. If you find one, you got to clear it. That's the rule which goes along with it.

This assumes tremendous importance, because here, there, I've been picking up cases, time after time after time where an individual has been left with an uncleared withhold. And I've found in every case that he's squirrelly; he's thinking unkind thoughts; he's wondering about things; he's wondering if Scientology works or doesn't work; he's having an awful time. Actually, he dreams up all sorts of gossip trying to lessen the overts of one kind or another and he just gets into a terrible spin.

And this is an empirical datum. This is a datum which I've been watching now through auditors' reports coming in from Central Organizations, from this particular class and they are just mounting up to be legion. They are innumerable. This is a datum which is being forced upon me by constant, constant, constant observation of that datum. And it is not a datum which you can ignore, any more than I have been able to ignore the datum. So I say, "Well, all right. Huh – Susie Ann is in an HPA class and she doesn't know what she's doing, and so she misses a couple of Security Checks. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. So what?"

Oh, I'm afraid that an auditor has to learn how to swim perfectly the first time he's thrown in the bay on a Security Check. Isn't that interesting. Because frankly, you could get blows out of the Academy. Every time a student sits down and he picks up the E-Meter and he says, "Let's see, these are the – that's the tone arm. No, no, no, that's – that's – that's – . Ah-ha," and so on. And he hands it to somebody diffidently and he says, "Now let's see."
The Instructor finally comes around disgustedly and says, "This is the 'on' button, and ..." – throw it on.

"What's this moving needle?" [laughter, laughs] "When you turn it on, the needle moves. Move the tone arm; needle moves. Ha-ha! Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! Ha-ha-ha! Move the tone arm and the needle moves. I see what they're doing. When the auditor gets something on the pc, he moves the tone arm and that moves the needle. Now I understand an E-Meter."

And he understands it all for two days and then a pc actually has a stray, unkind thought about what he's doing, you see – one of his fellow students – and the needle moves when he isn't touching the tone arm. "Broken." [laughter]

And during that period of time, unfortunately, although he has to be practicing in something vaguely resembling meter actions and so forth, he is asking people questions and these questions, any of them, we could – then become Security Check questions. And he doesn't know enough at this period of time that he's got to clear it off. The needle moved. What's he supposed to do? Well, he writes it down on the piece of paper he has, "Needle moved."

The Instructor comes around and says, "Where's Pete?"

And this fellow that's just written it down, "I don't know. He went out..." [laughter, laughs]

And you have the HCO squadron of cavalry riding all over the neighborhood trying to round up Pete. By this time he has socked a policeman, he has done this, he's done that and slept with his best friend's wife.

Well, somehow or another they get it patched up, but that is the immediate consequence of what would happen if he missed a Security Check question. We can't ignore the fact. That is what happens. It's just in from every place. Some of the most confoundedly weird things have occurred you have ever heard of.

Girl in an HGC: They missed a Security Check on her. She rushes straight out. She sees every friend she's got. She says, "All auditors are doing in that organization is sleeping with their pcs and there's all this going on and there's that going on, and it's all terrible and it's awful over there, and horrible things are occurring in that organization." And then this girl went and wrote a whole bunch of letters on the subject, and all this in relatively a few hours. She was the busiest person you ever saw.

And you know, it took the organization about a week to round this up? They got ahold of the girl and they put her down, and had enough sense to realize that the last thing she was doing was unflat. That was probably all that was really known about it.

So they made her do the last thing she was doing and it was a hot question on a Security Check. And it was something to do with the second dynamic. And the auditor had simply gone on, you know, and not asked any questions about it and then sort of ended the session and it was never going to come up again, and boom! Immediate repercussion.

So hell hath no fury like a pc whose withhold isn't pulled. It works completely reverse. I don't know whether the pc instinctively realizes he's been done wrong or if he has had some-
thing reactivated so that he must compensate for it or if he is making – trying to make nothing out of the overt by making nothing out of the people who might have gotten the overt, so that nobody will believe them when the overt does come up, you see? But an unpulled overt has horsepower in it. It has real horsepower. And it drives people to the most confounded excesses you ever heard of.

I think the excesses of the criminal are simply on the basis of just tremendous numbers of overts against the society. And the overts and the withholds – the overts which are a withhold – then become the horsepower which make the criminal. Not quite that the man goes wrong, you see, and then – who hides it from the society, the way we ordinarily look at it. I think it's quite different.

I think, because the individual is withholding something, then you get horsepower. I think this is a source of explosive reactor fuel of some kind or another. So a restimulated withhold becomes a lighted charge of dynamite. And when you ask the pc if he has a withhold and then you don't get it, you have just the same as stuffed a stick of dynamite down his throat and litten the fuse. You've lit the fuse and then you say, "Well, you don't have anything." You see? That's it.

After a while in the distance, there's a dull boo-om-m-m-mm! You see? And you say, "What's that? It has nothing to do with me. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. It has nothing to do with me. I mean, I audited him. I tried to help him. Tried my best, but he came to us too late."

You see, you could get off into all sloppy things. You realize this – a psycho-analyst always and totally excuses every failed case on that one phrase: "He came to us too late," which I think is quite amusing. He believes this, too, you know? He believes it implicitly. Fellow has been with him five years and "He came to me too late." Always. I've talked to these birds and they tell me with a perfectly straight face. Well, three of his patients have committed suicide in the last month. And he tells you this, quite frankly: "Oh, yes, they committed suicide in the last month. Yeah, a lot of them. Well, there's Bessie. She came to me too late. And there was George. If he'd come sooner, I could have done something. And then there's Mehitabel. Well, long, long overdue. She should have come to me much earlier."

You say, "Well, what were you doing with these patients for that time?"

"Well, they just lay there on the couch and talked."

"Well, did you ask them any questions?"

"Well, of course. I asked them what had been done to them in their childhood." [laughter] Restimulate every overt in the bank, don't you see?

Boy, I tell you. You talk about people who have taken people's lives in their hands, look into that field. But it'd be any field where you didn't pursue the question.

Now, the poor old Catholic church that I have raised so much the devil with occasionally, from time to time – the poor old Catholic church – for the lack of this datum which we're talking about right this minute, has developed all of its heretics, its Martin Luthers and the lot. The boys they've had all the trouble with, they manufactured at the confession box.
Person comes up, he's just groveling in the dust, you see, and he's just gone through having intercourse with his sister or something. And he scratches on the confession box, you see, and he says, "I have something to confess."

And the priest is sleepy that day, you know? He says, "Yeah, what – my son."

And he says, "Well, I've done something very..." And his courage fails him, as you see in pcs all the time. The guy's courage fails him, you see? And he says, "Well, I – I heard some nasty gossip about the mayor." [laughter]

And the priest says, "Well, what was it, my son?"

"Well, I heard the mayor was sleeping with the alderman's wife and that the alderman – and that the alderman has committed incest with his sister." [laughter]

And the priest says, "Well, that's eighty-nine and a half paternosters and two ump-teegahs, so tool off now."

And the fellow says, "Whew!"

And a little time goes on and the Inquisition all of a sudden is called upon to find out what all this sin is going on over there and what's all this commotion against the true church. And all this commotion against the true church is getting more and more commotional.

Well, they managed to burn most of them. After they'd missed their withholds, then they had to burn them. But they managed to burn most of them, but they missed just enough to cause an overthrow of the Catholic church, because it's no longer the dominant church on Earth. Well, I forget, we in the white race consider ourselves extremely, egocentrically, as being the races of Earth. But as a matter of fact, there are so many other churches elsewhere that are bigger than any church we have anywhere that that was it. But one time the Catholic church could have numbered up along with some of the great Eastern churches, and so on, and it doesn't anymore.

But that's it. There's your Martin Luther. There's your Calvin. I'm sure that it happened right there at the confession box: priest didn't have an E-Meter. I think it's very poetic justice, because he buried most of the knowledge – the church buried a great deal of knowledge that came out of ancient Greece and Egypt, and so forth. They put a lot of this knowledge away because they didn't think it was good for people. They kept it in the catacombs. Actually, they released Aristotle – just in the Middle Ages, they suddenly broke out Aristotle complete and released it to the scholarly world.

Nobody had ever heard of Aristotle and Plato before that. They broke out Plato so as to prove that Catholicism was the true religion. All of these various things occurred and they sort of shut off knowledge, one way or the other. And they didn't have an E-Meter. That's – that's what it amounts to.

Well, what problem are you faced with then? You're faced with an immediate heretic. He doesn't like you. He doesn't like your organization. He's going to dream up all sorts of wild tales and lies about you and your organization, or about others or something, because of the missed withhold. And what are you supposed to do then?
Well, let me caution you against following the policy of our immediate forebears on this particular planet. Firewood is very costly. If only on economic grounds, why, you shouldn't have to go burn every person, you see, who has been missed on a Security Check.

Now that's what it would amount to, sooner or later. You're walking up the line, you see? You're walking into a heavy – a heavier power position on this particular planet and that's what it would amount to. You already have means and ways of cutting down the overts against the group, to keep the group from being sundered and keep individuals of the group from being cut to pieces. You have that, inherently, in a Security Check.

Now, supposing the Security Check becomes badly done and overts get missed left and right. Well, the very mechanism which is supposed to prevent dissension and upset and slowed-down cases, and all of this sort of thing – that very mechanism is the mechanism which restimulates an heresy, of some kind or another, which eventually brings about an overthrow of the group.

So it's no very light thing I'm talking about now. And this has been presented to me so many times, on so many folders, by so many people, and it has happened so often, that we must conclude that it – not that it is an invariable reaction. No reason to conclude that it is invariable, that because somebody has had a withhold and it hasn't been pulled, that this person immediately tries to destroy everything under the sun, moon and stars. We're not justified in concluding that, because it's happened many times without repercussion. And some auditor got it later or didn't get it at all and the case merely stalled. And some Director of Processing or some auditor someplace noticed the case wasn't moving sooner or later, and decided to get ambitious, and went back and found the withhold.

And the only thing that happened there is the case stalled, which is an overt enough, but nothing happened to the group and nothing happened to individuals. But you can count on the fact that it will happen sufficiently often that a repercussion will follow the act, that in the cumulative centuries it could utterly destroy anything we're trying to build up.

It is not at all a tiny mechanism. It is a big, important one. You could disobey most of the Auditor's Code and you wouldn't get into terribly serious trouble, except a pc would be upset, and case gains, and ARC breaks and you'd feel unhappy, and a few things like that. But Clause 16, "Stay in two-way communication with your pc," is violated the moment that you find – that is you tick, that you come close to – a hot withhold and don't get it.

You're asking a Security Check question, you say, "Well, have you ever raped anybody?"

And the individual says, "Well, people who rape people – actually, I heard about a terrible rape, and there was an awful situation occurred over in Northumbria, and so forth. There was a number of rapes over in Northumbria and I think this is pretty terrible. And that's what the needle is falling on."

And the auditor says, "Well, I guess it is pretty terrible," and goes on to the next question. As I say, it isn't invariable that he burns the house down. It's amusing that the psychoanalyst in – Freudians, in dealing with kleptomania make statements of this character.
They're the most generalized, sweeping statements you ever wanted to hear in your life. It's something on the order of "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal anything, they burn the house down." I don't think there are that many houses. That statement is part of a text. It's a direct quote. The bad English in it is not mine. "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal anything, they burn the house down."

Well, it isn't of this order of generality. It's every now and then when you fail to get a withhold, you set off an atomic bomb. And it's often enough as a group repercussion, and it's often enough and far too frequent as an individual repercussion, because you get a stall.

The individual goes through this cycle: The overt having failed to be pulled by the auditor restimulates the necessity for the pc to minimize the overt that he has done by running down the target against which the overt was committed. So the pc, far from having an overt pulled, or having a withhold pulled, has been tricked into committing a new overt on top of the withhold, against the people who tried to get it. You see the mechanism?

All right. The Rosicrucians were trying to get the withhold and they failed to get the withhold. The individual would then go "natter, natter" and his withhold, then, is against the Rosicrucians. So he immediately tries to blow up the Rosicrucians. You got the idea? They have no such mechanism as this. But, I'm just giving you an example.

If his overt is against the ETU, and he's withholding it like crazy, and it's the ETU that ticks the overt – see, that tick the withhold, but not get it in any way – he is liable, if it's a center-line withhold of some sort or another, fly into a fantastic potpourri of yip-yap against the ETU, don't you see?

The overts are always against the people who fail to pull the withhold. Knowing that, I think it might put a little spurs to your ambition never to miss one, because the succeeding overts are always against you. You fail to knock out the withhold and you or your group will get the benefit – questionable benefit – of the succeeding overts. And this is one of the primary principles of mental reaction.

They try to lessen the overt, to make nothing of the people who might find out. They've had the overt restimulated, so now they have to make nothing of the people, to everyone, so that nobody will ever believe the people, if the overt-withhold is suspected.

They might have an idea that – you see, as long as the thing is unpulled, it has dynamite. The second it is pulled, there's no dynamite connected with it. It's just – they just throw a flounder out on the table, you see? It's a very mysterious action, this whole thing of pulling a withhold. You reach down into the pc for this smoldering volcano, you know, with lava running all along, and the villages burning on all the mountainsides; everything going to pieces, you see, and the steam flying out of the sea. And you've reached down his throat to pull out this unsavory, bombastic object, and you drop on the table a dead haddock.

Just in the process of it passing from his throat to the middle of the table, it goes flop. There isn't even a cinder. Have you noticed this? A cleanly pulled withhold transmutes from the most bombastic explosive manufactured to about the limpest fish ever caught, in the process of being pulled. It is just nothing. The pc sits there and he looks at it. And he says, "What on earth is that?"
And he's mystified. There's always a little "unknow" follows this thing, which doesn't do him any damage at all: "I wonder why I was so upset about that." He always has this kind of little action. You yourself who have had a withhold of magnitude pulled on you have probably experienced the same thing, you know? You just grind and you worry and you search, and so forth, and you're, "It's – well – mm-ulp. Oh, I'll try – I don't know. Well, let's see if I can get away with not telling them. Well, actually, the truth of the matter is, I really have never had anything... Well, I'm gonna tell him. Ahem-ahemmm. All right. Well, I'll come out with it... All right! All right! I pick my teeth. I pick my teeth. I pick my teeth."

"What is the matter here? There's nothing very important about picking your teeth. Now, why was I so upset about telling the auditor?"

And when you've had a big one that you've been sitting on for a long time, you – you can see the partnership in that particular series of reactions. It is – absolutely feels ghastly just before you hand it out. Have you had something like this occur? Some. All right.

Now, supposing it went this way: "Well, tsk. On the subject – well, you a- you got reaction on it. You – you sure your meter is working? Are you sure your meter is working? Oh, you're not sure your meter is working? Oh, well. Oh, well. That's – it's ... okay. Well, I feel much better now. Let's go on to the next question. All right. That's good."

And the auditor goes on to the next question. And you get outside the door, you know, and you say, "Should have told him. No, I couldn't have told him. Uhrrrrrr."

You get home at night, you know. Wheels start going around, and you say, "God, he's a lousy auditor. Well, that's terrible. Horrible things. I remember something Ron did once." [laughter] "Let's see. Hm. Hm. And I heard of an auditor one time who – who charged too much for auditing, and so forth. And see, see, see, see, see, see?" Immediate reaction of that kind of thing on a withhold of magnitude that's missed.

And a guy sits around – actually, he's disappointed. He's left sitting on the middle of something. It's too much for him. He can practically feel the steam coming out of his ears and nobody did anything for him about it. He basically is disappointed.

Also, he knows that it is so forceful and so powerful that if he had told about it, there might have been great repercussions on the subject. And therefore, it's much better that he didn't say anything about it and he has really won because, you see, if it got around that he'd picked his teeth – oh, well, I don't know, lots of things might have happened. The Dental Association might have gotten onto him, and all kinds of things might have occurred. They might be ... so it's a good thing. It's a good thing. And – lousy auditor and he shouldn't – know better. And actually, truth of the matter is ... But that's all because the withhold is simply restimulated, don't you see? And the person is fighting back and forth, and he's left sitting on a charge of steam, dynamite, volcanic lava, and so on, all of which amounts to – when he finally gets out and looks at it – in the final run, why, he picks his teeth. He picks his teeth. He picks his teeth.

Well, what was so important about picking your teeth? And when you've had – seen that mechanism occur, you'll realize that if you interrupt it before it is displayed, you've left
the pc with a full head of steam. And of course, the pc is liable to do almost anything. Do you see this?

You know, you might as well face up to the fact that there are liabilities to auditing. There weren't liabilities to unsuccessful auditing. There weren't liabilities to very mild auditing. There weren't liabilities to simply running out a few engrams, if you could get your hands on them, and so forth. There weren't any great liabilities to it, nor were there any great liabilities to running concepts – no real mess on that. So we got away with that fine.

Now we move over into the heavy artillery, and we bring up parks of 155s and German 88s, and we string it out along the line. And then we put a bunch of rocket launchers in the lineup. And then we say well, that's fine. Let's take some B-47s and line them up over here and put atom bombs in their stomachs. And now let's – let's go ahead. And along about this time, you're possessed of sufficient tools, that what – the stuff you are handling, which is the root stuff of human aberration, and so on, has to be handled as it should be handled. That's all.

Now you'll go, in this basis, from one extreme perhaps, to the other. I don't remember if this was the exact sequence, but it makes better telling this way: A bunch of recruits who were just out of boot school were assigned to a ship and they were afraid of ammunition. And the main battery was sitting there, and they, of course, were the loaders. And they were handling the ammunition and slamming it into the breech – they were supposed to, you see? And they'd pick up a long shell, you know – a shell about that long, you know, with an explosive fuse nose, that if you ever dropped it, you know, it'd go m-m-boom! and that would be obliteration with magnitude.

And they'd pick up this thing, you know, and they'd – they'd pick it up with their – you know, and hand it to the next one, you know? You can see in a – in a rapid-fire action, that shells being passed with that slowness and that care into the breeches of guns, you see, are not going to obliterate anything. It's quite the contrary. They're liable to be dropped on the deck and blow everybody in the gun crew to smithereens.

Well, I adjudicated that they had been talked to too long about the great care that they must use, the great care they must use in the handling of ammunition. I assume that they probably had been talked to by fellows from the Ordnance Department, that explained to them, "These were the nose fuses of the goodygumps and if you ever dropped one, why, it went blang! and so forth. And you must always be careful to keep the ammunition in its proper cases and in its proper slots and you must always keep it marked and flash-marked, because it's all very dangerous. It's all very dangerous. It's all very dangerous."

By the time they got to the ship, of course, they were afraid to touch a piece of ammunition. They had no familiarity with the ammunition. They just had the sensibility that the ammunition was dangerous.

Well, I saw this, at drill, you know, that sort of thing. They're trying to whip this gun crew together and so on. And at drill it was just this matter of "Huh-n-huh-n-nuh-oooooo-ahhhh, you got – you got it, Joe, you got it, Joe? Ha-ha-ha! Oh, thank God, you've got it, Joe. All right. Now open the breech very carefully. Don't hit its nose against anything, you know."
Oh, God, it was terrible. So I asked them if they had any dummy shells. I asked the gunner's mate if he had any dummy shells. And he said, "Yeah, I got some dummy shells."

And so I had all the gun crews of this particular type of gun in the main battery around and line up in a ring on the foredeck. And I took one of these dummy shells and I handed it to them and told them to play catch with it. It was the same size and weight, as everything. It was just what was used in order to demonstrate or drill-load something. And of course, they were very happy with that. And they'd catch back and forth and kicked it around, and they got so they were -- they'd throw it so it was spinning to one another and toss it back and forth across about five, ten feet of deck, you see, to one another. They were happy with this dummy shell. Of course, not live, no fuses in it, no powder, nothing.

And they kept doing this and doing this, and I had them do it for two or three days, if I remember rightly or maybe a day or two. And I saw they were at it one morning and they were having a fine time playing catch. So I went down, opened up the magazine, had the gunner's mate hand me a real brass case, fuse-loaded, nose-fuse-set piece of artillery.

And I said, "Here you go!"

And the first guy in the line -- they were looking at me sort of like snakes -- you know, like birds who'd just sighted a snake or something, you know. And I took the first shell and I said, "Here you go." And I just threw it to him across the open deck, you know?

The guy caught it. "God! Theept-eept-eept."

Three days, they were throwing that live shell with a set nose-fuse fifteen feet across the deck to one another, playing catch with the thing. Some ordnance officers came down from ordnance and saw this ship lying there alongside of the pier, and its gun crew was playing catch with a live shell, and he went straight up and a mile south.

He had no authority over us. He pointed out to us though, if anybody had dropped it, it probably would have been the end of the USS Washington which was lying alongside of us. And I said I didn't like battleships anyway. [laughter] But he totally was overlooking some of the principles with which we are now totally familiar: that a person has to become familiarized with a dangerous object before he can use it easily and well and not have accidents with it.

The way you can have accidents with a dangerous object is to know it is dangerous and not know there is any way to handle it. And if you know a dangerous object is dangerous, you can always have accidents with it.

Now, the actions of an auditor are given publicity on this particular basis: because people are generally very nervous about auditing and very nervous about looking into people's human minds, and because "everybody knows" you mustn't have anything to do with a human mind -- oh, "everybody knows" that.

Some of your friends -- you say, "I'm studying Scientology."

And they say, "Oh, well, what does that have to do with?"

You say, "Well, that just has to do with the human mind."
And they say, "Oh, well, you shouldn't – I don't know if you ought to tamper with that or not. It's a pretty dangerous situation. You mustn't have anything to do with it."

Well, why don't you point out to them at that time, "Well, you mustn't have anything to do with it? Don't you think they have an awful lot of casualties with this thing they mustn't have anything to do with, you know? Don't you think it's kind of dangerous not to have anything to do with it? Haven't you got one? Have you got one? Well, don't you have anything to do with your own mind?"

Whooo-uh, that would be a staggering thing, but the guy is liable to go into a funk when he realizes that every time he figures out an arithmetical problem, he is tampering with the human mind. [laughter, laughs]

And we're liable to err along this line. We're liable to say – we're liable to say to people, "Oh, well, auditing is very easy. You can't make any mistakes. There's no way to make a mistake. There is nothing you can do wrong and you just sit there, and you go through a certain – there's nothing to it. You actually can't do any damage." And there is a tendency on our parts and on the part of Instructors and so forth – in order to give students confidence – to say that you can't really do anything very damaging or very wrong.

There's a tendency on our parts to do that. And that is in the effort of restimulating their courage because, well, students in an Academy and that sort of thing, are awfully nervy characters. They sit there and they pick up the E-Meter and wonder if they're handling a thirty-megatron hydrogen bomb, you'd think, to look at them. They can't even look at the thing. The needle wobbles and they don't even know what it's all about. They think it's a dangerous weapon.

So we say, "Well, it's not dangerous and there's nothing you can do to hurt anybody, and so on and so on."

Well, we've actually leaned too far in the other direction. All this attitude was possibly perfectly justified in 1956 when we were running a tremendous number of concepts, and sort of Havingness Processes and SCS and things like that, all of which are perfectly valid. (Add to your list of processes early in the lecture: objective, physical-universe processes as a safe series.)

But all of these things are valid. And they – you don't get into danger with them and they don't blow anybody's head off. But look, for years and years and years now, Ronnie has been at work. And I've been trying to get the hydraulic jacks underneath of the basic core of human aberration to a level that any case – without paying much attention to the auditor – that any case could be resolved fairly easily, within some finite period of time. Well, they're resolving Clears now and some of the places are making Clears, and so on. We're resolving Clears maybe, in something on the order of two, three hundred hours, some top figure. It's a finite period of time. Last Clear made in Australia was 118 hours. This is finite time, you see?

Yes, but what have we paid with? With what coin have we paid for the speedup? Ha-ha-ha-ha! We have paid for it with stripping the safety precautions off, because now we have to run things that, run wrong, wouldn't spin somebody in, but it'd certainly make a pc unhappy.
as hell. It'd certainly mess things up. It won't do any permanent or lasting damage, but it'll certainly make somebody awful sad. And it'll certainly make them very uncomfortable.

And done wrong – we have moved into a strata of processing – done wrong – that will make somebody awful miserable, because you've got hydraulic jacks. And all you have to do, you see, is you just take another little notch on one of these jacks and it puts thirty tons of pressure against this particular engram. And the pc says, "Well, it isn't resolving." And all you've got to do is lean over and put another notch on the thing and put another thirty tons of pressure – another inch, you see? And the pc still says, "Well, it isn't resolving." And you're dealing with technology that it is very easy just to pick your finger up and just put that jack over another inch. It's the wrong object you got the jack leaning against. Wrong target.

And your pc, of course, gets very uncomfortable and blows session, gets very upset with you and gets extremely disturbed, and he acts like a nut. And part of his shame is the fact that he doesn't know how come he is acting like a nut. This is a mystery to him, don't you see? You've sat there being nice and sweet and kind, and there's – you're not doing anything wrong. Obviously, you're sitting there to help him and all of a sudden he feels like hell. Well, what is this? You didn't do it, so he feels guilty every time he gets upset and you have a much harder time with it. And he's upset of course, because something has gone awry in his bank – don't you see – that a gross error has to be entered in.

Don't think that it's a minor error the auditor would be making, you know, like running a command one time too many. No, it'd have to be the wrong terminal and the wrong command, run on top of a present time problem and an ARC break. But the auditor, because of the processes he is handling and so forth, actually can, in spite of all this, hold a pc in-session and throw that hydraulic jack an additional notch. And of course, that's the one notch it shouldn't have been thrown, because the whole thing is awry anyhow. You see what I mean? I mean, you're dealing with high horsepower, high – highly skilled technology. And if the technology is wrong or if you do some of the most obvious wrongnesses that can be done, you're going to get a repercussion. And the repercussion is considerable. I don't wish to minimize it, so I'm just leveling with you. Do you see?

So on the one side, we could say, "Oh, auditing is easy and anybody could audit, and there's nothing you could do to hurt anybody's human mind, and so forth." Well, it's true. There's nothing we can do to permanently injure or damage somebody's mind, but oh brother, could you give somebody a very nasty cold, for instance. Could you give him an awful bad bellyache, could you do a lot of other things, don't you see, that would be damnably uncomfortable. They'd all fade out in three days or ten days or a couple of weeks, or something like that. But it wouldn't be good.

Now, there's no sense in saying, "Well, you can't do anything. You can't hurt anybody and nothing will ever upset the pc, and so forth." That's an extreme and it's a dangerous extreme because it's not, strictly speaking, true.

And on the other hand, on the other hand over here, we say, "Oh well, auditing the mind is very dangerous and there is no way possibly that you could really tamper with somebody's mind. It ought to be done by an expert. Call an electrician," or something like this, the way the psychiatrists are doing these days. And you get over to this and you can say, "Well,
it's very dangerous and you shouldn't have anything to do with it at all," you see? Between these two extremes, there is the sensible level of: "Yes, there are tremendous numbers of things you can do with the human mind, if you don't make gross errors."

Now, the errors that you can make that will be damaging errors to the human mind are, all of them, under the heading of gross errors. They are glaringly large. They are huge. They loom up out of the rundown like Marble Arch up in Hyde Park. I mean, they're big. You run into that with a car and you'd know it was there. And if you've got the idea that an auditing error is the size of a twig that just fell off a tree on Rotten Row, tsk, change your mind, you see? You go over that with a car wheel, it just goes flick or something like that. You hardly know it's there, and so on.

Auditing errors are not of that order of magnitude. The auditing error, to produce a bad result on the pc, has to be absolutely huge! And you, in running auditors or directing an HGC or doing something in this particular zone or area, do a good job only when you get your eye off the twigs and start looking at the marble arches that have gotten across the road.

You know that that's quite interesting? It's quite an interesting fact, that people directing auditing and supervising auditing, when they get auditing reports and see that the case is not running well, or something like that, always look at twigs. Yeah, the little tiny things, and they say, "Well, are you very sure that you're giving him an acknowledgment every time? You know? Are you very sure you're acknowledging well? How is your TR 0 as you're auditing him?" You know? Little, little things.

Of course, the auditor's TR 0 has to be good, but an auditor's TR 0 can be totally out and the case will still make gains. It's fact! And the acknowledgments can be nonexistent. You can say, if you're running a goals terminal or something like that, you're running some level, "Well, how have you helped a mugwump?" "How have you helped a mugwump?" and "How has a mugwump helped you?" "How have you helped a mugwump?" "How has a mugwump helped you?" The preclear probably wouldn't notice from one second to the next, whether you acknowledged him or not. Do you realize that? He's just so interested in the thing. He follows the auditing command and so on. He doesn't notice it.

On the other hand, he gets so interiorized into high-power techniques that you acknowledge him perfectly, your TR 0 is perfectly and everything is perfect, and he never notices that either. You get the idea?

So these are tiny. These are tiny. You've got to know your TRs to be a good auditor and the combined effect of all TRs out can be rather interesting. But let's not, when we say something is happening with this case that is wrong, go into these tiny things. And do you know that you will most often avoid the gross errors, you know? And it's the gross error... Now, what's a gross error?

Well, was the auditor there for the session? Now, that would be a gross auditing error, don't you see? And you know, in directing auditors, you almost never ask these burning questions: "Did you have your E-Meter turned on? Does it work? Have you gone into any screaming fits at the pc?" These are all gross auditing errors, you see?
"Now, when you clear the rudiments, do you clear the rudiments?" Gross error is: "Do you ever look at the needle while you're clearing rudiments?" That's a gross auditing error of course, how the devil can you audit and find out anything about the pc if you're not looking at the meter? And you would be amazed how often this is the auditing error which causes the miss. The auditor under training is doing everything but looking at the meter. He asks the question and then looks at the meter. The meter's reaction takes place in a tenth of a second and he takes a half a second to look from the question to the meter. So he misses all reactions. And do you know we've had that going on right here? That comes under the heading of a gross auditing error. It's just not doing auditing.

All right. Now, you read along and this auditing report is just fine and everything seems to be okay about the thing, and you just can't understand why this pc isn't making any advances and you say, "Well, now, are your rudiments all in?"

"Oh, yes, rudiments are all in. Yeah."

"Well, is – you're running the goals terminal on the run? You're not overrunning the assessment? Still getting tone arm action?"

"Oh, yes, getting tone arm action."

You check it all out. Everything is perfectly beautiful, and you're running in some Podunk, someplace, where you've got auditors there, you know, that haven't been very well trained, or something like that on the line. Whole case becomes a total mystery, and you say, "Well, gee, we must have some wrong combination or the technology is wrong," and we start adjusting the little things, and we say that the auditor's TR 0 has got to be improved, and there must be a different command used here, and there must be a this, and there must be a that, and we fix it all up and we get a whole bunch of extraordinary solutions.

Truth of the matter is, if we went back and checked it up from beginning to end or if we had a motion picture of the session, we'd find out that the session went along just fine, except right in the middle – because after the break every day and after they go back into session every day, the auditor gives the pc a total spinal adjustment! [laughter]

Now, you think I'm kidding, but this kind of thing – this kind of thing is the usual – the usual gross auditing error. It belongs in that category, don't you see?

All right. Gross auditing error: You could actually audit a pc on the technology you have today with somewhat of a present time problem. You could get him through one session, and he has a bit of a present time problem, and just kind of bully it through and somehow or another arrive at the other end, and he'd get a little bit of gain. It'd be almost impossible to miss. But you couldn't do it with all rudiments out. Or not running any rudiments at all. You say to the auditor – it's this pumpkin center that you're running and you say to him, "Well, now, are you sure you got your rudiments in?"

"Oh, yes, sir. I got my rudiments in. They're all in," and so on.

And then a brilliant stroke of genius comes to you and you say, "Well, when you're putting the rudiments in, do you put the pc on the E-Meter?"

He says, "Oh, no. Never."
"Well, how do you know if the rudiments are in?"

"Well, the pc tells me so."

"Well, how does the pc tell you so?"

"Well, I ask him, 'Are all your rudiments in?'" [laughter]

Now, this sounds utterly, fabulously idiotic to you. But do you know that auditing errors of this magnitude exist? And when you're supervising a large number of auditors and so on, you will always have some people who are just out of the Academy, who are pretty green, that sort of thing, and you can just beat your brains to pieces trying to figure out why the technology isn't working. The technology always works. But is it being applied?

And the gross auditing error comes in the application of the technology. And that's the zone you should look in, in order to correct a case.

Now, we can add to these gross auditing errors, leaving a withhold in restimulation. Because then, I assure you, the case is not going to make any progress.

We right now have a course running someplace in the world, and in weeks of run they have only found, in a number of students, a goal or two. And those they have found a goal or two on early, they found no terminals for. You'll find this quite common in various places, by the way.

A whole group can go sailing along and getting no terminals and no goals and no nothing and so forth; we were doing it right here, till I finally just got right down and figured out what the devil this was all about. And I found out the rudiments were just wildly out and the auditors were actually in a games condition on the subject of goals. You know? I mean, just frankly that: they were in a games condition. They were so ARC broke on their own goals, they were damned if they were going to let anybody else have any goals. I think that was about the way it added up – something of that sort. So, by straightening the rudiments out, and raising the magnitude of importance of keeping rudiments in, why, what are we running into now?

Well, I was just asking a question. There's a student been here for about two weeks and a little bit – two weeks and two days – and we don't have his goal and terminal. I'm starting to ask questions. What is happening? Because this is not usual now.

You see? We've learned to keep our rudiments in before we do goals and terminal assessments and having learned that, why, we find our goals and terminals, and that's about all there is to it. That was the gross error: It was just not having any rudiments in.

It wasn't that we needed new trick methods of finding goals and terminals, we just had to have somebody sit there and actually ask for the goals and ask for the terminals, and not invalidate any of them and not add a bunch of things to the nonsense that was going on. Keep the rudiments in; we found goals and terminals just bangity-bang! It's very easy to do. And some of you right here were – have experienced that particular gruesome experience. And that was gruesome, wasn't it?
You see, the light and dark of the situation was too fantastic for words. The first
course I taught, immediately ahead of this course, I found all the goals and terms, I think they
were all found the first few days, weren't they?

*Female voice: Yes, it wasn't very long. We did Presession 38 first and then ...*

We did Presession 38 and shook down a lot of – 37 and 38, wasn't it?

*Female voice: Thirty-seven and 38, too.*

Yeah, and we'd had them – we had their PTPs and their withholds all off – and bang!
Assessment: There was just nothing to it, just fell in your lap. Nothing to it.

Well, now, this unit, at great distance from here, happens to be running into the same
difficulties right this minute. And I have sent over cables about "Get your rudiments in," see?
"Get your rudiments in. Get your rudiments in." And I don't know whether this will be heard
or not, because this has to amount to looking at the E-Meter. And I've just had a datum, from
that particular unit, that some of the students on that particular course can be forced to stand
and look at an E-Meter which is reacting and be asked what the reaction was, and they can't
tell you that the needle moved.

Well, we look for a gross error, so I tell them, "Get the rudiments in, get the rudiments
in, get the rudiments in." I probably ought to be saying, "Show them an E-Meter and find out
for them where the tone arm is. Show them which is the knob or black object, that wiggles." We'll find out it's some gross auditing error, you see, of that magnitude.

It always defies your imagination when you run into these gross errors, and running a
great many people, a great many auditing teams or a great many staff auditors, or something
like that, all – it's a great many students – it all boils down to the same thing: You're just sure
that you have a dog case that has avoided technology, and then you try to do everything under
the sun, moon and stars you can with technology, in order to straighten out this case. And you
find out the case hasn't advanced for some time, because "Well, you see, actually we're sup-
posed to look at tapes at four o'clock and the auditing session is also at four o'clock, so we, of
course, have been skipping the auditing session."

The case wasn't being audited. I mean, this sounds idiotic, but that is how idiotic and
that is how gross most of these errors are.

"Oh, yes, I always get the rudiments in on the pc. Yes, I always get the rudiments in
on the pc. That's very good. I make sure that the needle is moving when he says he has with-
holds. When he has no withholds, if the needle moves, then I know I can pass on to the next
rudiment."

I know, they're all so stupid and all so incredible that they get missed. And you are
very often persuaded into being very inventive about technology. This is – even I have been.
On the basis of persuading some – of being persuaded that you just – you've got to think of
some new solution, that's all, because this case just isn't moving, you know? And then we find
out that, well, he doesn't get audited, either. Tapes are at four o'clock, and the case is sup-
posed to be audited at four o'clock, so he just doesn't audit the case, but hasn't really had
nerve to tell you. Or something *wild* like this, you know? And it comes down to something fundamental.

The common denominator of all of this is *no auditing done*. It'll be some degree of that, and I wanted to give you the common denominator of it. It's some degree of no auditing done: Whether they just – the auditor never reports to the auditing session at all or after he gets to the auditing session, omits some large section of auditing, oh, doesn't run the goals terminal of the pc; decides actually that he's got to get Mother out of the way first, and he just goes on for ages auditing Mother. Mother, Mother, and we audit more Mother and supposed to be auditing "a tinker."

And you'll get errors of this character and I hate to say it, because staff auditors are actually terrific. I have lots of confidence in staff auditors. I've never had staff auditors balk at doing anything; I've never had them do anything but – when they followed through results – just try their level best to deliver. Terrific willingness. Main failure has been – is me telling them, comprehensibly enough, what I wanted done, so that it could be understood.

I consider that any main failure, because the willingness – there's never been any want of that. So therefore we come down to a simplicity, and they can do this and everybody goes off at a smart trot, and everything is working along fine this way.

But I've seen some of the wildest miscomprehensions of a relayed communication, such as this: You run the level – this actually happened – you run the level until the tone arm gets moving and then reassess for the next level. And that was the way the auditing direction was interpreted. You know, you run a level long enough to get the tone arm moving well, and then you assess for the next level of the Prehav Scale, and you run it.

Man! I can tell you that if you did that for about four or five levels, the whole case would come down to a slow jam and the pc would feel like he was going crazy! It'd take him about ten, twelve days to get over the idea, too. He'd just feel like he was going crazy!

If you want to audit a pc into a feeling that they're nuts, don't do a terminals run on his goals terminal, but just take some kind of a general Routine 2 run and assess the pc – very carefully assess him – and find out a real live level, a good level. Find his level real good and then audit it and audit it until you get the tone arm moving good, see? And then just skip it. And then do another assessment – and ignore the fact that that one is still going – and pick up some other level of the Prehav Scale, and then run it – don't get rudiments in – [laughter] and run it, run it, and run it hard and run it hard and run it hard and run it hard, and all of a sudden the needle will freeze up and the tone arm will freeze up or something.

Well, insist that that isn't so good, you see? That isn't so good that it did that; run it a little bit longer. And don't get in any rudiments – no need of end rudiments, either.

Now on the next line, assess again, get some other level of the Prehav Scale, and just run that one till you finally get the needle broken loose – just get it broken loose. And then reassess again, and your pc, about this time, will go "Hmmmh! What's happening? Everything is going green! I have this horrible sensation that this ear keeps tying a bowline with this ear! Ha! I knew I shouldn't have drunk the coffee." [laughter]
He'll actually have a sensation of going mad. He won't go mad! A few days later it'll drift out and he will merely spit every time he sees you. [laughs]

But that actually – that actually is the direct results of not flattening levels of the Prehav Scale. But that's a pretty gross auditing error: Every time you get the needle moving, every time you get the tone arm moving well, reassess and get another level; and when you get the tone arm moving well, reassess and get another level. Never flatten anything. And on the Prehav Scale, of course, a person feels like he's going mad if you do that, because you're using one of the most powerful set of boosters you can. You talk about thirty-ton hydraulic jacks! The commands can't help but move his mind around. You know, he could sit there and resist even doing the command and suddenly he realizes, well, he does it, you see, and Rrrr! Rrrrrr! It's running a ship on a rocky ocean, believe me.

Do you see what could happen? Because the technology is quite adequate to really pushing the thing down the line, you see? He will do it, willy-nilly and he goes far in, much further in than you would ever dream that anybody could be pushed.

It'll all drift off in three to ten days and he will feel fine, whether he gets any auditing or not. But that's not the point. You've wrecked a pc and you may have wrecked a goals-terminal line. And believe it or not, this actually occurred in a Central Organization. This actually occurred.

Yeah, the interpretation of my request was – wasn't any backwards reason – is as soon as you get some motion in the tone arm, you reassess and do a new level.

All right. Gross auditing errors is what you are dealing with here. That is a far, wide departure. Now, technically, there aren't too many of these things. One would be, right now, to run any terminal but the goals-have terminal. We would consider that a very gross auditing error, because it would really make a mess out of things.

Leading that, in term of violence or even worse than that, is leaving a withhold question unflat. That would be a gross auditing error. We have to move it up to there, because it produces a gross mess when it is done.

Doing a wrong assessment or using an assessment that was done carelessly, indifferently or incorrectly and not getting it checked: That would be a gross auditing error. Getting or using an assessment that was briefly and carelessly done, or even lengthily and carelessly done. But use an assessment that you just aren't sure of: It's a gross auditing error.

Failing to continue to security check a pc as his case advances, because again this is quite case damaging and is a gross auditing error.

You haven't heard that one for some time, have you? But nevertheless, it's very much present right now. Do you realize the faster the case gains, the more withholds are going to come to view? And if there's no Security Check to pull them off, your case can ball up in a knot quick as scat. So, the auditor who is running the line should think of his withhold point of the end and beginning rudiments – and the withhold should be left into the end rudiment, also. Just add another one in there. You know, add a "Have you told me any half-truths, untruths?" and so forth. And also add withholds in, because your technology is going too fast, it gives you another crack. So you got an additional one, additional crack at it.
I haven't given you a new write-down of this, because I'm still redoing the end rudiments. You'll see it shortly. There are two or three things that I'm questioning and don't know quite what to do with yet, but I'll know pretty well, very shortly. That's why I haven't issued you a new slip on it.

And the auditor who is running a run on a goals terminal – having found it and he's running a run on it – and he doesn't pay a considerable amount of attention to withholds in beginning and end rudiments, is actually guilty of a gross auditing error, because the withholds are going to appear by the reason of the case is making advance, and the case will advance just to the degree that the withholds are off of it.

And he'd say, "Well, I got all the withholds off at the beginning of the week, and the – it was just clean as a wolf's tooth. And so the rudiments are in, so I don't have to pay very much attention to withholds on this particular case just now." And then we had two days of marvelous and wonderful gain and everything was just going along beautifully, so of course we're going to have a third day, aren't we? Ah, that's an unjustified assumption, because there is this about withholds: The withhold which is not pulled – which is restimulated but not pulled – can raise hell.

That's "missing a Security Check question"; can just raise the dickens with a case. And a case advance is also marked by an advance in responsibility, and being marked by an advance in responsibility, brings to view more overt s than were formerly available to a Security Check.

That is a test: Is a case advancing? If a case is advancing it develops more withholds; more withholds come into view if a case is advancing.

Now, I'll give you an example of how a case is not advancing We've done a Security Check, we've cleaned the rudiments, we ask a sort of a Presession 38-type of question in the rudiments, and "What question shouldn't I ask you?" And we've done a good job and we've got the rudiments all clean, and he's just had a Form 3 and everything of this sort. We already have his goals terminal; we go on a goals-terminal run. And we run it Tuesday, and we run it Wednesday, and we run it Thursday. We pay no more attention to withholds, see, and we – Thursday and Thurs- what the hell happened? Everything is stuck, and so on. The pc is very unhappy and appears rather blowy. And Friday ... oh, well, it's an ARC breaky session; it's all very upset.

Well, what could possibly be wrong with the case? Well, the case advanced – that's what's wrong with the case – and if a case advances it develops withholds.

Now, this is how it should run, according to some auditors. Let's look at this one: Now, you get all the withholds off, and you get it all straightened out, and you run him Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. And you do another Security Check and you're just very careful of withholds on Friday, and you make sure they're all polished up and of the end rudiments, and so on, and so forth. And you don't find any more. There are no more withholds than there were on Monday.
And you say, "Boy, I'm sure doing a good, clean job of auditing." *With absolutely no advance of any kind whatsoever.* It's almost unthinkable you could do that these days, but it theoretically could happen.

And if you got no gain on the case of any kind whatsoever, it will occur then, that the case will not raise in responsibility of any kind whatsoever. So it will occur, then, that at the end of a considerable period of auditing, the person will not have remembered any new withhold of any kind whatsoever, because no raise in responsibility, no additional or new withhold that he hadn't remembered before. See?

Gross auditing error not to keep the withhold off a case while you're running it. It's one thing that can really stall it down to a walk. It can just go to a sudden *thud* and so on.

Withholds, then, make a good test of case advance. Actually, you could take a short Security Check and shake a case down at an end of a short period of auditing, and find out whether or not the case was winning. You do the short Security Check at the beginning, then you audit him for a little while, and do the same exact Security Check at the end, and he has remembered nothing new – no advance in case. Much more reliable than a profile. A profile is reliable, too, but it'd tell you directly and immediately.

Yeah, because in the first place, remember that withhold are not relegated to current lifetime only. What happens if you start opening up whole track? Don't you think anybody has got any withhold on the whole track? You mean they – you mean they lived all these lifetimes right up to this lifetime, and so forth, and they never had any withhold in those lifetimes? They just died by natural acts and causes, you see, and everything would go along. But this lifetime is different; in this lifetime they have withhold.

Well, you start opening up a track and you, frankly, will see it in running this Groups Terminal Process. The individual all of a sudden realize he has a withhold from a certain particular group. *Ughh!* He didn't tell them that!

And then it finally occurs to him, at the long end of a run, or something: "You know, I'm not in that group anymore? And this amounts to the fact that I am actually withholding my body and my beingness from that particular group. Yes! I have a withhold on that group."

He'll recognize with great clarity that he isn't in the group and therefore is withholding himself from the group. He recognizes things like this, and they didn't occur to him earlier.

"Oh yes, well, there was the Marcab government, and there it was, and still there! Yeah, I was part of it once and it's still there. No, I haven't anything on them. No withhold. No. There isn't anything I've done they wouldn't like. It's funny, you are asking me that, because, actually I've never done anything, you know, as far as they didn't like. I never have, never have. They get along fine, I got along fine with them, and there's just nothing, you know; and it's all kind of imaginary anyway and hasn't anything to do with me."

And after you've run the process for a while, why, you come back across the same thing, and he says, "Well, the Marcab government is – eeuulpt!"

And you say, "What's that?"
And he, "Ugh! Well, the last time I was there they had a warrant for my arrest. Ha-ha-ha, ha-ha! I'm not about to go back there!"

And every time, of course, you run across one of these "I am not about to go back there. I am not going to there anymore. No, I do not want to be a member of that group! No-o-o-o-o! What? Become a member of that church? Oh, no! Under no circumstances! Well, that's silly! Stupid! I mean, I don't want anything to do with them, you know, I mean, ruhh!" and so on. "Of course, I'm totally unemotional about it."

"Have withholds from the subject?"

"Oh, no, I don't have any withholds! What made you ask as ... ? oh, wait a minute. Ha-ha-ha-ha! We had a treasurer once that robbed the exchequer and took all the cash that was in their account. I know that happened and the group was pretty mad about that."

And then we go through and we mix up – and a few questions later, maybe the next auditing session, all of a sudden the pc goes back across this church group, and he says in a little small voice, "You remember my telling you about the treasurer that embezzled all the money? Ha-ha-ha. That was me!" [laughs]

Well, what's the phenomenon? It isn't that he didn't recall it. It's that it was below his level of responsibility. And if his responsibility increases, he eventually remembers more clearly what the situation was and takes responsibility for his own overt.

So actually, the number of overts and withholds that show up newly on a case haven't very much to do with what a criminal the person has been. Everybody has plenty of withholds. You can just assume that – everybody has got plenty of withholds.

The question is, how many are available at any given instant? How many can be pulled or how many are they willing to talk about at any given instant? Well, it's a direct coordination with the amount of responsibility the case has.

Now I'll give you a brand-new way of thinking about this: Everybody has a number of withholds. Let's just say everybody has a number of withholds. This would be pretty close to a fact, you see? It's a finite number of withholds – 800 billion or something – but it'd be the same for every person. People aren't necessarily different from one to the next. But that number could be considered more or less constant, person to person, pre-auditing – before they're audited.

All right. Now, what is different? What is different is the degree of responsibility the individual can take for his withholds. So that you have a criminal sitting there. And he says, "Yeah, I robbed, I – and I did this and I did that, and I did the other thing, and I did.... Oh, yeah, yeah, I murdered babies and so on. And I just killed my wife and children one time and left home," and so on. There's not even a knock on the E-Meter.

Well, his irresponsibility is down to such a level that they're not even withholds. All right, he gets some auditing progress, and he finds out that out of this whole potpourri of crime, one time he was standing outside of a bank and he turned the dead guard over with his foot. And that's an overt. That's a real withhold. And he hadn't remembered that, and now he's
telling you. And he sort of feels a little bit bad about it, and he's happy to get it off of his chest.

Then we go on, a little bit more auditing and we got – a session or two later – and other things are coming and going, and so forth. And he tells you, "Well, wheegh, I just realized I'm wanted in Chicago," even though that was two lifetimes ago. "Remember that bank guard I said I turned over with my foot? Actually, I shot him."

You say, "All right."

Few sessions later, you're running across things, and so on, and you're getting off withholds and so forth and that's fine. And the criminal comes back across this point and he says, "You know that bank guard I told you I shot? Well, the truth of the matter is, I shot him when his hands were up and his back was turned to me. And I read later in the papers that he was the sole support of his wife and children and two aged parents."

And you say, "Well, all right. Good. All right." And he's glad to get that off of his chest.

And then you audit him a while and he comes back across this thing later and he happens to be clicking down the line on his various overt s and so forth. And he says, "You know that – that bank I was – told you I robbed in Chicago. And I was just a hood and I was just nobody, and so forth. Actually, I was the leader of the gang. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Hate to have to confess this, but I was, and we dealt exclusively in bank robberies, and we brought about the panic of 1929. Yes. Ah-ha. I hate to have to tell you about that. There – there it is. There it is, you see?"

You get the idea? Perfect pattern of it was pulled by a fellow one time – I mean, a pc, a very famous guy. I won't particularly expose parts of his case, but he said, "We had a plan one time. And this plan... Well," he said, "it was just a bunch of us fellows, and we put some people in ice cubes, and we got rid of them – and, you know, heh-heh, just – just nothing. Didn't have anything to do with thinking of anything. Nothing much going on, so we just thought this'd be a good thing, and it was a gay thing to do. And we – later on, I realize it was bad, now, but we just froze them up in some ice cubes and dumped them in an ocean on another planet, and that's all there is to it."

Well, on a little further questioning, why, it turns out that well, actually there was some plan in it; there was some reason they did it, and so forth, and it went on on this kind of a stupid gradient, and so forth. And we find out that we're talking to the fellow who thought up the plan, and executed the plan, and directed the plan that had to do with the implantations of all planets in this corner of the universe.

That was just too much overt, don't you see? It starts out with the basis, "Well, a bunch of us got together and some people weren't behaving very well, and just some crummy little people, didn't amount to anything very much, you know? And we just put them in some freezer compartments, and we took them over and dumped them in an ocean. Ha-ha-ha! Funny joke, wasn't it?"
You get the difference of magnitude in how these things walk up. Of course you don't know what series of withholds are going to develop into big ones, and what will nearly remain little withholds.

But the only thing dangerous about it is not clearing the question that you come to as you go across it. So it amounts to one of the greater auditing goofs, and it is a goof of magnitude. The individual that you let sit there and, "natter, natter, natter, natter," you're actually ruining his case, because you're letting him sit there and lessen the overt, lessen the overt, lessen the overt, lessen the overt. And you should realize what he's trying to do. He's trying to tell you, "I have a withhold!"

And you never say, "Yes, yes, but what did you do of that type and kind that would make you feel that way, yourself?"

And the individual says, "Nothing!" and the needle falls off the pin. And then you find out, "Well, yes, as a matter of fact..." And it is quite something else, the time you do this. And all of a sudden it clears! And the case starts going Clear.

But by finding things which other people have done on the pc, you see, getting the motivators, and finding that the pc's – other things, and so forth – you worsen a case.

The only thing you ever want is what the pc does, and what the pc did.

But it comes under one of the headings of one of the finer crimes, to leave a Sec Check question unflat. It can do more damage per case, per question, than any other single action; obviously, from the case histories which I have immediately and directly at hand.

So take it to heart, that's something you should never do. Make sure that it's flat before you leave it. And then don't think that a little later – when the person has had a lot more auditing – that the question, if found unflat now, was left unflat at the time it was hit – it wasn't. This is a whole new series of withholds coming up under the heading of the same question, and you differentiate that particular difference.

Okay?

_Audience Voices: Yes. Mm-hm._

Well, will that do you any good in your auditing?

_Audience Voices: Yes, sir!_

All right. Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.
RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on 31 October 1961

Thank you.
Okay. And this is...

Audience: October 31st.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, October 31st, 1961.

All right. Now, you have come to grips with clearing since I've talked to you last in a very definite and broad way and I want you to do this with your pc at the very next session before the session is started. Do a Dynamic Assessment just for the dynamic. Do a Dynamic Assessment for the dynamic before your next session. I simply want a Dynamic Assessment.

Now, if you don't know how to do a Dynamic Assessment, that is very simple. You just ask the pc how he feels about the various dynamics and you take the one that reacts the most or the change of needle pattern from the remaining dynamics and then you tell me which dynamic fell the most on your pc.

Now, there's a few bits and pieces of news with regard to processing. And you are posing the problem in a very heavy way of broad, rapid clearing and we have been using some Class II types of technology in order to clean out circuits that interpose and so forth in clearing and so on.

Now, you know that it would be very difficult to audit anybody unless you had some Security Checks squared away on this person. I think you will agree with that, with the experience you have had here. Isn't that true? That'd be very – rather difficult, if you never did a Security Check on a pc to expect him to go anywhere.

Now, you see the goal will disappear rather easily. The terminal will disappear rather easily, so that assessment becomes rather difficult. But remember that you are running a goal and a terminal and in view of the fact that you are running a goal and a terminal on the pc, whether you're running it by Prehav Scale or some other process, no matter what you're doing with the goal or terminal, it can disappear. These two can disappear as easily during the run as they can disappear during the assessment. So you see, a goals-terminal run then must be handled with the rudiments in just as you have to have the rudiments in, in order to assess them. Does that make good sense to you?

All right. Now, those things which are closest to present time often have a greater influence upon the preclear than the whole track. Now, where is the boundary? This life is more important than other lives. In the pc's eyes only, not from the standpoint of his aberrations. His past lives have far greater aberrative value because of course, they're more hidden. But in the pc's eyes, this life of course has much greater importance than any past life. So you have at once a situation where the person who is sitting there being processed by you is completely
convinced that anything that is wrong with him has happened to him in this lifetime. Well, this is one of the things that's wrong with him: that he considers that he could get this aberrated in just a half a century or less.

You see now, that's silly. There's really nothing happened to anybody in this lifetime compared to what has happened to them over thousands and thousands of lifetimes, you see. So you're processing somebody who believes that this lifetime is more important than past lifetimes, when in actual fact this lifetime is not at all important as far as auditing is concerned. As far as the basic seat of aberration, as far as his reactive bank is concerned, it all has its fundamentals in his past track before this lifetime ever began.

All right. Now, let's take that a little bit further. What has happened in the last twenty-four hours is more important to him than has happened in the last month. Let's just look at that again.

Now, of course, what has happened to him in the last twenty-four hours is not more important to him than has happened in the last month. But the pc thinks it is. Well, here we go again. You see, it's the same equation working out now in a little more finite piece of time.

All right. According to the pc's viewpoint, what has happened to him in the session is more important than what has happened to him in the day. Let's get it down – you know, not this lifetime-past lives, but let's move it down now to this day is more important than this month. Therefore, to the pc, what has happened in the vicinity – in the immediate vicinity of this auditing session or in it is more important than what has happened in this day. That's what the pc thinks.

So of course, you get a tremendous reaction on the part of the pc from an ARC break and he thinks this is the thing. Right now this is what is wrong with him. It isn't what is wrong with him at all. It's probably those fifteen thousand prisoners he had executed way back when, you see. And he made them sit in a chair, you see – he made them sit in a chair and he executed them with electrodes which look remarkably like E-Meter cans. [laughter] Something on this order, don't you see.

So he has an ARC break and he will tell you it is the ARC break which is holding up his auditing, when as a matter of fact it's the fifteen thousand prisoners. But because of this value, you cannot audit across the top of the ARC break easily. You can't do it because his mind is fixated on the moment of time nearest to present time. He fixates on this superficially and analytically. So that has to be pulled before you can get to anything else.

And it's something on the order of a little tiny gate made out of strips of flimsy tin or bits of Dennison crepe paper and the pc says, "This huge, enormous, iron gate, which is spiked, counterbalanced and which weighs seventy-five million tons, called an ARC break, is the gate that is interposed between me and getting on in this session." See, that's what he says; that's what he thinks. All right. It isn't true. It isn't true.

This ARC break, actually, as far as his future life is concerned, is made out of Dennison crepe paper. But it looks awfully big. Now, as this ARC break floats back into the past, gradually drifts back into the past, it gets to be yesterday's session, it is not so important you
see. It gets to be last month's session, no great value. It gets to be last year's session, well, you have to dig like mad to find it.

Well, why is this? Because of progression of time. The analytical mind fixes closest to all of the havingness. You've got all this havingness around here, you see. Present time has got all the havingness in it. Therefore, those things which are closest to the havingness are, of course more valid than those things which aren't close to the havingness. He no longer has Camelot, see. But he does have modern England.

So what happens close to modern England, of course, that's close to the havingness, so that's fine, you see. But Camelot, he never can get that back; that's gone. Of course, it really has no value as he looks at it. It has great aberrative value, but it has no analytical value.

So there is this basic disagreement always occurring in an auditing session. What is wrong with the pc is in the yesterlives and what the pc says is wrong with him is right here and now. Now, if you treat what is wrong with him right here and now with bulldozers and heavy axes and dynamite, as though the gate which is closed in your face is made out of iron, is of enormous tonnage, is a tremendous barrier – if you treat it in this fashion, if you slug away at it as though it is iron – the pc will think so, too.

You can validate the pc into out-rudiments. You can work on him and you very often will be right, but in the process of working on him too hard, you can actually blow rudiments out.

You start removing rudiments ineptly, you start sluging them around and you get the PT problem out and the ARC break in. And then you get the room out because it's the havingness around which the bad incident occurred, don't you see? And the room goes out and of course withhold goes in. But by this time you've cleaned up the PT problem and the ARC break, but now you have the room out and the withholds are out.

Now, if we were to go back over the rudiments again and check them, we would find this to be the case, but in order to get on with it and have an orderly progress of rudiments, we run, of course, the rudiments consecutively and never cross them again. So we don't notice this other point. An auditor has to judge this way. He has to make a judgment. He has to say, "Is it going to do more damage to get the rudiments in than to audit with them out?" Now, that is sort of a – sort of a wild one because it's up against this perfection: is that the best auditing and the best gains always occur against rudiments in. And a goals run is very, very difficult to achieve with rudiments out.

All right. That's – that's the ideal, isn't it? The ideal is all rudiments in during the entirety of the run, right? Now, how about crudely putting the rudiments in? You can actually put the rudiments in with such ardor, you can attack this gate the pc has got closed against auditing in his bank with such ferocity, with such battering rams, with bulldozers and dynamite and so forth, that he becomes utterly convinced one way or the other that the rudiments are way out and that it's all a pretty hopeless proposition. And you throw the rudiments further out than you throw them in.
Can a condition exist whereby the handling of rudiments worsen the run? Can a condition so exist? Yes. And this is the discovery which we make here and it's an interesting discovery. There are two or three I will detail to you here.

And that is that any auditing of a terminal other than the goals terminal of the pc can increase the density of the bank and the resistance of the preclear. It doesn't happen a hundred percent, but it happens enough to make one very wary.

Any auditing of a terminal which is not the goals terminal of the preclear can result in difficulties. Tone arm rises; it gets sticky; it goes up; the pc gets very uncomfortable; the pc becomes very ARC breaky; the pc gets very, very upset; the rudiments are very, very hard to keep in. Why? Why? Because in not auditing his goal and his goals terminal, you are of course liable to be auditing other terminals and these increase the density of the bank. So that the pc becomes more ARC breaky by auditing certain rudiments than if you left them alone. See how this could be? It's one of these – one of these horrors. It's one of these superimpasses. It's one that requires judgment on the part of the auditor.

Well, I'll give you an idea. The pc's goals terminal is "a willow wand." Let's take something nobody has for sure and so the pc runs a willow wand and you can do all sorts of weird things with this willow wand. You can run concepts on it and brackets on it and you can run it backwards and upside down and nothing very grim happens on the willow wand, see? This can run, you see.

But in the rudiments, he has a present time problem with his boss. So we say, "Well, get an idea now of getting even with your boss; get an idea of your boss getting even with you. Thank you. That's fine. Get an idea of getting even with your boss, your boss getting even..." We're auditing the PT problem, you see. And we're going to clear up "boss." The boss is not a willow wand. And the harder we try to get it in, the less it goes in, because the pc's attention is distracted off of his goals terminal every time we say the word boss. He goes flink, boom. "Boss, boss, boss. Wow! Boss. Well, us willow wands ..." See? So off it goes and the bank gets stiffer, heavier.

All right. We're going to have an ARC break. We're going to run this ARC break in, see. This is going to be real good. Well, the person has an ARC break with the auditor and has had ARC breaks with past auditors and we're all set now. And we'll say well, "What has an auditor failed to do? And what have you not been able to say to an auditor?" And we go on this way, and we go on and we go on and we go on. And every time we say the word auditor, the pc's bank says, "Well, us willow wands..." No, thank you. His attention is being pulled out of session, out of session, out of session, out of session. Don't you see? So the ARC break eventually disappears without the tone arm going down. You've stiffened the bank up, don't you see?

Now we had it stiffened up on the PTP. Now it gets stiffer on the ARC break. And now you say, "Do you have any withholds from me? Me over here, see. Me. Me. Me. You know? Me. Me. Me. You know? Withholds from me. Me. Me."

And all of a sudden – all of a sudden, "Us willow wands..." And the bank again doesn't go down. Nothing deflates here; nothing happens. So having "gotten the rudiments in" (quote)
(unquote), in this particular instance, all we have succeeded in doing is getting a nonregistry of the meter by stiffening the bank up past registry. You see how this could happen?

Well, it's happened here lately to several cases. I've been steering you along the line, I've been steering you close to the edge in a few places and out of the last week-or-so's auditing, these facts have emerged: that some of the cases present in the last week or so being audited – a very few of them, only something on the order of about 20 percent, but that's good enough – would have done much better, thank you, if the auditor had never touched a rudiment. Because the auditor was getting them in by attracting the pc's attention violently off the goals terminal with a resultant rise of tone arm.

In other words, the rudiments weren't being put in; the meter was sudden – just being beaten into nonregistry. So finally all rudiments are out but not registering and rudiments can go out and not register if the tone arm is very high and the needle is very sticky. You should realize that as part of your auditing kit.

Try it sometime. Assess somebody very carefully and get a terminal. Let's say it's a "hyperbolid," see. And then very carefully for a very long time in auditing, avoid ever letting him put his attention on a hyperbolid and very carefully put his attention on everything else but a hyperbolid. And you'll wind up at the end of this particular run with about 20 percent or something like that of the cases so run with a high tone arm and a sticky needle. The rudiments have just all been violently driven out.

How have they been driven out? Well, the pc is actually experiencing a scarcity of auditing. That's one of the reasons. He feels he isn't being audited. So that would be one reason. And the other more important reason is the person's terminal is not getting the attention it thinks it deserves, which is total attention. You see how this could all add up then to a miserable sort of a situation?

So if, in the process of putting rudiments in, the tone arm starts up, it's a very good thing to look very pleased as though you've just gotten the rudiments all in beautifully, [laughter] give two more questions, give the rest of the rudiments rapidly and look very pleased – needle falls off the pin on withholds, you get the idea – look very pleased about it all. Even have a sigh of relief if you want to make a liar out of yourself, but the sigh of relief would actually amount to the fact that you've actually gotten him out of that particular embayed position without running him aground completely. He's just partially aground. And then run whatever you're running and for heaven's sakes make sure that what you're running has something to do with the goal or the terminal of the pc. And his bank will soften right up and it'll all come out all right.

But if you keep at it – if you keep at it, pound, pound, pound, pound, pound, pound, pound – and that tone arm isn't coming down and the needle is getting too stiff to read, you're just heading for trouble. You can just park the case just like that.

Oh, I'm – can tell you all this because it has been subjected to considerable test and nobody here was being used as a guinea pig. It just turned up as a gratuitous fact. It just turned up and took off its hat and said, "I am a sturgeon." And we said, "Well, how do you do?" That's the truth of it.
Now, terminals arrived at through a Dynamic Assessment, a full Dynamic Assessment, were apparently not too far off goals terminals, so old Dynamic Assessment runs were not too bad, but any vast concentration on the case where the auditor simply picks the terminal out of midair and makes the case concentrate on it, is liable to bring about in enough percentage of cases to make you worry about it on all cases – any time it gets up above 20 percent, well, it's liable to happen to you at any time, so just avoid it. We recognize clearly that the goal and terminal of the pc, properly run, will get the case further than any other single process.

Now – remember now, as we say this, that rudiments are just a process. They are four or five processes. That's what rudiments are. They are just processes.

Now, if those processes take the pc's attention off his goal or terminal to too great an extent, you suffer from this other liability. The rudiments will go out faster than they go in and that's what I've been talking about. On such a case, you will get further, actually, by auditing with the rudiments out rather than audit with the rudiments further out.

Now, it isn't true that a case makes no gain with the rudiments out. The gain is very tiny. There is some gain with the rudiments out. It is very slow. It's quite microscopic. But it is a gain. It is a gain. And that little, tiny gain of course, is better than a negative gain, see. It'd be better to audit toward a tiny gain than to a thoroughly messed-up case, see. The better choice.

Now this is no invitation to assess people with the rudiments out. It is no invitation to run people with the rudiments out. I'm just pointing out to you that under these circumstances that when assessment is driving the tone arm up – pardon me, when rudiments for assessment just drive the tone arm up and make the needle sluggish, when rudiments for the original runs on the case just drive the tone arm up and make the needle sluggish, you're much better off saying, "Well, how do you feel about the room? Good. Is it all right if I audit you? Fine. Do we have any ARC break? Good. Do you have any withholds? Oh, fine. Good, so forth. Oh, yeah, present time problem. You haven't – you don't have any present time problem. Oh, that's good. That's fine. Fine. That's wonderful. All right. Now we're going to run this process, and it has to do with a willow wand."

Or in assessment – in assessment there is another dodge. You pick up the pc when the rudiments are most likely to be in and assess him at those times when the rudiments are likely to be in and don't assess him during times when they are likely to be out. Doesn't that sound weird? You say to the pc, "How do you feel?"

And the pc says, "Oh, I dunno. I'm not too good," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, we'll have a session tomorrow." [laughter]

You see? You actually could do this. You recognize that you could do this.

You say, "Well, what time of the day do you feel best?" [laughter]

And the fellow says, "I feel pretty good around three o'clock, usually – afternoons." He thinks this over, "Well, yeah, usually, afternoons I feel pretty good. After lunch I feel pretty fine."
And you say, "Well, that's fine. That's good. Now, we're going to have our assessments here. We're going to assess for thirty-five minutes immediately after lunch."

That'd be a way to get the rudiments in, wouldn't it? So it wouldn't be impossible, even if the rudiments appeared to be out, you would get someplace this way by picking only times when the pc was in good shape.

Now, you're laughing about this now, but you actually will encounter this in your auditing and I can see that sooner or later you're going to use this on somebody.

Well, why all this? Why did they go out? Well, I should give you this very important datum, this extremely important datum. You understand the datum I just gave you as important was that taking the pc's attention off his goals terminal could result in a stiffening or a massifying or solidifying of the bank as registered on the tone arm and needle of the pc. And, therefore, it is a liability to run any other terminal than his goals terminal.

All right. Here's the other one: The pc's goal, if run by itself on a two-way or more flow, should bring down the tone arm and that is a wonderful thing to know. That is a wonderful thing to know.

You've got the pc's goal and terminal. You can't get the rudiments in. Everything you're trying to run for some reason or other causes the tone arm just to go higher and causes the needle to be stickier and it goes along with an ARC breaky pc and you're trying to run the goals terminal, but you don't seem to be getting anyplace at all. You know, on a 5-way bracket or there's something messed up about the command or maybe the level isn't right or you've overrun a level. This was an old problem in clearing, was overrunning a level and getting the tone arm so high and getting the needle so stuck, you couldn't reassess.

Now, I can give you a method which should, under ordinary circumstances – since I haven't done it to enough people to tell you broadly that it'll do it to all cases – I myself believe at this time that it'll probably, will undoubtedly do it to all cases, but I can't tell you that from actual fact, I can only tell you my observation up to this moment – that running at least a two-way flow on the exact goal of the pc phrased in some action wording would cause the Prehav Scale – or stiffening of the bank or rudiments stiffening of the bank to come right off.

Quite marvelous. You see a high tone arm – you see a high tone arm, a stick needle, you don't know what's gone wrong. Your assessments might have been out on a Prehav Scale. You might have overrun something. It might not have been a proper command. You might have been running with the rudiments too far out. There might have been a level which was left unflat, and then you went on to another level and this goofed it. There might be something wrong here and you can't quite find out what it is. You apparently have this to fall back on: You can phrase up the pc's goal. You – it's given. You have to have his goal already. You can phrase it up so that it can be run just as itself and that is all. You just run the goal.

It has to be action phrasing, however. You can't just chant. Let's say the pc's goal was "don't want to go home." You can't just say "Don't want to go home. Home don't want to go," you know. [laughter] That would not be a proper command phrasing. You would have to say how, or what, or something like that. "What would you have to do to go home," see, something like that, you see. "What would go – what would wanting to go home involve," some
such phrase, but it's better to have it in a two-way flow and you'd say "What would make you want to go home? What would make another want to go home?" Now there's a very good one, see. "What would make you want to go home? What would make another one want to go home?"

"What would you have to do – ?" – any such phrasing – "How could you go – ?" "What would this involve – ?" Any such phrasing woven around, leaving the goal more or less exactly worded and intact will give you a brand-new lease on life.

Now, you can – you can discharge it all down. You get back to where you were and you've now got a needle that you can assess. You got a pc who isn't ARC breaky and you now feel happy about the thing and you can go on auditing and find out what is wrong. This is to get him back into the realm of the living. So you see, that's a valuable thing to know.

If that fails you, well, you've always got suicide. You could propose that to the pc. That would solve his problems. "R2-45" by its various – various other techniques. So don't think that you just have this one technique to fall back on.

Now, that's a valuable thing to know, that you can probably desensitize the situation – that is to say, you can resensitize the meter by running the goal.

The goal run all by itself apparently produces some interesting – interesting phenomena. Apparently, a goal can be run all by itself. Now let me give you a further ramification on this.

We find the pc's goal and the pc has a goal of – well, let's say it was, "Under no circumstances to let the auditor have my terminal." Let's just corn it up, but let's say that that was the pc's goal: "Under no circumstances to let the auditor have my terminal." Now, of course, you'd recognize clearly in black and white letters of fire that under no God's quantity of expert terminal-finding over the next three weeks were you going to have much of a show because your pc is always going to have the rudiments out. The pc's always going to have it mucked up one way or the other – obviously, with a goal like that. You see that clearly? "To never let an auditor get anywhere near my terminal," or some such goal. That's his – the lifetime he's – I mean, it's a goal for the last trillion years, see. He knew he was leading up to this lifetime or something so he had his goal all set.

Well, you could turn around and run it and all you do is run the goal. That's all you've got. You haven't got a terminal. So you just run the goal until you can – got the goal kind of tamed down a little bit and you can find the terminal now. Cute, huh?

In fact, this is so good that I don't know that it wouldn't become standard procedure to run the goal before you looked for the terminal, because it'd be very fast assessment if you did. I don't know that it would become standard procedure, but I'm just giving you warning. Having made a discovery of this particular magnitude with what you can do with a goal, why, you can be prepared for anything

You can do something with a goal and if I find you can do something with a goal, why, I guarantee you – ha-ha-ha-ha – that we will do something more with a goal, you see.
All right, so there is a method of short-circuiting it. Now, I've given you a very weird and corny type of goal: "To never under any circumstances, over my dead body, to let the auditor have my terminal." See? That's very corny, isn't it. How about a goal like this? How about a goal like this? "To remain totally undiscovered." Well, isn't that the same goal? Isn't that the identical goal? Now, how long are you going to sweat over that one before you get smart and remember this lecture?

I'm going to invite your attention to the pc's goal as indicative of his behavior in processing. You look at the pc's goal, I'll predict his behavior in processing and I won't be a hair off any time. I've been looking down your throats on this now for weeks. Matter of fact, I just – I once angled in toward a pc's goal because of his behavior in assessment. He was just laughing a minute ago there.

I did. I said, "Well, let's – let's sort that out from that angle because we couldn't get anything to stay in. Nothing ever would stay in on this goal and of course, the thing was practically "Nobody is ever to find anything on me," you see. That was the goal and it was very hard to find. And this pc, by the way, was being assessed, continually, with the rudiments wildly out. They were always out.

Well, look-a-here. It was after the fact. You've got the goal. So now you can understand why it was hard to get the assessment. But remember, you're doing – you're doing the assessment before you've got the goal. You – you don't have this datum yet, do you? Valuable as the datum would be, to know the person – the best way – the most easily – the easiest sessions you would ever run would be those sessions in which you were trying to find the goal that you already knew what it was. That'd be a very easy session to conduct.

The goal is "To hit the auditor over the head with an E-Meter," you see. And you know that, so every time he reaches over for the E-Meter and so forth, you put his arm back in the chair, and you – there's no surprise involved with it, don't you see. But we sweat along over this goal for a long time and we are considerably annoyed all during the assessment because at the least provocation, the pc picks up the E-Meter and hits us over the head with it and we think this is getting in the road of the assessment. [laughter] You might say that the pc sitting there is the assessment. So if we knew it in advance, the pc would never give us any trouble. But we don't know it in advance.

But let's use this idea. We go down a long list of goals on the pc – Routine 3 is just done Routine 3, you understand. There isn't big changes occurring here. I'm just showing you some of the mechanics back of all this – and we do an assessment. We get our rudiments in. We get them in very well. We make sure that a Sec Check has been done on the pc. We make sure everything is grooved in and everything is very neat and everything is very nice. And we go down and we get the goals list and we get the thing all assessed out and we wind up with the pc's goal. All right, that's the way we should do it.

Is there any way to make it any easier on us? Well, that's for sure. There's ways to make it easier on us. As we look this thing over, we should do a goals list rather relaxedly. We shouldn't attack the pc and extract his goals list from him something on the order of a highwayman taking the gold off the night mail, see. This is kind of a wrong approach.
We can weight this thing up with importance, you see. We can make this so terribly important. We can make it under such strain. We can put so much attention on these Dennison crepe paper doors of the rudiments, you see, that he begins to think these things are castle high. "Oh, God, nobody could ever – . Oh, I hope I don't – I hope I don't have a present – I hope – I hope I don't have a pr-present time problem before this session because, of course, I won't get any place in the session. And we'll have to spend the whole session on present time problem, and I hope I don't have a present time problem. And let's see, how can I keep from having an ARC break with the auditor. Let's see, if I get an ARC break with the auditor, then the auditor won't be able to find my goal and terminal and – and the session will be no good. So let's see. I guess no matter what the auditor does, I won't pay any attention. I think that would be a good idea. Now, let's see, room. Room. Well, that room always makes me nervous, so-so-so the best thing for me to do is just not look at it, the whole session."

See, the pc is helping you out, see. "Ah, now let's see. I have no present time problem and I'm not going to say anything much to the auditor or not going to hear anything very much that he says and then I'll get no ARC break and – and then I won't notice the room, so that'll stay in. And – withholds, withholds. Do I have any withholds? Do I have any withholds at all? Let's see, do I? Do I? Do I? Is there anything I haven't told anybody? Let's see. Let's see now. No, I guess I don't have any withholds, but – but on the other hand – on the other hand, he might find out the first third of my life. Somebody might get into that quarter of my life and maybe at the time of withholds, maybe if I just sort of clench the cans convulsively"[laughter] "when he starts asking about withholds, we'll get across that one all right. Now I've got the rudiments in, we will have a session."

You'd be surprised what goes on. The pc – pc tries to help you out all he can. I just ran an assist a little while ago, by the way, on Quentin. It had been carefully buried. Nanny had told him it was all better now and he was now well. And you know, I couldn't get a single somatic out of him? This little kid runs like a – like a baby carriage, you know. He'd fallen out of bed on his head. No somatics? This character? Impossible. Because usually all I have to do is say, "Bing, bing, bang, thud. Put your attention on this, that, boom," and it blows. And that's about the end of that. But in this place, no somatic? No somatic? So I trace it back and I find out how he's been reassured while he's in a state of near concussion that "it doesn't hurt now." Somebody's installed a somatic shut-off. So I had to search this over, and – it took me a moment or two, and I said, "Well, has anybody said anything about this? You mentioned this to anybody?"

"No, nobody but so-and-so, and they said it didn't hurt now."

And I said, "All right. Well, do you recall when that was and where it was? All right. That's fine. Got that all straightened out. Okay, now let's go through this whole thing again." Somatics, you know, bang! Right in there, thud! And he was running.

So don't think that I'm saying you don't have to have rudiments in. Here was a somatic shut-off and here was somebody auditing before me. At the moment of the accident, he had another auditor and he was still – as far as the accident is concerned, you see – still totally fixated see, on a person that was supposed to be helping him out at that time. So as long as that person was standing there in the incident, the incident was shut off.
Well, of course, rudiments are in essence an effort to be the pc's auditor, and if you can become the pc's auditor through putting the rudiments in, of course the pc runs wonderfully. The somatics go on. All kinds of things happen; various phenomena occur. Pc goes rapidly through the bank. The rudiments are out; benefits occur less to the degree that the pc doesn't have an auditor, you see. I mean, it's a direct proportion proposition. The more he has an auditor, the more confidence he has in an auditor and so forth, why, the more will occur in the session beneficial to the pc. It's a direct proportion, so don't let me discount in your mind the importance of getting rudiments in. I've just told you that there are times when it's better to leave them slightly out than to drive them out with clubs.

I think we need a new phrase about there. Let's just call them muzzled rudiments. Muzzled rudiments, you know. You say, "Rum-thum-thum-thum-thum-thum. All right. Now we're going to run this process." And bang, here goes your session. You see, you've gone through the form of Model Session and if one or two questions didn't release the needle, you leave it alone. You don't run any process on the pc. You would do that at times when the tone arm was high and the needle sluggish during the last session that you gave the pc.

Of course, the pc comes in – of course, any pc of mine comes in with a high tone arm and a sluggish needle and they left the last session with a low tone arm and a loose needle, I curl my long, nonextant black moustache and I say, "Well, I don't mean to inquire into your private life, but what have you been doing?" They usually tell me and the needle goes down thud, see. Needle goes loose. Tone arm goes down. They go into session. Now in essence, however, if they're not going to and if this phenomena is not going to occur by reason of everything being out, you – you're better off auditing them with rudiments out than trying to slug the rudiments in.

Do you see? That's the only point of judgment I'm trying to make with you. Muzzled rudiments. If you notice that every time you try to get the rudiments in the pc becomes more ARC breaky than before, you might decide that it's a marvelous idea to do certainly one thing – to sort of muzzle down the rudiments. Toughen up security checking on the pc.

You see, that's not a rudiment. Security Checking is Security Checking, see. If he's going to be so chopped up and messed up and ARC breaky, he's probably got withholds like crazy, so throw that over into the department of Security Checking and if his tone arm and needle are not responding to any process known to man or beast, if you're lucky enough to have his goal, run it. You just run it and the whole thing will soften up. It'll bypass everything else that's happening to the pc because this is the single, more important thing than present time.

You have something more important than present time. So, therefore, it overrides the top of rudiments and so forth. So is the terminal more important than present time, but less so than the goal. The terminal is not quite as important as the goal. And the goal is the softer road. See, there can be several terminals to one goal. You can run a terminal flat for that goal and then have to find another terminal for that goal. See and maybe have to find another terminal for that goal before you get rid of the goal. But goal? That's just one goal. Zoom! When it's out – when you've got it audited out, then it is out. And that is it.
These are all points of adjudication. What do you do in auditing? And a very finished auditor, an auditor who really knows his business, can handle a pc well, goes on the basis of fundamentals. He sees what is happening with the case. He knows what he wants to have happen with the case and he just throws aside all barriers which interpose on his having that happen with the case. I gave you a very crude example but a very easily understandable one.

Well, all right, I'm trying to give a little boy an assist. No somatics. Well, I don't try to sack into his past life and do this and do that and the other thing. I just figure out "Well, what – woo-woo. This boy has no somatics and he should have somatics. And nobody has run this thing. And must have been something in the environment at the time." And sure, we find a somatic shut-off. Somatic shut-off. Knock it out. There goes the rest of it.

Would it have ever come out into the clear if I'd just run the process? Yes, yes. I could have run the thing and run the thing and run the thing and all of a sudden he would have remembered the person telling him this and it would have blown anyhow and I would have come out the other end. And it would have been the difference between about a two-hour session and a fifteen-minute session. The way I did it was a fifteen-minute session. You can always cut corners by knowing your business.

You understand that an auditor can almost always get there in some knuckleheaded fashion. Skill does just this: It makes a time difference in auditing. It can make an enormous time difference in auditing. It can be something on the order of five hundred to one. See? It can be five-hundred hours for one hour. See, pc gets this session. Auditor really understands this. Gets a good grip on it. Has a little bit of luck. A couple of horseshoes in one pocket and a rabbit's foot in the other pocket and some shamrocks stuck in his lapel. Just hits it, you know. Bing! And he said, "Is it so-and-so?" And the pc says, "Yes, it's so-and-so." And he does so-and-so. And zoom and that's it. And that clears all that up and that's the end of that.

And somebody else runs the CCHs and then follows through the CCHs and he runs a Present Time Problem Intensive one way or the other and gets that out of the road. He runs all existing Security Checks, fifteen Security Checks more that he himself has thought up and so on. And somewhere in this mass of stuff, why, he hits the exact thing that the pc was on. And it happens more or less at that point because the pc is softened up. You get the idea?

You could get there. You can always get there, you know, but riding what tortoise sometimes.

Now, it isn't just basically that you always have to get there faster. As a matter of fact, getting there swiftly is sometimes an economic liability and in a society of this particular character, getting there too fast and getting there too slow can be looked on alike as undesirable. They would have you strung up in short order, I'm afraid, if you went out on the roads and you saw somebody sick and you said, "God bless you, my son," and it – he instantly was well. And you looked around throwing these God-blesses in all directions and so on. Well, they'd say "That fellow down there in Judea. It's about time we hang somebody else, man." They'd hang you, that's for sure.

Furthermore, it'd be economically very difficult. Negotiations – economic negotiations before you said "God bless you," you see, would take more time than the cure and this would all be rather silly. And of course, I'm joking now about this, but the economics of the situation
do influence the length of time in auditing. I just don't want them to influence the length of
time in auditing the way they did in psychoanalysis. Almost the total end product of psycho-
analysis is "how long can you get somebody to be analyzed." Hasn't anything to do with what
you do with the person in analysis. It's how long can you go. Because the longer it goes, the
better your paycheck is and the more weeks you're sure of it. So there's an optimum that the
society will accept in terms of speed, economically.

Now of course, I'm just joking on that point, but there is another point: it's how much
change can a pc accept over what period of time and you just start talking to this pc you're
having too hard a time with on the subject of Clear and you're liable to find out that it's just a
totally unacceptable proposition because he looks on it as a rapid proposition. And you talk to
him about rapid clearing, he's all set to tell you that he wants to be cleared this session.

Well, that's interesting because you'll see some pcs putting it down session after ses-
session after session that the session goal they put down is to be Clear. Well, that's dandy. We're
awfully glad they put that down as a session goal. Nobody's criticizing it. Wouldn't say any-
thing about it except for this: It should occur to you as the auditor once in a while not to ques-
tion the goal, but to discuss the subject with the pc with your eye on the needle.

Now, you shouldn't take up the pc's goals too arduously as did he reach them or didn't
he and his goals are his goals, and they are his goals for the session. And you take up the ses-
session's goals at session end and find out if he made them or didn't make them. But if all the pc
ever said was "to be Clear," "to be Clear," "to be Clear," "to be Clear," we wouldn't question
the goal, but sooner or later we'd find out what was he talking about. What was he talking
about?

And you'll find some tremendous variability. They – he doesn't really know what he's
talking about. Now, not that you would do this in a session – very often he definitely does
know what he's talking about – but, not that you would do this in a session but you could do
this in a session: You could say, "All right. This session we are going to try to make this goal
of yours 'to be Clear.' And we're going to make it in this session." And this, of course, to
somebody that's reading at 6.5 and stuck up and so forth.

It won't necessarily violate his reality, but it'll violate his speed-of-progress factor. The
idea of sitting down in this session in one condition and coming out at the other condition
without any time allowed for adjustment, healing, feeling whether or not the water is cold,
doing all of these things, you see – and you're liable to get – you're just liable to shake up the
meter just – just horribly. I'm not saying you should do that. I'm just saying the consequence
of doing it on some pcs who have this as a goal. Speed. Speed. The speed with which you
clear the pc is sometimes unacceptable to the pc and you very often will find a pc planting his
heels in. But what has got its heels in? And this is very important to you. His goal has got its
heels in. That's what's got its heels in.

Examine a case from the aspect of its goal. Examine the goal from its aspect – from
the aspect of what dynamic it is an overt against and you'll find out something about pcs.
You'll find out how a pc got a goal in this solid. He had this goal. It was a perfectly honest
goal – perhaps. And – it was – it was a perfectly good goal and he went along, but nobody
wanted this goal because it didn't fit with certain dynamics. And they invalidated it and he
reasserted it and they invalidated it and he reasserted it. And they invalidated it and he reasserted it, and they invalidated it and he didn't assert it very much. And then he reasserted it and then they really invalidated it. And after that, he skipped it and it kind of crops up now and then. He thinks about it, you know, sort of, "Well, sort of a fairy-tale thing. I mean, nobody really believes in it, you know. It doesn't amount to much – just something you ..."

And when you first pick it up, you'll find out it behaves like an overt. A pc's goal, even though it is a goal – and it is a perfectly honest goal – nevertheless behaves like an overt. And you can run it as an overt. And that's why it works to run it two ways. It's running overts. It's the most remarkable thing you ever cared to run into.

All right. Let's take the goal "to climb a mountain." Highly unlikely goal on some pc, but we will take it that way. "To climb a mountain." All right. "To climb a mountain." Very good. And you say – you can't figure out that this would do anything to anything very much. And you say, "What would this do to a group?" And by golly, the pc will come out with a long chain of overts. It is an overt against a group to climb a mountain. You wouldn't think so at first glance, but of course the goal wouldn't be stuck to this degree if it hadn't been invalidated, if it hadn't been an overt. See, it was treated as an overt, so it becomes one.

Naturally, it's been objected to so often that it's easily invalidated and this is how a goal or terminal goes out on the pc. Any goal that was not a mass goal of the race or line of the pc – but not – you know, just actually not an axiom; any goal that isn't an axiom – is out of agreement to some degree and therefore has been invalidated very often by other members of the groups with which the pc has been associated, has been invalidated on other dynamics and having been invalidated on other dynamics becomes a fruitful source of invalidation.

Now he's used it to invalidate eventually and people invalidate it, so you say to this pc – you're doing a goals assessment on the pc – and you say, "To climb a mountain. To climb a mountain. Did you ever go in for mountain climbing?"

And the pc says, "Oh, huh?"

And you say, "Well, your goal here 'to climb a mountain,' did you ever go in for any mountain climbing?"

And the pc says, "Well, no, not particularly. I thought it'd be very nice to climb a mountain sometimes."

And you say, "Well, don't you find mountain climbing awfully tiring? Ah, it's not being done much these days, you know. Did you know that – did you know that airplanes now fly much higher than Everest? Did you know that?" And you say, "Let's take up this goal now 'to climb a mountain. " It doesn't register.

Now we get the rudiments in and get the ARC break off and the thing registers again. Now, what's – what's the phenomena connected with this? It's just that the goal has been invalidated very often and has been used for the purpose of invalidation of certain groups of people and so is a fruitful source of invalidation. And you just sort of breathe on this goal lightly, you see, and it apparently folds up.
Actually, this is a misnomer. It simply disappears from view and it disappears from consciousness, but it sure doesn't disappear from the reactive bank. It's in there plowing and chewing and mashing, going on like mad, you see, down underneath the cover, but you can actually – can get it off of the meter by invalidation.

And because the terminal is an outgrowth of the goal, it of course could be similarly invalidated. Well, these things are easily submerged. So the rudiments go out; there disappears the goal and terminal. You could go forever. Actually, we have. You can pull a thousand, fifteen-hundred goals or terminals off of a pc when the original ones are invalidated? Mm.

Oh, I'll tell you one. An HGC didn't take the pc's goals list. Pc laboriously writes out a goals list, so an HGC didn't take the pc's goals list, but wrote the pc a new goals list down for the pc, taking it off by the meter. That was it; that was enough. I don't know how long they assessed and it wasn't length in that particular instance. They did a complete misassessment. The goal they found couldn't possibly have stayed in. The terminal they found couldn't possibly have stayed in. They ran it. They got nowhere. It was a complete mess.

Fortunately, we found the list. We found the list and found out about this and got this straight and so forth and it was just a matter of, I don't know, five, six hours. Just five or six hours. There it was. The pc's goal occurred on the original, handwritten, personally written list, but didn't occur on later lists. That any goal had been invalidated, you see – by not accepting just the pc's list of goals, the goal – the pc's goal disappeared. It disappeared because when the pc was asked to list the goals again, she didn't list it. She omitted her goal. Interesting, isn't it? Ha-ha-ha, boy, I'll tell you. Finding goals and terminals is walking a tightrope.

Now, are there any processes that you can run – well, I've given you one. There's this goals process. That's very good. Several brackets of the goals process; two brackets or something like that. It's marvelous. But there must be some other processes. Must be some other processes that you can run. Oh, yeah, well there's a hatful of them. I've just done a safety table which I think you already have. Should have been issued. It was last Thursday's bulletin. If it hasn't been issued to class, it should be. But it's a safety table. Safe processes. That's all.

Now, this particular problem is what can you audit and it lays down this rule. I have gotten enough information now so that I can write up a Problems Intensive and will talk and give a comprehensive lecture on the subject of everything about a Problems Intensive – all the form and so forth. I'm redoing the form and so on.

But it follows like this: that you can always ask a generalized Security Check question. Contains the word you and it contains the word "someone" or "anyone". You can always ask that type of question. You, someone, anyone. You know? "Have you ever robbed a bank?" Well, fine. Not much of a terminal, a bank. "Have you ever – have you ever sunk any boats?" These are not as good a Security Check question as "Have you ever robbed anything? Have you ever sunk anything?" See?

The further you can get the question away from a particularized or even what we used to call a generalized terminal, why, the better off you are. You say, "Has there been any commotion before that problem? Was there any commotion before you had that problem? When did you have that problem? Well, what activity was going on then?" See?
You didn't name anybody. You don't direct the pc's attention directly onto past terminals if you can possibly help it. Now, understand you can get away with it. You can get away with quite a bit of this. I'm just showing you that it's a poor practice and you should realize that it has liabilities and it has limitations. So it is a better Security Check question – "Have you ever robbed?" What's the – where's the rest of it? Well, just leave that to the pc's imagination. His mind will go over onto something, see? See, that – I'm just doing the *reduo* *tio ad absurdum*. Actually, this is being too careful, see.

"Have you ever robbed?"

The pc says, "Well, there's the next ..." You know, his mind connects on the proper terminal or whatever he has robbed, you see.

All right. This – that – that's nearly perfect, but too extreme. "Have you ever robbed anything?" or "Have you ever robbed anyone?" Ahs that's good. See, yeah, that's all right. That's quite acceptable. You can play that around and do a lot with this.

"Have you ever robbed your father?" Oh, no, that is utterly and completely unacceptable as a Security Check question. I finally got all of the bars down now and got this thing shaken out and seen where it lives and I know all about this thing and that is just not acceptable, as a Security Check question. You understand what I mean?

What does this amount to? "Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you."

Well, what's happening here? Attention on terminal, Father. Attention on terminal, Father. Attention on terminal, Father. This would be a little bit safer but also a little bit corny: "Have you ever robbed any member of your family?" See? At least his attention can flick around without you crushing it down against Father. He'd be better off. That would be the better thing to do.

You understand that you've got wide latitude here and you can get away with an awful lot. I'm just giving you the perfections of it. That's all. I'm being pedantic, in the extreme. You can run through a Security Check question, you can actually assess lists of people and you can find out who drops the most and run practically a repetitive command on the person of what they've done to them. You can do all this sort of thing and you just get away with it left and right – as long as it's a Security Check because O/W is the only thing that'll run against a terminal. It's the O/W that excuses it.

You can always run Overt-Withhold as long as overts and withholds exist. Don't run Overt-Withhold where no overts or withholds exist. That sounds awfully mechanically something, but why – why do I add the additional provision? Well, this is strictly and entirely because if no overts and withholds exist, you're still putting the person's attention on another terminal, than the person's goals terminal. And you're going to get some kind of a repercussion.
Therefore, when a pc runs out of overts and withholds against a certain person in the past, he would get ARC breaky. Why? Did you ever have a pc do this? "Yeah, but they're – but I don't have any more. I didn't do anything more. I – I – mean I have no – I – uh ..."

He's sensible now that his attention is being crowded newly over onto that terminal. You got it washed up before, but now newly you're crowding it onto that terminal. That's a bad show.

So Security Checking is the best way to run Overt-Withhold and a generalized sort of question is – having to do with the action, not the terminal – is much better than any other type question. And you get some sloppy, pronoun type of terminal – well, that's not, not perfect, but it's quite acceptable. "Have you ever robbed anyone?"

Now, you understand that you can throw questions in along the line, but you should realize, actually, that you are just to some degree getting away with something. It's a violation of this other, so you are – you're – you're just getting away with something.

All right. You take prior confusion. We'll take up prior confusion in another lecture and beat it to death. But you take prior confusion: the person says, "Well, was there any excitement before – when was the first time you noticed you had that problem? Oh, yeah, well, that's good. Was there any excitement occurred just before that? That's fine. Now, oh, yes, well, you had a fight with your sister. All right now. What did you do to your sister there? All right. Did you have any withholds from her? Was there anybody else you had any withholds from? Oh, yes, you had a withhold from your sister. Good. Is there anybody else you had any withholds from then? Any more and so forth? Oh, all right. That's fine. That's good. Did you do anything else in that particular period? Did you do anything to anybody else? Was there anything of this a little earlier? Did you have any unkind thoughts any earlier about anything or anybody and so forth?" And you're just running unkind thoughts, criticalness, withholds, overts, you know, just – just reach around the basketful and just clean up the confusion, you see. Just plug away at it and so on. That's almost perfect.

You'll find out the present time problem will blow. The somatics will blow. The person's illness will blow. You'll find out the ARC breaks blow and so forth and it opens up the door to a brand-new type of rudiment. It's a Security Check type of rudiment. You clean up your rudiments by Security Check and find out you can get away with it much better.

You don't have those at this particular instant. They're still in development. It is based on this other lineup, see – the prior confusion to get rid of the out-rudiment. Well, it doesn't violate the goals terminal, and it doesn't leave the pc sitting out in the middle of nowhere.

But let me give you just this – this other fact. I've talked about it quite a bit and I've been asked here a question of "What exactly makes the bank stiffen up by taking its attention off the goals terminal? What exactly?" Now, I've said that the terminal asserts itself. It's one of the built-in mechanisms of the terminal that if it is ignored, it gets apparent. This is one of the mechanisms of the thing. This is still, however, not answering this question because frankly I don't know, frankly. I can give you the generality and I can give you the basic law that makes it occur, but the exact mechanics of how this is done actually, practically – practically it just staggers you trying to figure these things out. Exactly how would the pc with his
left hand make his bank go stiffer and heavier and more solid and so forth, so that he notices it on the right hand, you see.

It's always this mystery about "How does the pc do it with his left hand – in order to feel it with his right hand and just exactly what goes on here?" Well, the exact mechanics of the thing – electronically and so forth – I could not tell you at this time. I don't know.

But I can tell you this: that you needn't worry about hidden standards anymore, because all the basis of all circuitry are to be found on the goals list of the pc. The basis of the pc's circuits are in his goals and the type of circuit he will have of various kinds will be found on his goals list. So that you get his main goal, you'll find out one line of circuits and when you go down and assess another goal, you'll find another whole series of circuits. After you've gotten rid of the first goal, you'll find another whole series of circuits obeying this other goal. And we have the basis of circuits for any given individual. And isn't it interesting that it's different for every other individual, so don't – and there are a couple of billion of them alive at the present moment right here on this planet, so don't blame me too excessively for not having noticed they were all the same mechanism before, but I have just more or less scouted this out at the moment.

If a person has a hidden standard type of circuit that is immediately in action, running the goal bypasses it. And if he has several types of circuits, they will be found somewhere on his goals list, and you will get to those as you clear him. As you get rid of the terminals and the goals, why, the next layer will unpeel. And of course, those that are most active may come last, but they will surrender the most easily.

Well, what – what is the goal of the pc? Well, you'll find this – the first goal that you find on the pc – remember you're going to find other goals on the pc, too, after you've gotten rid of the first goal. It has to get out of the road. But the first goal of the pc will describe the most available series of circuits and one of the things you do for the pc when you first find his goal is you actually do blow up some of his circuits. So actually, the best way to get at hidden standards is to clear the pc. Interesting, isn't it?

But you clear him with his goal and if you bring his goal into the command, his circuits will clear up, which is what's new here. You're getting commands now that include the pc's goals as part of the command, which we will also talk about at some other time.

But it's quite amusing if you recognize that the center ... This is a possibility, you see, that the pc has a goal "never to give the auditor a terminal." They actually will respond as a circuit which goes into action in the presence of an auditor and then which blanks out the pc's memory of anything if the auditor asks for the terminal, see?

I'm just saying – supposing this were the main goal of the pc, just giving you a piece of idiocy. Which is – nobody ever had that goal. You get how that would be? He's got a circuit set up so that you say, "Now, what is your terminal?" and immediately this thing goes into an occlusion, makes him stupid and doesn't answer. And he says, "Huh?" You know?

All right. That's his goal. His goal expresses itself in a circuit form. So you get circuitry goals. "Never to make money anywhere." See? That's his goal. Let's say it's "never to make any money at any time, anywhere." Every time he sees himself in danger of making any
money, a little voice talks to him and tells him that's the wrong thing to do. He just comes close to making some money and a little voice says, "Well, that's very bad. That's a very bad thing," you know? "Much more advantageous to sell it than buy it at this particular time," you see? And he gets caught in the stock market crash and he's always in financial disasters.

You ask this person who has a goal like that if he was in any financial disasters. "Oh, yes, yes. Lots of them."

"Well now, do you have any little voice that tells you what to do in order to make money?"

"Oh, well, it's funny you ask this, but I always have a hunch."

"Well, how does this hunch express itself?"

"Well, I get a burning in the – under my jaw here, you know. It sort of comes to life, you know? And I just know."

All right. You run the person's goal, you find the person's goal and run it a couple of ways and so forth and this somatic will go ke-pshwt! And there goes the circuit.

So we're down to – we're in reaching distance of straight ways to blow circuits, anyway. So we have made a considerable gain here in the past couple of weeks while you've been agonizing around. But I've decided to treat you all nicely. I've decided to be very good to you and so forth. And as far as possible at the moment, I have you running directly in the direction of Clear pointed and fired.

And it's some possibility that some of you in the next few hundred years – [laughter] might, as you're auditing might accidentally slip, you know, and disconnect the E-Meter so the needle will float and something on that order. I'm not going to threaten you with being Clear. You don't have to be Clear if you don't want to be. Really. You can go on being aberrated if you want to be and so forth.

The only thing I will say is if you – if you insist utterly on remaining totally aberrated and so forth, you have approached a period when you've got to be very careful. [laughter] You've got to be very, very, very careful and try not to do any of the auditing commands because if you do just a few of them, it's liable to happen. And so I'm not threatening you and I don't want to beef up your banks and so forth or anything like that, but I'm very happy to – no, I'm very happy, by the way, with the general run of cases for the first time in many, many, many, many, many, many weeks. First time this year, actually. First happy – where I'm very happy with all the cases which are running. There's a couple of little question marks hanging over the left ear of a couple of cases present, but that's all working out and it's all going very smoothly. But I think you must somehow or another accidentally have applied some of the information you've been getting on the bulletins. For that – [laughter] and for that I thank you. I thank you very much.

So I hope that – I hope you have a very successful run of it, and – I do. I want to see some Clears here in the very near future. So you, too, could sacrifice yourself toward this ambition or goal. Okay?

Thank you.
Thank you.

Well, that's enthusiasm. Must have some processing results today. [laughter] Maybe my popularity has gone up here. Who knows? [laughter] All right.

This is what the what?

_Audience: 1st of November._

You say it's the first of November? It is? No kidding. Halloween was last night. Guy Fawkes Day still has to arrive, the 4th of July comes later. [laughter]

All right. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 1st November 1961.

I should talk to you something about the formation of commands. Particularly at this particular stage of the game, you are not getting any opportunity of any kind whatsoever to form any commands. I am shoving them down your throat and you get twenty-five infraction sheets and your pc gets a knock in the head if they don't run it. I mean, that's – that's a – it's a very diplomatic address. It's one of these conditions of you can do exactly as you please. You can do anything as you please as long as you do _exactly_ what Ron says. [laughs, laughter]

Well now, oddly enough, commands as a subject is one of the most esoteric, unetailed, unformulated subjects in Scientology – how you put a command together and what you do with a command and all that sort of thing.

And I don't know. I don't know if it's teachable. I see once in a while, I see something wild going on like – well, let's say that the pc's terminal is "waterbuck" and the level assessed is "Anger". So we see a command like this with all the blanks ready to fill in and we see a command that's been filled in this way: "What anger waterbuck?" [laughter] You think I'm kidding, but it's as grim as that, see.

And by my laying out commands, it's more or less just by my knowledge of commands over a very long period of time. And along about midnight after you've turned in your ten o'clock reports – Mary Sue and I going over your cases and reports; along about midnight, one o'clock, two o'clock or three o'clock in the morning – you would be amazed the desperation I sometimes feel of simply getting your pc by the nape of the neck and putting him on an E-Meter for about two seconds and finding out which word will be the stronger reaction.

Now, it shows you however, that commands will run without drastically clearing them with the pc because such commands _do_ run. So you might say there is a – the commands are divided up into three categories: One is "utterly asinine." That's category one. That's an utterly asinine command. I mean, it doesn't make sense. It isn't together and so forth. It is not a smooth, answering command. And under that category, you can get all commands where a
Prehav level has been taken slavishly and simply put down in a blank and some sense is supposed to be made out of it. Or a command which has no possible concourse with flows: "How have you shot a waterbuck? How have you kicked a waterbuck? Thank you. How have you shot a waterbuck? How have you kicked a waterbuck? Thank you." You know, something weird like this, you know. One way flow, one way flow, one way flow. Well, the pc will hang up on it and that's all there is to that.

Under another type of error that is made under this particular command line is a command that is too complex. It is too wordy; it is too impossible to state. And some of the goals you've been getting, you've been taking, of course, just as you should, exactly what the pc says. The point has never come up because I've never before asked you to run goals. But you realize that a goal is something on the order of "to climb the tallest mountain and dance a jig thereon while shooting off rainbow flares with my tootle-gun." [laughter]

Well, that's what the pc said and so there it goes as a goal. All right. Well, that's all right; don't interfere with the pc's goal. That's for sure. But what of this is the pc's goal?

Now, I have to ask you at this particular time if goals are going to be made into commands, that you – to find out what out of all of this avalanche of verbiage was the pc's goal. And you may be able to get it right back down to just a verb.

It isn't actually "to climb the tallest mountain and dance a jig thereon while shooting off – " you know, it's – that has nothing to do with it. It's "to climb." And if you sort the goal out and compartment the goal the same way you do a Security Check, after it's all checked in and it's stayed in and there it is – you understand, you've checked it out; and now let's find out what part of this is the goal – you'll have a lot more success. You'll find out that the pc all of a sudden does a new cognition on the thing.

Now, you would just compartment the goal and find out what part of the goal's wording falls and then, the only part that falls is the part you leave in. I mean, it's elementary, my dear Watson. You just leave that part in. And it might be, of course, with such a goal "shoot off sky rockets with my doodlegun," you know. And all right, if that's what stayed in and if nothing falls unless you have "to shoot off skyrockets with my doodle-gun," that's the goal. Unfortunately, that is the goal.

But you may get it pared down and find out that it's just a word and that one of the reasons goals go in and out is because they're too particularized, they're too long. The goal might be "to shoot." The goal might be "to climb." And it might do a fade in and out because it's being overlapped, don't you see?

So after you've got a goal all sorted out or if you're having a lot of trouble trying to sort a goal out or something of this sort, you'd better go down the line on the goals that are still occasionally flicking.

You know, they're in and they're out and they're in and they're out. You've seen that happen. I think you better sort out what in that line that you are reading – just like you would a Security Check – what in that line reacts. What verb in that line or what noun or what something or other or what phrase is actually doing the reacting. And now there's a possibility – I have not done this myself; I just mention in passing – there's a possibility you might – I was
just thinking about that this morning – you might have a consistent read if you only had one small section of all this, you see, whereas the rest of the read is sort of knocking it out all the time and is losing the thing. Do you see what I mean?

So just as you compartment a Security Check – "Have you ever been PDH'd by a cat?" You know, that famous example, now. "Pain," "drug," "hypnosis" – these things are all reactive and go out, you see and so on. And finally it gets down to "cat" and we find out there's an overt against a cat and it clears.

But you compartment a Security Check question and if you had a long and involved Security Check question like "Have you ever shot any girls off the top of a mountain with a BB gun?", you see? And you keep getting a reaction on this thing. You're just a plain knucklehead if you don't go back – "Have you ever shot – any – girls – off – the top – of a mountain?"

All right. Three of them didn't react and it's, "Have you ever – shot – . Have you ever shot – girls?" Nothing else reacts. Well, what have you shot? Now, you should know that well in putting together a Security Check question because you can make fantastic errors in Security Check questions by noncompartmentation of the question.

Now, similarly with goals after you've got all the pc's goals and your rudiments are in and you're not ARC breaking him or anything like that. You've got some goal that's going in and out and you're having a lot of trouble isolating goals or you finally wind up with some sort of a goal "to join the I Will Arise Societies and lie quietly in a coffin while snoring." Well, now you can make up your mind that it is insufficiently fundamental. It has to do with one section of track and you've actually gotten a little tag. A little flag is shining there. But it is somewhere in this long goal and you're liable to get something tremendously fundamental. And all of a sudden the pc will wake up to it by compartmentation of this goal.

I'm not telling you as you go down an original Goals Assessment to compartment every goal. I'm telling you that when you've got some goals down toward the end and you're having a bit of trouble sorting them out, you should start compartmentation a little bit and you're liable to be able to break a goal down to a fantastic simplicity of some kind or another that absolutely pervades the furthest reaches of the pc's life, whereas "to join the I Will Arise Society and lie in a coffin quietly while snoring" pervades that exact time when he was in Birmingham. And we finally find out that it's "to lie." Ah, ha-ha-ha-ha. "Double-entendre. Ah-ha-ha. Quelquefois, que magnifique! Aha!" You get the idea?

The pc has not necessarily written his complete goals list when he gives you his original list. Remember this. He's not necessarily written it. Well, I daresay there are traces of his goal in any such original list. You see? And maybe some of your difficulties with Goals Assessment is the fact that there's a part of one of those goals which is the goal and not the whole goal at all.

And if you have finally settled down to it and you do have this goal at the end and it's "to join the I-Will-Arise-Society and to lie in a coffin quietly while snoring," and you've got that, we get to the subject of commands. If you're going to express this as a command, where are we at? So you had better work this thing around to make sure that it is what it is, and that
the part of it that is alive as the goal is the part. Now, this has a little more importance than just wording of a goal.

You actually, occasionally, will get a much better goal summary which will reach much deeper into a person's life by taking some section of the goal – the last few goals, that you have hit upon. You know, verb – goals don't always have nouns.

Well, you get somebody; he's got a goal "to be a waterbuck." All right. That's fine. Seems very peculiar. "To be a waterbuck" and so on and we get it going along fine. And it's kind of – it's all right. Now, before you finally turn the goal in, let's find out if it's "to" "be" "waterbuck" and find out what fell. And then we find out "to be" "waterbuck." And we're liable sometime to find out we've assessed the terminal and not assessed the goal or that the pc's goal is something on the order of "to be," which would be an interesting goal, you see. And it isn't "to be" anything, but "waterbuck" happened to be connected with it in the original list and it's never come apart since.

You see what can happen at the end of a Goals Assessment. It doesn't mean anything particularly is wrong with goals, but I would take any long goal that a pc has and check it over by compartmentation and now the least that can happen is that we get into commands, but the most that can happen is we get a more pervasive goal. Much more pervasive goal. We have some goal like "to climb Mount Button-Button in the lower Mojave Desert while carrying two burros on my back." You see?

That refers to one stupid incident someplace or another and all he has is actually he's got a piece of his goals chain. See? That would be valuable. He has a piece of his goals chain, but you don't have a goal. The goal is concealed in there someplace. We possibly find out elementarily his goal is "to climb," see. And there we are. His goal is "to climb" and that's that.

And all of a sudden the pc wakes up, pinwheels go off, Guy Fawkes Day combines with 4th of July and somebody drops a live butt in the firecracker box, you know? Bang! Got an entirely different sounding goal which is very pervasive, whereas the pc up to that time was going along with his goal but now we've got a goal which reaches the tip of his little toenails whereas before it gradually was seeping down about an inch below the left ear. You see how that could be?

Now, this is fraught – all goals formation and rewording of goals and that sort of thing – boy, that is really fraught with more perils. I'll tell you, navigating the coasts of England during a fog in a leaking boat is a lead-pipe cinch compared to – it's just nothing compared to trying to navigate a pc through the rocks and shoals of changed wording. We'll get this kind of a thing. I'll give you an actual incident.

We had a goal "space commander" and the next day the auditor shortened it to "commander" and it ceased to react. It was "space commander." That was it. That was the goal or the terminal?

Female voice: The terminal.
It was a terminal, you see. "Commander" – no, no, no, no, no. It did not react. "Space commander" reacted. That was all that reacted and that was the wording that reacted, and that was it.

Now, for the benefit of command, of course, it'd be very handy to be able to drop that "space," but with such eagerness in view, don't lose the goal or the terminal just because you want to edit it or bobtail it. Keep a firm grip on it while snipping at it and snip at it in such a way that it doesn't get invalidated and you'll be all set and you will wind up with a goal which can be phrased.

This all comes under the subhead of "Get a command that can be said." And the asinine category of commands are commands that just cannot be said.

"How would you be afraid of someone who wanted to join the I-Will-Arise-Society and lie in a coffin quietly and snore?" Well, the pc has gone to sleep. [laughter] His mind is incapable of holding that much verbiage. And you find out he'll be wrestling with this, you know. [laughter] And if he had a glass dome for a skull, you would see little whirlpools and dust devils starting up inside of his head, see. He just can't hold that much thought.

So you'll – you'll see occasionally some phrased up command which just goes on for a paragraph practically, you know and it's an unanswerable command.

Another impossible command is one that the auditor can't pronounce. [laughter] And you think that is – you think that it has not happened, you're being silly. It has happened. I remember one poor auditor that it was perfectly okay – I've forgotten the exact word that he – letter that he had trouble with. Was it S?

Female voice: It was G.

Huh?

Female voice: The G in "Give me that hand."

Oh, the "G." He could not say a "G" and he was trying to run the CCHs. And every time he hit a "G" he would stutter. And it was so "G-g-g-g-g-g-g-g-g-g-g-g-g-g-Eeuuh! Gimmethat hand!" And of course, it would have been quite in order for him to have said, "Hand me the paw, partner," and he would have had the same end result. As a matter of fact, he would have had a better end result because the pc would have gotten some commands.

Now, under that heading, of course, is some "She sells seashells by the seashore." And you once in a while will run into one of these things and you don't notice it until you get going, you know. And you just set yourself up colossally, you know, to have command flubs. It starts making you nervous about the thing. You should look over commands from that particular viewpoint.

Well, the next category of commands are the commands that are just generally workable. They're just generally workable. They do work and they are generally applicable and there aren't many of them. What do you know. There are very few. In fact, I'm looking at a mimeographed sheet here that contains most of them that are just generally workable. It's not even important to read it at this particular stage of this lecture because it wouldn't tell you very much. There's Rising Scale Processing is rather generally workable. The old wording
that occurs in it. The CCHs are pretty generally workable unless you run into somebody that stammers and he can't say a "G" or something.

You've got numerous categories of processes that you just spit them out and so on. Your rudiments, for instance, are your best example of this. They're just generally workable. "Are you withholding anything?" you see. Well, that works. And by that type of command it is, is without the auditor skewering around in any way to make the pc understand it, it gets answered. You know, it's a very directly communicating statement.

And then we get over into the third category of command and it is the type of command which is in blank form. It's the blank form kind of command that has to be fitted to each pc by reason of assessment. Well, you have a wonderful example of that. You have – you don't run the goal and terminal and level of the pc without assessing them.

Well now, you have certain blank-form commands and they start in at the beginning and they go through to the end, but you've got to have the assessed material before you can form the command. In other words, in order to run a person's goal, you'd have to have his goal. In order to run his terminal, you'd have to have his terminal. And in order to do any broad runs on the terminal, why, you ordinarily – and certainly sooner or later – will have to have a Prehav level and these things all fit into a blank form. But it requires the special information from the pc.

There actually is another category of commands and that is the command of blank form which has to be fitted to the pc. It's a blank form that has to be filled in by assessment and then you have to turn around to the pc and you clear it by meter.

Most of your clearing commands should fall into this fourth class. Now, let's take a sort of a generalized sort of a run. Here's – "Assess the pc on the primary Prehav Scale and run with the following commands:

"How would you (blank) a (blank)?

"How would a (blank) you?

"How would (pc's goal)?

"What would be attempted against (pc's goal)?"

Now, that's an interesting form there, but it's certainly a Class IV command. This thing has to be adjusted. You've got to have all the data off the Prehav Scale in the assessment. You fill it into these blanks and then it has to be adjusted to make sense. That was understood. But then it has to be further adjusted against the pc to work absolutely perfectly without ever a hitch or a flaw.

See, we say the command to him, clear the command with him. We ask him about this wording or that wording or something of this sort.

I'm not trying to make any kind of a stylized science here of putting together commands. I'm just giving you this so that you can differentiate amongst them.

You've got this "Think of a... " and that's terminal. "What would a (terminal) think about?" Well, now apparently, that's one of these Class II commands, you know. I mean, it's
just blanket and everybody works, you'd think. But it doesn't; it doesn't. And the second it
doesn't work, checked against the pc, you of course are in trouble because you've got to re-
form the whole command.

All right. Let's say his terminal is "a waterbuck" and you say, "Think of a waterbuck.
What would a waterbuck think about?"

All right. And as you're clearing this thing, you find out that the second you say
"think," you get no reaction on the meter. It's just dead. The pc is all ready to be buried. Of
course he gets a reaction on "waterbuck" because it's his terminal. But that "think" doesn't get
any kind of a reaction at all. And you say "Get the idea of thinking." "What do you think
about thinking?" is the way you'd clear a command on a pc, by the way. You got his terminal
by assessment. "What do you think about thinking? What about this word think?" You got the
meter there in front of you.

And he says, "Well, uuy-uuuuu-uuu. As a matter of fact, people have been fooling me
for a number of years."

You say, "Yes? Yes?"

"Yes, they say 'People think.' Nobody can think."

Well, frankly, you could run, "Think of a waterbuck. What would a waterbuck think
about?" for literally hours and hours and hours and you get no tone arm action. Because the
command is undoable to the pc. He cannot do the command. He cannot do this command
"think."

Don't laugh and this is not a rare case. This is about 50 percent of the people you'll
process, at a rough guess. Because it's just about that many that have had trouble with it.
There is a remedy for it. You can turn around and clean up the thing semantically.

I'll give you an old process. We had people looking around and finding things that
weren't thinking. And it is quite remarkable. After you've looked around and found enough
things that weren't thinking, thinking doesn't get so arduous. You see, a person's doing a Q-
and-A with MEST, of course, on the postulate that MEST doesn't think, which it doesn't and
so on and there you've got it and it straightens out. But nobody is asking you to process the pc
so that you can process the pc. This is kind of silly, you see.

So we – we process the pc for forty-nine years in order to run this command. No,
there's a better route – a better route for this and that is to find something he does understand.
This is peculiarly true of children. You're always having to word commands in some other
direction and work them around till the kid finally understands what your thing's saying. It
may sound silly to you, but he – he can understand what you're saying. You're saying – or
you're trying to get the idea of moving, you know or "walking" or something of this sort and
you just aren't getting anywhere with "walking" and so forth. So you finally hit on "jumping".

"Could you jump from point A to point B?" or something of this sort.

"Oh, yes, yes, yes, yes." He could jump from point A to point B. Their semantics are
limited and they're restimulated easily on semantics and so on. And you have to go into the
subject with them and clear up what – and find out what they can understand.
By the way, the expert on this is Mary Sue. She's not only your best expert on terminals, she's really an expert on putting together kid's commands and simple commands of a particular character. I'm very often amazed at what she can get away with running a child, you know.

She will word a rather complex thought and the child will be very happily answering it, you know, cheerily. But it's reworded. It requires a taste for a simplicity. It's cutting through the Gordian knots of semantic, polysyllabic English.

Now, "think" has a number of synonyms and ordinarily if they can't run "think" they can "get the idea". But this throws the whole ... Now, this is what you have to be careful of in commands. This throws the whole thing haywire.

Now, up to this time, whenever we had "think" in a command, it was a perfectly easy thing to do. You just cleared the person as almost – this is standard operating procedure. You clear the person whether they can be run on "think" – you get a reaction. Or no reaction on "think," then you can run "get the idea of," you see. "Get the idea of" has formerly been a good substitute for it and they can run like a bat on this. Everything is fine, you see. "Get the idea."

This person says, "It's not possible to think, but anybody can get the idea of, see." It's quite remarkable. But these things are true.

So our young auditor sails into this knowing this old truism about "think" and "get the idea of" And we say, "Think of a waterbuck. What would a waterbuck think about?"

Well of course, we're trying to knock out the postulates and now-I'm-supposed-to's of waterbucks. Smart, huh? So we transmit the command this way: "Get the idea of a waterbuck." That runs all right. "What would a waterbuck get the idea of?"

Well, after you've done some flub of this character on a command, don't blame me if you get no tone arm action and the pc has a hard time trying to answer it and stay in session and so on because it's all contained in the command. And if you're having trouble with a pc on some command, the time to have trouble is before you begin to run it. That's the time to have trouble with the command. Not after you've audited it for three hours. Because now, every time you've uttered it, the pc has done something else than answer the auditing command. The pc is getting pretty sick of it, withal.

Now, the time to find out if a command is answerable is before you run it.

Now, you can go to another extreme on this and every time you start a session – see, you've run this particular five-way bracket for the last twenty hours. And you start a new session, and each time you start a new session, you clear the whole command with the pc, word for word. That's a good way to waste auditing. Pcs will get very restive about it. That's the reductio ad absurdum.

But the first time you use an auditing command on a pc, you had better clear it. You had better find out. No matter if it's a standard command – it looks standard to you and it looks answerable to you – you should read it off to the pc and ask him if it's answerable. Not "Word, word, word, word." Let's read the thing off and find out if it's answerable.
"All right. It's 'think of a waterbuck.' All right. Is that an answerable – I'm going to read you this command now. I want to know if that's an answerable command – if you can do this, if you can answer this. 'Think of a waterbuck.'"

And the pc says, "Uh, no. A waterbuck. I just – I just (so on and so on)." Well, now you go back and now you take it apart word for word, see. Give him the broadside first, and then take it apart word for word. And find out what is unanswerable about this and you'd run into this word "think." "Well, nobody can think. I mean, silly business. How can anybody think? Naturally."

So you say, "Well, all right. We'll translate that," you say – very sloppily, you say. "Well, we translate that," and we say, "Get the idea of a waterbuck."

All right. Now, that means we have translated "think" into "get the idea of" and now you just insert "get the idea of" down on this second line on "think." If we did that literally we'd get "What would a waterbuck think of about?" It'll become that silly, you see.

Well, just because "get the idea of" was answerable in the first line is no reason it becomes answerable in the second line and you have to do something about the second line. And then, because you have to do something about the second line, don't be too disturbed if you have to go back now and readjust the first line.

Your object is – here is to adjust the commands with the pc so the pc can answer them, not to force the pc into some frozen pattern of some kind or another. Just get something this pc can answer.

We, after all, are trying to transmit a mental concept and mental concepts are not always expressed in words. As a matter of fact, mental concepts can exist in the absence of words. Now, you wouldn't think that – there – there are chaps in the universities – I think they call them professors? Something like this. There are chaps in the universities who teach semantics. And their basic consideration is this: that because all words mean different things to different people, then communication isn't possible. Well, there's some two-hundred and eighty-thousand Bachelors of Arts graduated a few years ago, all of whom had been taught this with great thoroughness. They've been taught that nobody can communicate with anybody. Nobody can communicate with anybody. It's not possible to communicate with anybody because the derivation of words are different.

Well, what is wrong with their thinkingness? Their thinkingness is just muddled on this basis. They think words – the word is the think and words aren't the think. You see? The word simply expresses the form and character of the think.

Now, I guarantee you, that if you shove Mamie Glutz and Joe Blow simultaneously up against a hot stove, they will have the same thought and it will not be verbalized. They will not think, "Goodness me, I am moving toward a hot stove. Now, I am burned. It is very hot." [laughter] That is not what happens.

They get a mental concept of hotness and they get another mental concept of proximity and the word hotness and the word proximity do not even occur. Now, you don't even have to know what the Spaniard means by "Hace calor, no?" if he mops his brow at the same time. He's saying "It's hot" and you agree with him and yet you didn't understand the words.
Well, you say, "Well, it's transmitted by the gesture." Oh, fine, what's the semantics of a gesture? Korzybski, front and center. Move thy tombstone and present thyself. What are the semantics of a gesture? "Different words means different things to different people" would then mean that when you mopped your brow, the holding out of the little finger while you mopped your brow would then make your communication incommunicable to somebody else who would normally consider that you held your little finger in close while you mopped your brow.

In other words, how pedantic can you pedant? [laughter] So you can get pretty stupid on this whole subject of semantics when it comes into commands. And semantics are bound up with commands. There's a whole subject. Alfred Lord Korzybski, Hayakawa – all these birds. It's interesting to read their books though. My golly, aren't those books wonderful examples of noncommunication. The basic book on semantics by Korzybski is called *Science and Sanity*. And if you open it up to Chapter One and start reading, you don't know where you are at. That's a fact. It's an interesting experience. You read several pages, and it's not about anything that you ever heard of before because he doesn't ever say, what he is talking about.

Actually, the book *Science and Sanity* is apparently a continuation of some earlier book and this earlier book ... It's supposed to be the key book, you see, but it doesn't say what it's about and it's a continuation of an earlier book and it actually – I think it's – the beginning is continuing an experiment which is begun in the earlier book, the conditions of which are not repeated in the new book. I think you find yourself reading about a horse or something of this sort.

It's supposed to be all about words, and you read about this horse. Or it's some such beast.

So they have trouble with their semantics. Well, the reason they're having trouble with their semantics is because they're giving the word importance and the idea that it conveys, no importance.

Now, learn the lesson better than that, and take a look at this and consult with your own wisdom. It's the thought and then the word. The auditor's thought becomes the word, becomes the pc's word, becomes the pc's thought.

So there's a four-step proposition here. There is the – the impulse which the auditor wishes to communicate which transmits into a word which is heard by the pc and is transmitted into an idea.

Now, the action following that idea is what the auditor is after but is really not part of the communication itself per se. All we are doing is, the auditor has an idea that he wishes to put into a word and then the word is received and heard by the pc, is reanalyzed and he gets the idea which is transmitted. And having done all of this and gone through it, Lord knows, ad nauseum ... If you figure out all these steps of what communicates to what and which communicates to where and – and exactly how he hears it and get a psychologist's explanation of how it registers on the neuro-aural cavities of the aurality and then re-echo against the medulla oblongata with the echo effect well known as the screen phenomena of the basic metabolism, you've just about got as much – It's – what I've just said is far more intelligent.
There's a thetan who, to communicate, goes through MEST. And to hear takes it out in MEST and that's how he keeps off other thetans. So it's – it's just this mechanism is all you are going through.

Now, to become slavish, you see, to the mechanism itself is very poor. It is important to duplicate your commands. That's very important. The command must continue to be stated in the same wording that it was stated in, but the time to catch an error in the wording is before you begin to communicate these commands. If you begin to communicate these commands properly, they're very easy to repeat.

The duplication factor is a sort of a havingness factor. It definitely does not challenge the pc's attention and it is doing something far more important than this; it is making him think a repetitive thought which eventually will push its way through and as-is most of his circuits and so forth. That's what you're trying to do with all this.

So it's a good thing to have the words right, but don't get pedantic about the thing. We don't care if a command has the word... Well, we're – we're processing a lumberjack from the backwoods of Canada and his hair sort of stands on end every time we say, "aren't," "Aren't you happy?" or something, you see. Aren't. Aren't. He knows the right word for it. It's "ain't," see. It's "Ain't you happy."

You unfortunately find yourself in the position ordinarily of having to process in the language that the pc speaks and that applies to dialects and colloquialisms as well as to different tongues.

Well, Devon – imagine somebody from Edinburgh, you see, and somebody from Devon as an auditing team, don't you see, that was – that got into a semantic argument. Well, actually, the auditor is at liberty to use any words that he wishes to use in a command as long as it relates between himself and the pc the exact idea that he wishes to have communicated. The words that he uses are secondary to the meaning transmitted.

The meaning transmitted is always primary, so that if you do not clear your auditing command on an E-Meter, you very often find yourself in a noncommunication state of the pc, in disobedience of Clause 16.

You might have to take this command and say – well, let's move this over into a possible thing. "Get the idea of a waterbuck. What ideas does a waterbuck get?" or "What idea would a waterbuck have?" – asking for just one idea at a time. Now, that's a doable command if you understand what you're trying to do. You're trying to get his attention on the waterbuck, his terminal and then get the thinkingness of the terminal as-ised. Tricky. So that he can then eventually differentiate between the thinkingness of a waterbuck and his own thinkingness. That's the total target of that type of a command, you see.

Now, if you're trying to compose commands – I hate to have to tell you this – but if you're trying to compose commands and hang them together without any knowledge of the basics and fundamentals of Scientology, I'll tell you it'd be far less trouble to yourself and the pc if you just went and hanged yourself quietly in some corner someplace, because it just isn't going to work.
"What afraid have you been about?" "What waterbuck has been about afraid?" It sounds like gobbledygook to you. It sounds like total balderdash to you and it is. But if you laid every command out simply with blanks – you know, you – here's the command form and a blank and you're supposed to put the Prehav level in the blank – you'll come up with things that sound as nonsensical as that. You have to make the command sensible.

All right. So we've assessed "fear." And the command form requires "What would a waterbuck be fear of?" and "What would fear a waterbuck?" Well, the second one isn't too bad. But the first one, that's sort of weird. So now we take off into the wild blue yonder and we simply say "That's easy. That's easy. We'll just say, 'What would a waterbuck be afraid of?'" and "What would be afraid of a waterbuck." That's simple. Now, let's start to run it." And an hour later we haven't gotten any tone arm motion and everything else has gone wrong. Well, that's because we didn't get this Class IV-type command has to be cleared on the meter. And you've had to find out if "afraid" made this – meant the same as "fear." Or maybe it was "frighten." You see, maybe it was "frighten" means the same as "fear," but "afraid" doesn't mean anything like "fear." Or "fear" is something solid that you hack off in pieces and carry around with ice tongs. And that's what has registered is this solidity called "fear."

And you have to bend the whole command around to something on the order of "What would put a waterbuck into a state of fear?" and this is transmittable and it is very understandable. Oh well, yes. And "What would go into a state of fear because of the waterbuck?" Or "What would a waterbuck drive into a state of fear?" This sounds like you're getting long and arduous, but this apparently communicates to the pc and this you get the most reaction on. He finds this very easy to answer. That's an easy one to answer, but the other one doesn't answer at all.

"What's a waterbuck afraid of?"

"Well, the waterbuck really isn't afraid of anything, you know."

"Well, fear. Fear is what assessed on the Prehav Scale, you know. How do we account – ?" We wouldn't be this invalidating. We'd say something on the order of "Well, how do we account – . What is fear? What's meant here by fear?"

"Oh, fear. Oh, well, fear. That's leaping about. That's trembling."

Well, Hayakawa was apparently right. Korzybski needn't come out of his tomb and account for himself because this pc definitely had a weird meaning for this subject of fear.

All right. This is sufficiently weird. It's not up to you to sit there – the pc didn't learn this in kindergarten when he was much smarter, five years old. He isn't going to learn it now. And this is not up to the auditor to run a language school any more than it is to run a process to clear the process. So a language school is not in order.

"Fear" does not mean frighten, does not mean afraid, does not mean timid. "Fear," at his first glance at it – because it, after all, fell because it was aberrated, remember. You forget that. You know, if he wasn't nuts on the level, it wouldn't fall. Now, don't expect him to be sensible about it if he's nuts on it. That's – that's what it amounts to, see. We find out there's just this thing called fear. And a waterbuck actually picks this chunk up called fear with a pair
of ice tongs and leaps about. This is about the – the meaning that transmits. "Fear – well, it's a sort of a dark brown substance that is carved off in blocks."

It is? First I ever heard of it. Well, you wouldn't abandon the level because the pc didn't understand it. No, I think the pc understands it and has slightly overreached his understanding and sooner or later that particular level will orient and many a time you've seen a pc all of a sudden brighten up and said, "Oh, angry, angry. Oh, angry!" You've only been running this for an hour and a half, you see. "Angry. Oh, yes, I see what that means. It means getting mad at somebody." Leaves you completely in the dark. What the hell did it mean to him before? What did it mean to him before?

Don't leave yourself in the dark with a pc. If you want to know, ask him. You say, "Well, all right. Good. It means getting mad at somebody. All right. What did it mean to you just before this time? Just for my own curiosity, what did it mean to you just before this time?"

"Oh, well, it's very simple. It means a pent-up pressure at oneself."

Oh, now you know why it fell on the Prehav Scale. He could never be angry at anybody. He could just be a pent-up pressure against himself. We don't know where himself was located – maybe the third button of his vest. But there it is.

Now, in hanging together a command, in other words, try and make the command communicate. And try to make it communicate regardless of the aberration of the pc, which is what the command is trying to take care of and now you will see at once why commands become a very tricky subject.

If all pcs were Clear at the time you formed and ran the command on the pc, this would be very easy and we would not be giving a lecture today. You see that, how factual that is. In fact, we wouldn't have to audit the pc at all. But your command that you're giving the pc is straight into the middle of the small whirlpools, dust devils, hurricanes and black ebbs and flows of tides which shift with the phases of the moon inside his skull.

He tries never to look at that particular part of his livingness because it is too painful. And you, adventurously, are going to say, "Very good. Now, look into the maelstrom that we have just found there. Good. Look into the maelstrom. That's fine. Now, jump in. That's a boy. Now, jump in. Now, swim about a bit. Thank you. Jump in. Now, good, good. Oh, you needn't flounder too much. I'm sitting here. Now, jump in. Get your head under, too. Thank you. Thank you very much. All right. Drown now." [laughter, laughs]

And, of course, your command is cleared with a pc who is standing upon the edge of the precipice and he is well aware as you're clearing the command that over there where he has not yet looked are the whirlpools, whirlwinds, dust devils and black tides which ebb and flow at the phases of the moon and which may contain terrible monsters which go tok! [laughter]

So where – where this particular situation obtains, there is aberration, you wouldn't be auditing the pc on that line if he weren't in that position and in clearing a command with the pc is rather unreasonable of you to ask the pc to do something terribly difficult semantically when he's already doing a tight-rope walk impossibly and the command which you're clearing
with him has already got him pretty spooked. And you're saying, "All right. Think of a waterbuck." Well, this is simple to you. There you are. You're sitting there. You're all right. You're not worried about waterbucks. Your terminal is a giraffe or something. [laughter] You're above all that.

You say, "Think of a waterbuck." With what aplomb you can toss this off. But in his particular case – in his particular horrible case – the idea of thinking of a waterbuck: that's a pretty adventurous proposition. [laughter] There's no telling what might happen if one did that.

Now, "Think of a giraffe" – he could do that. And you will occasionally get sudden resurgent agreements, overwhelming agreements by the pc to run something you really didn't intend to run very much. "Oh, well, yes, yes. Well, I think – I think it'd be an awfully good idea and I'm sure my terminal is a giraffe like yours." [laughs, laughter] Oh, he can run that command beautifully. Run it for hours, no tone arm motion, no auditing, nothing. Be good, but he certainly wouldn't have to walk... He'll have an ARC break with you, too, after a while if you run it.

So your commands are always being formed and cleared up against the raw stuff of which aberration is concocted. As a result, it becomes a very tricky subject. And it becomes a very vast subject. The fundamentals of the mind are very simple. And they are not very many. I'll have to retire one of these days, you realize, because they're practically all found, nailed down and there they've got signs on them and that sort of thing and I won't have anything to do.

Right now I'm rather pressed to the wall about it, you know. I'm having to build a fireplace that nobody ever heard of before. I just was out inspecting it just before I came down to the lecture and the estate bricklayer was just... He's just heaving sighs of relief. He's a happy man tonight. He's singing. When he was taking off his boots, getting ready to go home, he was cheerful and he was smiling and he was happy because he's got it licked. Up to this time he has been going solely and totally on a touching confidence in Ron. [laughter]

Nothing else has been carrying him forward. He has never seen a barbecue pit. He's laid lots of bricks, but he's never seen a barbecue pit. And to cap that one, nobody in America has ever seen a barbecue pit like this one. [laughter] Nobody could ever have designed it in the first place. It took me a week just to figure out how to make the thing. After it's made, it becomes very simple. But I was two days trying to transmit it to the estate bricklayer. Two days. And then found out that it was totally unsuccessful as a transmission, so I just stood by and when he started to put bricks up over here wrong way, you see, I'd say, "Mr. Jenner – you know. There it is. Good man." He's terrific. Nobody else could have done it. That's right. He's terrific. He's out there in that – in that big glass house – turning into a pleasure pavilion out there. One of these days, students will be eating their lunches in there and so on. But it's nothing but touching faith on his part has carried him along. With what relief today he realized that we had it licked. It's actually sitting there in the form it's in. It's far enough advanced now so he knows exactly where it all goes. The blacksmith has come down, checked it all out, and so forth. Everything is beautiful. The structure is done.
The time to audit a pc, of course, is when he's Clear and the job is totally licked. The time to clear a command and the type of command to clear with the pc is one that will have no effect whatsoever on his case or on a pc who has no case. And you'll never have any difficulty clearing those commands. But the command which has to do with a waterbuck – ohhh, well now that is something else.

In the first place, you have an awful time clearing it because every time you come into this zone and say "waterbuck" and you say, "Waterbuck leaping about!" – well, you've said "waterbuck," so of course you're going to get a reaction. And then the idea of a waterbuck leaping about is the basic reason he gets sick at his stomach and you're trying to clear the command to find out if it's answerable and frankly you should have had the command in the first place and be running it. But you haven't got it, so you can't run it. You get the ideas that lie behind this? These are the difficulties of clearing a command. So therefore, you very often have a tendency to just give up and take a textbook command or a command that I give you without any further check against the pc of any kind whatsoever.

Well, that's very decent of you and shows a very touching faith in Ron. And most of the time you'll find out these are dead on and they run and so forth, because I'm very careful to give them generalized enough so they don't need too much clearing, you know, with the pc. They will communicate. But here and there, here and there, because of a scribbled note by the auditor with regard to the assessment or something, I've read the assessment as "fear," and the thing that was actually assessed was entirely different. It was "failed woofing" And so we'll have a pc run very nicely on "fear," and "failed woofing" still stays live as a level of the Pre-hav Scale. That's not so good, is it?

Now, even if I give you a command straightly, try to understand what is being communicated by the command. What thought lies behind the command? Because that is what I have written down. I've written down the thought which must be transmitted to the pc.

Now, if it won't transmit this thought to the pc because of some peculiarities of some sort, you should be the first person to scream. Not at me particularly, but let's put the English on the English in it to make it fit and transmit. So we have something that says, "Think of a waterbuck. What would a waterbuck think about?" Clear it with the pc. Because I would write it and give it to you in the understanding – in the clean, clear understanding – that you would read it to the pc and the pc would be able to answer it.

And if the pc said, "Think. You mean think? Think? Think. I was afraid you said that. You know, all of my life, I think people are just liars. They are just swindlers and thieves because they keep telling you that they think and it's not possible to think. Nobody can think."

Well, don't just plow it into him with a bulldozer. That's too easy to get around it. You say, "Get the idea of a waterbuck. What would a waterbuck get ideas about?" Or any other way that you can put it around and make it make the same thing that has been written down there. You would be definitely out of order to vary the basic idea of the command. Or to vary the level unless the level, of course, were miswritten or wrong.

We had a case right here in the class the other day that was going back and forth and around and around and the auditor stayed calm. I got, of course, misemotional about it, but fortunately, the auditor kept his head. And that was just on this one basis: The auditor was the
one who had assessed the pc's goal and had then written down one of these long goals. But halfway through the session, the auditor decided that the pc had a different goal because the auditor didn't realize that in this form "How would you... ? How would a... ? What would (goal)? What would be attempted against (goal)?" He didn't realize that that form was just the goal, the goal of the pc.

So he dropped one word out for one part of the session and we got him back on it again in a hurry. And he all of a sudden understood that that was just the goal. But it was a question. Was the goal wrong? Because if the word could be dropped out, why, then the goal could have that word dropped out. But apparently, this was or was not checked, but the goal was put back in and it was run the other way – was run properly, and it was run right back straight again, don't you see?

Now, the argument was simply, then, on the basis of the auditor's understanding of what I was trying to do. And, you see, it is really not good enough to completely take a ritualistic form that you don't understand what you're getting at and by filling in a few blanks, have it work by just repetition. This is tape-recorder auditing. The command might as well have been fed onto a tape recorder by me, one of these repeating, metal-tape recorders, you know. They're very cute. They – they give you a whole song and then they – the metal goes around – the metal belt goes around and gives you the whole song again and then the metal belt goes around... Well, you see, you could put a start-stop switch on this thing and the auditor could sit there with his foot, you see, on this little throttle-like device and holding the E-Meter in his hands, you see, so the pc couldn't see what he was writing, using the E-Meter, you see, as a barricade. And every time the pc had answered a command, why, then, all the auditor would do is press this little throttle, you see and this belt would go around again and the next auditing command, you see, would be given to the pc. That is just not good enough.

The weird thing about it is, is that it will work. That's what is weird about it. That would work. It had – it would have a level of workability. But the level of workability is not as reaching or pervasive as the fact that ... All right, I give you the command form, and this command form is "What problem have you had about a waterbuck?" and "What was unknown about that problem?"

All right. That's fine. I give you that form and you say to the pc, "Problem?"

And the pc says, "Yeah, well, problem. Pretty easy – problem. What problem ... That's easy, you know – it's very easy to ... You see, a problem is something ... Well, you know what a problem is. A problem is something that nobody has any answers for. So I don't really see how the auditing command could have an answer because if you never have any answers for any problems, why, then you would never have any answers for the auditing command."

And you don't know your fundamentals well enough to know that a problem is also a confusion. It's also a motion. And just say, "Well, all right. Problem? Fine" – reading your meter – "Confusion? Motion? Commotion?" Not much of a reaction here anyplace or another. "Mess?"

"Ohohoh, what – what do you know! Ha-ha." Clang, the needle went.

And you say, "What is all this wham here? What's – what's this?"

"Well, a mess. That's – I'm in a mess, of course. A person is in a mess, I mean that... What do you mean, you have to have it explained to you? Are you stupid or something? Something goes along in life, you're in a mess. That is a mess. That's what it is."

So you have an auditing command which goes as follows: "What mess have you had about a waterbuck?" [laughter] "What was unknown about that mess?" And you're still running, "What problem have you had about a waterbuck? What was unknown about that problem?" because a pc calls a problem a mess. But he can't call a problem a problem and he himself, because he has aberrations about problems, of course, can never call anything a problem. And confusions and motions don't mean problems to him. He's – he's above all that.

But a mess. Well, that's – that's good. That's fine. And you will cut down the number of hours run by about 75 percent. Blang! Why? Because your auditing command is communicating closer to the whirlwind.

Now, what does the meter say? The meter says we are standing on the edge of a precipice that we can recognize at this time as a precipice and by looking slightly but not too closely over the right or left shoulder, we can detect the bubble, bubble, bubble of the cauldron, which we have never looked at very closely because underneath it there may be things that go pp! You got a reaction. You're getting a reaction on the meter. It's real to the pc.

Well, when a pc is in bad shape, why, anything that gets a reaction is real to him and is horrible and reality is horrible. And you translate all these commands over and you'll find out that's very interesting.

It's not an invitation for him to take the commands which you're running on the pc at this moment and change them. You're committed. When a command is committed along the line, it is actually worse to change the command, in most cases, than to monkey it up. It'll take the pc's attention out of session and so forth. Just plow it through. Grind it out. Get it flat and next time clear the command properly with the pc before you start this kind of thing, you see. You'll find out a command that is out won't give you much tone arm action anyhow. So I'm not telling you that you have to go on for days.

Now, most of the commands I give you, they need no fooling with. But what I'm shuddering about is that near moment when you, in north Andalusia or south Stakoma or someplace are sitting there and you've got a Prehav command to put together and you get a pc and you take it off the Prehav Scale and it is "failed withhold." And the blank says, "What about a waterbuck would be a (blank)?" you see. You say, "What about a waterbuck would be a failed withhold?" That's pretty good. 'What about a failed withhold would be a waterbuck?'"[laughter] "That's pretty good. That doesn't sound right but that's the way it fits into the blank. And 'What has another failed withhold on a waterbuck?' That's not quite right. And 'What is a waterbuck failed withhold on another?' Doesn't sound too good. 'Now, what has a failed withhold on a waterbuck on a waterbuck? " And you say, "Well, this doesn't sound quite right. But Ron said so, so we'll run it." [laughter]
So I just want to be on record that I didn't say so. [laughs] I said "Run 'failed withhold' in a 5-way bracket on a waterbuck would be the proper step after the assessment of the Prehav level."

And of course, you say, "A 5-way bracket – well, a 5-way bracket, that's from you to that, that around, so forth and so and so forth, and that's all dandy." And then you audit a child on this and you find out the child cannot even get the idea of communicating from himself to the second bracket.

He can get the idea of the second – the terminal communicating to the terminal. So if he can get the idea of himself communicating to himself, he can get the idea of a terminal communicating to a terminal and you've pulled on back down the line from a 5-way bracket to a 2-way, totally individuated bracket, which is, "What have you failed to withhold from yourself? What has a waterbuck failed to withhold from himself?" "What have you failed to withhold from yourself?" and "What has a waterbuck failed to withhold from himself?" Works like a bomb. Everything is gorgeous. Person cannot reach any further than that.

But now you err like the mischief that – as you run it you don't expand the bracket up to a five-way bracket. Commands have to be expanded. When you start down below where you should be, graduate up to it. Every now and then when the thing gets to looking a little sticky, add another bracket. So we'd have "What have you failed to withhold from yourself?" and "What has a waterbuck failed to withhold from himself?" becomes, of course, only two ends of the bracket. So "What have you failed to withhold from a waterbuck?" and "What has a waterbuck failed to withhold from you?" are the natural steps. But you've still left one in there which isn't flat – "What have you failed to withhold from yourself?" – and you wind up at the other end of it, quite well, with a six-way bracket. So what?

You don't do a violent shift on commands ever. And you eventually have graduated the person with his understanding of the snake pit in which he finds himself with this waterbuck. Gradually he gets so that he can get outside of himself a little bit and look around and he realizes a waterbuck can look around and there might be another person someplace in the world. So we include that in the command and – and so forth. Well, reductio ad absurdum. You could carry this up to a thirty-two-leg bracket. Just keep graduating it and you'd also find a little more action on it. You'd always find it.

I don't know. Nobody – no genius has sat down and figured out the ultimate bracket and counted it. I don't know how many brackets there could be. By specific name, there could be 250 billion for the people of Earth. "What has George failed to withhold from a waterbuck? What has a waterbuck failed to withhold from George? What has Bill failed to withhold from a waterbuck? What has a waterbuck failed to withhold from Bill?"

And now we add the numbers of societies and governments which there exist in present time and we'd say "What has the waterbuck failed to withhold from the Rosicrucians?" and "What have the Rosicrucians failed to withhold from the waterbuck?" Ah, great. And we could go further than that. We could then take every society on the whole track for the last 200 trillion years and every individual on the whole track for the last 200 trillion years, and we could add all them in with special, separate legs. Wouldn't that be interesting?
Well, it exceeds the necessity. [laughter] And you get up on legs of a bracket above five and it's starting to exceed the necessity of the occasion. You go up to fifteen and you're getting a little bit dull. But in some particular cases, you will find that you had better go on up into the higher-numbered brackets, you know. I mean, get fifteen on a bracket. Run a 10-way bracket. That's okay.

Run two 5-way brackets simultaneous. Two 5-way brackets simultaneous. It would have to be plus-to-minus brackets. So you get, of course, a 10-way bracket, which is plus and minus. "How have you failed to withhold from a waterbuck?" or "What have you failed to withhold from a waterbuck?" And "What has a waterbuck failed to withhold from you?" (Now, of course, you violate the Prehav level if you do this, but I'm just giving you this as an example.) "What have you not failed to withhold from a waterbuck?" See, that's – means nonsensical. It becomes nonsense. It wouldn't clear as a command. The pc couldn't answer it.

So look at your commands before you run them. Meter them on the pc. Find out if you get a reaction on them. Find out what the reaction is. Find out how the pc is reacting to this particular thing. But basically and primarily – it doesn't take you forever to clear a command – all you want to know is can the pc get an answer to it. "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" here the other day produced an avalanche on a girl in the house.

And she'd go – "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" Brrrrrrrr. Brrrrrrr. Brrrrt. And then she'd catch one by its tails as it went by, you see and she'd give that as the auditing... Well, clearing the auditing command would have run into the automaticity.

And you'd say, "Well, I'm going to ask you if there's something you wouldn't mind forgetting. Now, do you understand that command? Can you answer that command?"

And she goes brrrrrt-brrrrrt-brrrrp-brrrrrp-brrp. Automaticity. Bing-bing-bing-bing. And she says, "Well, it's awfully confusing, and – and so on. And it's pretty weird, and so forth."

And you say, "Well, I don't know. Maybe we'd better run some other command. Maybe we'd better word this command differently." Because she said it's awfully confusing. Well, your error, then, would be in what was confusing. Is the command confusing? Is the wording confusing?

No, you'd find out, "Well, all these – I don't know. It's just suddenly as though you'd turned on a motion picture projector or a stack of cards or something and something went off inside my head. And – and it's – I don't quite figure out exactly what's going – ." Man, if you've got a command that does that to the pc, that is cleared. [laughs]

You just cleared it. That's good. Leave that one in. Now, if you go to the next one, clear the next command and see if you have that much luck on the next one. Probably you won't have because the avalanche is ordinarily one-sided. And it'll be only one leg that'll go off in a brrrrrrpt.

But here is your – here is the basis of commands. Commands depend on good sense. They depend on judgment. Commands are a section of Scientology that do that. You get too concentrated on the semantics of it all and too pedantic in the perfection of it all and leave
alone the fundamentals of Scientology in the meaning of the command as transmitted to the pc and of course, you're in soup all the time.

The command is an idea. When it is written down, it's expressed as an idea. Mostly when I give you a command, I mean you to run that exact wording without the slightest change and so forth because I couldn't get my hands on the pc. But that doesn't mean that when you find out that the pc can't think that you won't shift it over to "get the idea of" You should always clear your auditing command with the pc. You should always check it over. You'll normally find out it's perfectly correct. Perfectly all right. Perfectly routine.

But every now and then you're going to squander ten, fifteen, twenty-five, fifty hours of auditing on some kind of a piece of balderdash. And at the end of that time, you find out the pc couldn't answer it in the first place and now you've stacked up-five hundred auditing commands that the pc has never answered. Oooooool. Well, you mustn't do that.

So you clear commands. You clear them on the meter. You run exactly what transmits the thought. Now, you want "What problem have you had about a waterbuck?" Well, now this is what you want on the pc. You want the pc to figure out if he has ever had a problem about a waterbuck and you want him to state the problem about a waterbuck. But the pc knows that nobody can solve a problem and that you can't have problems and mustn't have problems and problems don't exist – and – and – problem. Well look, you're not trying to run "problem." You're not trying to educate the pc on the subject of problems. You're trying to get him straightened up on the subject of a waterbuck.

Ah well, this is different then. So it is what – what is a problem to the pc? What does communicate this idea of confusion and upset and inability to answer or something that is not easily answerable or something that'll put a little barrier on the track or you have to think about it for a moment.

What communicates this to the pc? So you say, "Well, confusion. Commotion." And now you've got no guideposts. But let me call to your attention on a guidepost for this, you're only stepping a quarter of an inch off the trail. You're not going into the trees very deeply. You'll come out and you'll find my signs again. I mean, you – you're not going to get lost.

Think at that point. Think and say "Problem. Problem is something that there are no answers for and it can't be answered. So can't do problem. Commotion. Commotion. Don't know anything about that. Upset. Yeah, I've heard of confusion. Ron said confusion. Confusion. All right, confusion. Problem. Can't run the command. So we'll just run it this way. 'What problem have you had about a waterbuck? '")

The pc says, "Well, I know, but it's an unanswerable auditing command and you can't have a problem without a waterbuck. Because I've never had any problems about a waterbuck because a problem is something you can't have."

And you say, "All right, well, can you answer the auditing question just for the formality of getting on with the session?" [laughter]

Well, you can run into that if you don't suddenly, you know, get the old screwdriver out and sort of tighten up the cogwheels and see – "Let's see, a problem. What is a problem to the pc? It's an upset, upset, a mess, a stinking row, a to-do, and so on." Just say, well, "A

"All right. Well, could you answer this auditing command then? Now, I'm giving you the auditing command – ." I always warn pcs that way, by the way. It isn't in Model Session, but I always warn them when I'm clearing an auditing command. "I'm not auditing you this first question. I don't want an answer to the question. I'm not giving it to you." I tell them this seven or eight times because they know they're standing on the precipice ready to drop in. [laughter] See? And I kind of give them a little lifeline saying, "Well, you don't have to fall yet." [laughter]

Now I say, "There it is." And you say, "Well, can you answer this? What mess have you had about a waterbuck?"

"Oh, man, could I answer that. Well, that's easy."

"All right. And can you answer the question 'What was unknown about that mess?'"

"Well, everything. Yeah, well ...

"You can answer that all right. All right. That's fine. All right. 'What group did not believe in a waterbuck?"

"What group did not believe – believe in a waterbuck? What group did not believe – believe in a waterbuck. Believe, believe. Believe in a waterbuck. Group believe ... Believe. Believe in a waterbuck. Group believe ...

Well look, as an auditor, why are you sitting there? He obviously doesn't know what believe means or what you're talking about. So you say, "Well, how about '... wouldn't want a waterbuck?' Is that better?"

"Wouldn't want a waterbuck. Well, of course, no group would want a waterbuck."

He didn't clear the command. He just amplified it for you. But that's all right. He okayed it. And so you go on down the line and you clean it up. And you finally have all your commands answerable, all your commands understood. And then you say, "All right. Now, this little lifeline I've had on you up to this time that's preventing you from falling into the dreadful, Stygian dark – I am now cutting it. Here's the first auditing command. Pow! [laughter] What mess have you had about a waterbuck?"

And if you do that, if you realize that commands are communication, not semantics, why, you will just cut the living daylights out of the amount of auditing time you put in on a pc. Okay?

Thank you.
HOW TO SECURITY CHECK

A lecture given on 2 November 1961

Thank you.

Well, here we are at what date?

*Female voices: November the 2nd.*

Two Nov. AD 11. It's a 1.1 year. We're being very covert this year.

All right. I'm going to talk to you today about Class II skills in Security Checking and several new developments in this particular level and line that you ought to know about. And if you're not up to the point at this stage of the game where you know how to read an E-Meter, why, there used to be an old gallows – this was a Norman keep, you know? And we'll have to build it again and hang you. But you've got time during the building to learn.

The worst thing about E-Meters is of course TR 0. TR 0 goes out, if you haven't had any TR 0, it's not fairly flat, you have trouble with E-Meters.

Now, an E-Meter is a deadly weapon, and you can slaughter a pc with one by misreading it. It's not like a rifle. The only way you can do any damage with a rifle is use it with great accuracy.

Well, of course, you can also have a backfiring sort of rifle and you can also look down the barrel and put your toe on the trigger experimentally. But an E-Meter is not deadly at all unless it's misused. And if your TR 0 is out and you're looking at the pc and looking at the E-Meter and looking at the question, and you've only got two eyes, you see, and you need three, you can actually miss reads.

Now, a – the only read that is important is an instant read; you're never worried about latent reads. So you said the question and then you waited for a while, and then it finally sagged. Well, you'd just better go on to the next question because the thing is not there. What – all you want is an instant read. You ask the question: within a tenth of a second you get that needle reacting. If you've got an instant read, you've got a read on the E-Meter. If you haven't got an instant read, if it takes a half a second, a second or something like that, providing of course you're using a standard E-Meter of an approved pattern....

There are meters around, by the way – they're corny stuff that has been brought around – which have brought E-Meters into bad repute because they have a second lag built into them.

Have you ever seen one of these? They used to be quite prevalent in England. Somebody'd go down to the dime store and buy bits of old tinware and hang it together with some electric light cord. And they actually built a lag into the meter so when you asked the question it wouldn't react for a second. We have some of them in here in the electrical shop. I'll have to
show you sometime. It's how an electronics man can fix it up so that you don't get any results. Well, that is an unexpected one and we cut that one out by saying you use an approved E-Meter and we know that E-Meter will react instantly and behave properly. It's not a light thing to do work with a bad E-Meter.

The British Mark IV is the best of these meters. It is not the least destructible. It is a little tenderer. It's a better meter but it is more tender than the American meter. The American meter can be dropped for three floors and go on working. The British meter can be dropped one airmail flight and arrive at the other end with somebody having to look into it. We've got most of those bugs out. When we were originally sending these around the world, by the way, the extreme temperatures in a cargo hold would crack the transistors. Quite interesting. But we got that licked.

Anyway, with an approved meter you get an instant read and that's the only read you're interested in. And you're not interested in a latent read. If you follow up latent reads, your pc will start telling you what the other fellow did and what they have heard and that their aunt Mamie had a cat once that they think was stolen. Very valuable. It does a great deal for the case.

Now, the danger is, you take too many of these things off the case – you know, I mean, you get a latent read and he says, "Well, Aunt Mamie had a cat and this cat was in a decayed state. And I think it was stolen and I heard that and I thought at the time ..." yap, yap, yap.

And if you go on like this, you're going to wind up with a needle getting more and more sluggish, and more and more sluggish and more and more sluggish. And don't you be puzzled after you've let somebody get off an awful lot of "I heard" and an awful lot of unkind thoughts and an awful lot of that sort of thing, that you wind up at the other end of an E-Meter session with the tone arm not moving and the needle stuck and everything gummed up and the pc feeling like hell. How come?

Well, you let him sit there and get off nothing but overts. You let – the session was an overt. See? I mean, you let the man sit there, or let the girl sit there and commit overts for an hour. All right. So now they've got all these new overts. Isn't that what it amounts to?

But your latent read, when pursued, winds you up in the middle of nowhere. That works on all types of assessments. Whatever you're assessing, pay no attention to a latent read, a read which takes place – well, be on the safe side – takes place after a half a second.

Now, there's a borderline in there, the borderline in there: some pcs have got sort of a delayed-bank effect. And you'll notice working on some pcs the sound itself takes a moment to go through the circuit. And if you really wanted to be absolutely safe, you could space it out to three quarters of a second, but don't go any further than that.

Comprehension is landing on the reactive bank which is instantaneous. And those reads which are latent are landing on the analytical mind and the pc is figuring it out. That works for all types of assessments.

So I say again, if you want to be a successful E-Meterer, have your TR 0 flat so that you know what you're looking at, you know? Don't watch the ceiling and watch the floor and
then look back at the E-Meter to find out if it's reacted, because your instant read is the only important read and it is the one which, of course, you are going to miss. Naturally you'll miss it.

You look at the pc and you say, "Now, have you stolen any lollipops today?" And then you look down at your E-Meter. Well, it's read and gone. The reading is gone.

Now, this is why the E-Meter can be dangerous: because we have learned that if you miss a Sec Check question on somebody, you can wind them up in a ball. Not every time you miss a Sec Check question does the pc burn down the house. That is a commentary on the psychoanalyst who says, "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal something, he burns down the house." I love that "every time," you see? It classifies as a type of a remark of "jewelers never go anyplace." It's just about as nonsensical.

It is not a universal phenomenon that when an E-Meter read is missed and you miss the Sec Check and you leave the question and go on to the next Sec Check question with the last one unflat, that the pc always burns down the house, shoots the Director of Training or does something desperate. This is not always true. It's just 99 percent. There is still 1 percent of the time the pc does not do it.

Your pc comes in to session next time – "natter, natter, natter, natter, unkind thought. Whoo-ah-nyap-yap-yap-yap. I wonder if Scientology works," and so forth. And they go on and on and on and on and on and on.

You sit and listen to all this stuff. When are you going to get smart enough to put them on the meter and say, "Who missed a Sec Check question on you?" and find out what it was and clean it up?

And the person says, "Oh, well."

This is a very fascinating phenomenon that the fact of missing a Sec Check question is apparently a cross invalidation of everything that is going on. If you couldn't nail them, they now doubt. It's very funny. I don't care how long or how often the fellow has been sec checked. You miss a Sec Check question on him, he gets unhappy.

Now, that's a very important thing because there resides the easiest way to get rid of new Scientologists known. So I'll just lay it down there. If anybody wants to go out on a program of getting rid of every person they connect with that wants to have anything to do with Scientology, why, the program would be to either audit with a broken meter or a squirrel meter or something that didn't react, or to use a type of TR 0 which confronts the back wall or your own eyeballs while you should be reading the E-Meter and miss Sec Check questions. That's the first and foremost way of getting rid of people. They'll blow. They'll be very unhappy. It messes them up.

I think some of you have a little reality on that. Now and then, why, somebody has missed a Sec Check question on you wildly. And then you have found yourself sort of chewing your fingernails and nattering to yourself and not quite know what was wrong. And then somebody fortunately comes along and says, "Who missed a Sec Check question?" or something like that. And you get it off and straighten it out and all of a sudden you feel better. It's quite mysterious. It's quite mysterious.
I'm not going into the mechanics of how this happens. I can tell you the mechanics of how a bank beefs up, now. I've studied that for two or three days and finally got the answer to that. When you run the terminal, which is not the terminal of the pc, his attention is too bound up in his own terminal and goal to as-is the collapsing mass. So the auditor has – being more in control of the pc's bank than the pc, can of course push masses in on the pc. But the pc's attention is so bound up in his own goal terminal that this new terminal, which is being pushed in on him, does not get as-ised. And that is all there is to it. In other words, he hasn't enough attention to as-is anything but the goals terminal which he is stuck in. Do you see that? So his bank beefs up.

Similarly, your E-Meter starts up to the degree that the person is not as-ising what you're throwing in on him. So you get a high arm, high arm, high arm – an arm goes way up, an arm sticks. The person's attention is too bound up in something else to as-is what is being thrown in on him. Do you see this? So you could sec check a person into a high arm as well as sec check a person down from a high arm.

Now, how would you sec check a person into a high arm? Well, you'd make sure all the rudiments were out. You'd very carefully make sure that all the rudiments were out before the Security Check was entered in on. You'd make sure that the pc was unhappy in the room, had a present time problem, didn't want you to audit him, had an ARC break and had several withholds right in present time and then start security checking him on heavy questions. And the pc can't confront the question, can't give you the answer. Do you see the struggle which now ensues? And he can't get his attention out of present time, he can't remember the past and you actually could plunge him around until the arm would go high.

Now, it is not true that every arm going high during a run must be avoided, but you should understand why an arm is going high and why an arm hangs high during a Sec Check or during any other kind of run. An arm, a tone arm, goes high and stays high if more is being thrown in on the pc than the pc can handle or as-is. Period. That is all there is to it.

Let us say, if a pc were a coal burner and he were able to generate enough flame to burn one piece, one small cubic inch of coke per hour, and you emptied the hod into the furnace, you're going to get a rising tone arm which, of course, is measuring the additional mass entered in on the pc which the pc isn't as-ising. That make sense to you? I studied it out the last couple of days to see what the mechanism exactly was here and what was happening And it becomes valuable.

So when a pc's arm is high – you can just make a little side rule to go along with it that will serve you in good stead – be very careful to do one of two things: audit with the rudiments very well in or find where the pc's attention is stuck and audit that. Now, that doesn't say that you should run an engram, because the engram might have been the thing which was the hod of coal. You see, that might have been the upended coal hod.

The pc's attention was busily stuck, gorgeously impinged, upon a flower. You've been running a process, "What flowers have you failed to withhold?" or something. And all of a sudden an engram comes up. And you can ask too many questions about the engram and that's the same as throwing the mass in on the pc, you see?
You can say, "What's the largest object in that engram? All right. Now, what's some other object in that engram? Now, is there any masses in that engram of any character?"

Well, of course, that is understandably throwing heavy mass in on the pc, but you know, you can get the pc into the engram so the pc can't easily extricate himself, simply by asking the pc too pointed and too direct a question about the engram.

I'll give you a right-wrong example of this.

This is the right: pc says, "Woo! What an awfully big mountain. I wonder what's going on here?" and so forth.

And the right thing to do is to say, "Oh. All right. Okay. Here's the next question."

And here's the wrong thing to do: "Oh? Well, what is going on around there?" See, that's the same as upending the coal hod.

Now, don't be too surprised if the tone arm starts up right at the point you asked that question and stays up thereafter. The auditor can push mass, pictures, circuits, track in on the pc and move that track more easily than the pc.

This is one of the hardest things – over the last eleven years, this has been the hardest single point of instruction: that the auditor can move the bank more easily than the pc can move the bank.

I've even given demonstrations and told the bank to go north, east, south, west. And somebody who was totally stuck on the track and couldn't possibly move on the track and all that sort of thing, and I just said – not even to the pc – I said, "All right. Now, it will change to the picture of a theater." It did.

You know, the pc irrevocably stuck in this incident and can't possibly get out of it. Well, "All right. The incident will now become the picture of a theater." Bang! It did. He was no longer stuck in the incident. You can do things like this. You can move the bank around more easily than the pc.

So your interrogation – your interrogation of the pc can itself pin the pc's attention at various parts of the track where maybe it shouldn't be pinned. It's all right to get curious; it's all right to find out what's going on. But there are times when you should restrain yourself just a little bit.

The pc all of a sudden starts looking very sad and you say, "What are you looking at?"

"Well, these pictures of these pyramids. They're very interesting pyramids."

And you say, "Oh, all right," and give him the next question. That's real smart, you see?

Pc starting to look slow and comm laggy, you know? All right. All you'd have to say is, "What about the pyramids? When did they come up?" When did they come up isn't so bad. But, "What about the pyramids? Do they have big tops? Do they have small bottoms? Is there anything going on around the base of the pyramid? What is happening on the other side of the pyramid? Are there any ditches dug or anything like that around it?" This will – you're writing script now, you see, so that's – probably give him a good ARC break right at this point.
Now, you can go on and audit the process you've been auditing for another half an hour, and you say, "What are you looking at?"

"Oh," he'll say, "these damn pyramids, of course."

You gave him the pyramids. Now, don't be so alarmed about it because all you'd have to do is take them away from him.

Well, how would you take them away from him? The easiest way to take the pyramids away from him, the easiest way, is simply to tell the bank to do something else. You know? Say, "Well, what happened toward the end of that life?" You know? The bank will shift.

And you say, "What happened a couple of lives later? Is there anything that happened in a subsequent life to that that answers the auditing question?"

"Oh, there is. Oh well, what do you know?" You won't hear any more about pyramids.

You can move the bank around. One of the primary reasons auditors have trouble auditing engrams is they kept expecting the pc to move the bank. They would sit there and they would say, "All right. What are you looking at?" And be perfectly willing for the pc to go on and go through the incident, but nobody was moving through any incident. Why? Because nobody was moving the incident. Pc was incapable of moving the incident and the auditor wouldn't.

All the auditor would have to say is, "Well, the end of the incident will now appear. One year has now gone by. The picture of that incident, whatever is there, will appear."

It's very weird, you know. The pc says, "Well, you see, I was a beggar. I'm a beggar and I see all this. And it's a horrible marketplace and I'm a beggar. I'm sitting down there and I got leprosy," and so forth. And it's just not running, don't you see? And you say so on and so on.

He keeps saying, "Well, and this leprosy, and I – I've been leprotic for a long time," and he's getting more and more into the dramatization of the thing, and so forth.

And you say, "Well, was there a life later than that when you didn't have leprosy?"

Well, in essence, you've moved the bank.

He says, "Well, if you ask me that way, yes. Yes, as a matter of fact, I haven't had any leprosy since."

"Well, what are you looking at now?"

"Well, I'm looking at a small boy."

"All right. That's good."

Wrong: "Well, does the small boy have leprosy?" [laughter]

You can move the bank around just by the most innocent questions. You can audit, actually, with – by moving the bank by innuendo. Not anything direct – north, east, south and west – just ask the pc about this and that part of their life.
Now, you expect a pc to cycle through an ARC question. You just expect him to. He cycles through an ARC-type process, you see? He goes out of present time, he goes back into the past and back into present time again.

All right. If you depend forever on that automaticity, you're going to get lost somewhere because he's going to get into something he's not going to get out of.

You could always say to him -- you're trying to get him back up to present time -- "Well, was there an ARC break later than that?" or, let's say ARC processing, "Well, did you communicate to anybody after that?"

"Oh, yeah. Yeah."

"Well, the following year did you communicate to anybody?"

And he'll have to say, "Let's see, what year was that?" and so forth. And you figure it out for him, you know? And he figures it out.

And he says, "Oh yeah, well, that was 1942. Yeah."

"Well, all right. Good. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1946? Oh? All right, all right. Okay. You did. All right. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1950? Oh, all right. Good. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1955?"

"Oh yes, yeah. I did."

"Anybody communicate to you in that year?"

"Oh, I'll say they did."

"All right. Has anybody communicated to you in the last few days?"

"Oh yes, yes, yes."

"Well, have you communicated to anybody today?"

"Oh, yes."

"And anybody communicated to you?"

"Oh, yeah. As a matter of fact, you just did."

Well, you've moved the person up to present time by just interrogation. Interrogation with dates. You just asked him questions about dates. You didn't directly say "The bank will now shift 1.89 years north." But you could do that.

The reactive mind is always keyed to other-determinism and never to self-determinism. And one of its common denominators is other-determinism. So, of course, the auditor can always move the bank.

Now, in Sec Checking you very often get somebody into some kind of a situation, and by your pressure and your demands -- you're saying, "Well, have you ever stolen anything?"

And the person says, "No, I haven't."

"Well, have you ever stolen anything at all? Now, stolen. Have you ever stolen anything?"
And the person says, "No, I haven't" – you're not getting any read on the meter because you're not looking at it and you aren't getting any anyhow.

"Well, you mean to tell me in the last two hundred years you've never stolen anything?"

"Well ..."

"Now, I'm going to – when I snap my fingers something you've stolen will appear." [snaps fingers] "Well, all right. All right. When I snap my fingers something bigger you have stolen will appear." [snaps fingers] All right.

Well, don't be too startled if the tone arm goes up. It isn't an ARC break. You could probably get away with it but you've just given him more and more mass that he is not prepared to accept. He isn't about to as-is it. And then if you just walk off at that point and don't do anything else about it, you leave these things right there. So make things vanish that you made appear. A good magician, when he makes a girl disappear on a stage, particularly at these straight-laced times of police and all that sort of thing, usually shows her again to the audience, you see? Well, that's a good principle. Good principle to follow. It's the decent thing to do.

Of course, in tougher, rougher, ancient times, we didn't do that. We showed the audience this brand-new trick: You put the girl in the box and you put flaming torches in at every corner of the box and you opened up the box and there was no girl. And they thought this was marvelous. And it was a marvelous trick. Of course, she'd burned up. [laughter]

But I call to your attention that you're auditing in milder times than that. So when you say, "All right. Take a look at those pyramids," remember to say, "Take a look at something else."

All right. Now, the auditor who is sitting there doing TR 0 on the report or on the auditing sheet only – no TR 0 for the meter, no TR 0, you see, for the preclear, no TR 0 for the room, and so forth; he's got – TR 0 has advanced as far as the point of a ballpoint pencil, you see, and he can write and he sometimes can even read an auditing command off a sheet but doesn't pay much attention. Boy, the man's dangerous. Do you see why he's dangerous?

He not only never finds out what's going on with the pc but he never sees these instant reads in answers to his question. He never clears these things. He never finds out what's going on. If something did go on, he wouldn't do anything about it because he wouldn't think anything was going on. All very fascinating.

But the high arm is often, not always, but is often cleared with withholds. You get a withhold off the case – any old cotton-picking withhold, it doesn't matter at all, any withhold – and you'll see the arm start down a little bit if it is a withhold to the pc.

Now, what makes it a withhold to the pc? Whether or not it is against the mores that the pc has subscribed to. That is what makes it a withhold. We can broaden this definition. We used to say, "Well, it was a withhold if the pc thought it was a withhold."
All right. That's fine. But that's not technically usable. Let's take a more usable statement: A withhold is a withhold if it is a violation of a mores the pc has subscribed to and knows about.

In other words, you get a violation of a mores and you get a withhold. In other words, if the withhold is a violation of a mores it'll register on the meter, the pc will consider it a withhold, he will give it to you as a withhold and he will feel better.

All right. Let's get down a little bit closer here. Why do some people feel so wonderful when you get off some withholds and others don't notice anything?

Why is this? Why is this apparently spotty? You sit down and you say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" And pc A – you say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" And he gets a tremendous fall and you say to him "All right. When was that?"

Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! And he says, "Well, that was Chicago, 1931. We robbed a bank. There was La… Louie the Pits and a few of us guys, and we robbed the bank and we – we got away wit da loot. And as a matter of fact, we shot each other afterwards and threw da money in Lake Michigan and then I was killed. Yes, I robbed a bank. I – I got a recollection on it," and so forth. And that's fine. And you expect the pc to grow wings at this moment, you see, and so forth. He's gotten off a withhold. Oh – he wasn't withholding it. Nothing happens with the pc.

He did get a fall. We don't know what the fall is traceable to. We ask him now, "Did you ever rob a bank?"

And he says, "Nah," he says, "I never robbed any banks. Not any other banks than that."

And you don't get any more reaction on the needle and you say, "Well now, the pc should feel wonderful." But he doesn't. "Well, it did fall. So he should feel wonderful." Well, no, you see, robbing banks is not against the mores of bank robbers. And there being so very few citizens who subscribe to law and order in Chicago, you see – they're in the minority – that it doesn't make a mores. Quite the contrary.

Now, he might very well go into – get a terrific relief on the thing. You say, "Well, is there anything you've ever reported to the police? Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Have you ever reported anything to the police? Ha-ha-ha-ha! Hm? Hm? Hey? Have you ever reported anything to the police?"

"Ooo-o-oh," he says, "that's really bad."

You got an instant read here. "Come on. Come on. Come forth!" [bangs on the table] What's this you reported to the police?" You know, good, smooth ARC here. [laughter]

And he says, "Well, I – I reported once my dog had been lost." And the fall comes off the meter, and he feels wonderful.

You say, "What on earth is this? How come?"

Same fellow, you see? He robs the bank, they shoot each other up, they throw the loot – they don't even get the money – they throw the loot into Lake Michigan, and so on. And this
has been a terrific withhold and a great unsolved crime of all time, and here it is. And he gets no relief. But he reports a dog to the police and he says, "My, I'm certainly glad you're auditing me. I'm getting such terrific results."

Well, that's because you're operating from one mores and he's operating from another, as I've already talked to you about. Fantastic isn't it?

Now, supposing we find out something about the pc's past and we guess at what the mores of the various groups and societies he's belonged to might have been. And we do a Security Check from this particular level. We are always going to get some kind of a result. But this is a rather stunt proposition. Is there a faster way to do this? Yes.

It's called Security Checking by Dynamic Assessment. There is the most available body of life or segment of life, the most available segment of life on which he has a reality, against which he could be security checked. And you will miss, miss, miss, miss, miss if it all still seems reasonable to you that he is sitting there in a body, part of a race, and so forth and so on, and all these "I'm-supposed-to's" are all taking place, and this is a social world and so forth. And you think this is all ordinary and reasonable.

You forget. You forget that it's very unusual. A thetan is sitting in a meat body in a culture of some kind or another that is doing some weird, odd things of some kind. It is not usual. And you know, the whole thing can be security checked out? Let's look at it from that weird angle.

All right. Do a Dynamic Assessment. Here's the way you do it. Dynamic Assessment is done, of course, to find the most needle change of any one dynamic amongst the rest of them. It is done, really, by change of pattern rather than largest fall or something like that. It is done the same way you assess anything else.

Now, you can do a Dynamic Assessment by Elimination – brand-new news for you. That improves Dynamic Assessment a bit. You can assess by elimination. It'll leave you sitting there with one dynamic on which he has some reality.

All right. What are the parts of that dynamic? And we now are confronted with the task of composing a great many new Security Checks. They will be the teen series. There will be check number 11, check number 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18. And each one of those is subdivided, as necessary to – let us say, second dynamic would be Form 12, family. That would be A. So Form 12B would be something on the order of children. You see, you already have a Child Security Check, but that should be its number.

And Form 12C, which would have to do with marital sexual relations and what is – commonly passes for mores in the present society. I think that's the total moral code, is contained in that narrow sphere.

Twelve D would have to do with unusual practices on the second dynamic. And in other words, you can get a number of Security Checks plotted out here. Of course, they go by the number of the dynamic. So your 18, naturally, is a bunch of Security Checks – questions on the subject of God. They're just religious Security Checks of some character or another. So you have a whole bunch of these things.
"Have you ever blasphemed?" Okay? That kind of – that kind of a Security Check. "Have you ever used paraphernalia for other purposes?" "Have you ever used a church for any other purpose than was intended?" [laughter] You get the idea. You just dream up all of the possibilities of misuse/abuse crimes that fitted into innumerable areas.

Of course, number 14 would be your species checks. And that's pretty easy, but it probably subdivides.

And a Dynamic Assessment could be done for the subdivision so that you could get not only the dynamic but you could also get the subdivision of the dynamic and you could wind up with a proper Security Check. But no exact form Security Check is ever going to do the whole job. You're going to have to add your own questions to it as they may appear.

Your Dynamic Assessment directs you to that zone of life on which the pc has most reality and, therefore, would consider he would have the most crimes as it exists. You will find a pc all messed up on seven dynamics and able to be security checked on the remaining dynamic. He's got some reality on it, so he's done something to it. He knows, you see, it's his withhold.

Now of course, Sec Check Form 11 – none of these are written. You're going to write them. Any time you're doing this and you're asking questions, now, by golly, you write the question you ask down. And I don't care how much little side time that you spend going off and grabbing off somebody's folder and find out what you're supposed to run on them next week and actually dream up a Security Check.

Make sure it stays in the folder and then we can go back over these things and we will get some horrendous thinking on the subject. Okay? And it makes a good show. As a matter of fact, some of you who are not sec checking this week but who will be sec checking next week have in these folders, right this minute out here, you have this type of Security Check to do. And those which are security checking – will be security checking tonight – you just run into it like a truck hitting a wall. You're going to open up the folder and there it is, and you're going to see, "Well, do an eight dynamic Security Check. Dream up the questions," it'll say. All right. Well, dream them up. And you will find that you're getting off the case the withholds that come nearest to this pc's locus aberratus. And there he sits.

In doing Security Checking – let's get out to a higher generality here on the subject itself – the trouble with Security Checking is that the auditor is usually security checking from his viewpoint rather than from the pc's viewpoint.

The auditor is security checking against what he thinks would be a crime in his own view. And it is not a crime to the pc. So the auditor gets all upset because this question should have worked, and he's got this bright, sweet, innocent little thing sitting across from him – a little high-school girl – and she's sitting there and she's saying, "Oh, yes. Well, I was raped in the third grade, the fourth grade. As a matter of fact, raped several boys in the fifth grade. Yeah, as a matter of fact, I'm having clandestine relations at the present moment with my uncle, except when I'm down at the firehouse."

So he says, "Man, you know, when I get all this off, when I get all this off and get all this straightened up, this girl going to be flying right, you know?"
About three, four weeks after he's finished this laborious task of Security Checking, he walks by the who- firehouse and she in her negligee waves from the window. [laughter] What he missed – what he missed was this, what he missed was this: her dynamic was the – was the eighth dynamic, and she was a renegade from the Temple of Astarte. And of course, it would have been a awful break of mores for her to have done anything else.

Now, if he'd asked her questions such as "Have you ever been leaning out a window and have not whistled to somebody?" he would have gotten a fall, and she would have gotten this off, maybe with considerable grief. She meant to do right. [laughs]

Now, the odd thing about thetans is they are thetans. That is the oddest thing about a thetan. And a thetan is not natively a member of any culture. There aren't just natural-born eighth dynamic thetans and natural-born second dynamic thetans, and so forth. They are just thetans. And they've come down the track by their own devious routes accumulating, in their own peculiar way, civilizations, cultures, mores, group ideas and so on. And some of them have come a long way down the track without finding out any groups exist. And all sorts of wild things have gone on, you see? It's quite weird, you see?

It isn't that everybody has the same body of aberration at all. They're thetans. And in view of the fact that all the rest of this stuff is collected, well, it's just what do they collect? Some collect stamps, some collect blondes, some collect debts, some collect executions – sort of a hobby.

But the various mores in which they operate are registered very clearly and cleanly on the dynamics. And as soon as you start doing this, why, you're going to see some interesting renewed upsurge results out of Security Checking.

Of course, I'm put to it right now. I have to have a zone and level of auditing which is a comprehensible, highly usable, highly workable level of auditing prior to finding the pc's goal and terminal. And I have to do that fairly rapidly because you have a Class II Auditor and he has to have a body of skills. So I'm not just busy inventing them, I'm busy throwing them together.

It's like the other day, I looked up in horror in realization that we had no co-audit processes of any kind whatsoever that could be trusted in a co-audit. By the new safety table, I – you look it over from a viewpoint of the co-audit, why, you're in a box. That's a bad spot. But there's an old one, 1951, that could be run in a co-audit: Rising Scale Processing. Probably be gorgeous! Probably be gorgeous. You can probably even do an assessment on the people as they walk in. You know, I mean you could take the old Chart of Attitudes and kind of work it out. What did this fellow want? He tells the co-audit Instructor what his goals are. All you had to do is pick out the column, that's Rising Scale he runs. He'll make it.

It's quite a remarkable thing what you can do with concepts and that sort of thing – leaving terminals alone – the gains you can get.

Now, in this body of Security Checking, here is a whole zone of activity – a very simple zone. There will be forms developed for this particular thing and all the Security Checks. We haven't got them all now but that's no reason why I can't show you what it is or we can't.
use it, don't you see? You, after all, don't have to be led down the road with your feet being picked up one at a time and set down on the cobbles by somebody else.

Do a Dynamic Assessment, take the most active dynamic, preferably by elimination, take the parts of existence which might be the subdivisions of that dynamic; look those over and take the most active one of those or the most fruitful one of those – just dream up a Security Check that has to do with it.

Security Check the pc on that particular zone and area. You will be asking him things he never dreamed of were an overt. He's doing them all the time. And all of a sudden, "It's horrible! Oh, God!" He feels terrible about that. And he is so relieved.

A vegetarian, for instance, that is also on the fifth dynamic – she has other reasons that she could be a vegetarian – it might be on the seventh or eighth dynamic. It's something they should be doing, you know, because of some religious action or something of that sort.

But when a pc is on the fifth dynamic and vegetarian, and we security check him, here's where your reasonableness will get assaulted, you see? You're going to ask this person such things: "Have you ever eaten an animal?" and the needle is going to fall off the pin. And you'll find out he's been withholding every dinner he ever ate that had any meat connected with it, and so on. All sorts of wild things here.

You ask somebody along this line that falls on the fifth, "Well, have you ever walked on the grass?" Needle falls off the pin. He's liable to explain to you that he had to. There wasn't any way you could go around the grass. Of course, he realizes he smashed up a lot of grass in his day.

You see, you look on this as being so ordinary, you know, for people to walk on grass or kill plants or eat animals, or something of this sort, or chop down trees or do various things on the fifth. This is all so routine that you wouldn't think – bang! like that, that it would have any effect on a case because it's too ordinary and shouldn't have any effect on the case. Well, that doesn't follow at all.

What has an effect on a case is what has an effect on a case, you see? What – it's what the thetan thinks is a withhold. And that goes back to what group mores are you operating against?

Well, any member of the old biological survey that was operating around here about six hundred million years ago has his hair stand on end, whether he knows it or not, every time a new species becomes extinct on Earth or every time man plows up another thousand square miles and plants it in cute cottages at contractor prices, you see? That's grim. And his hair stands on end. He knows it's very usual and that he ought to be doing it. He knows he should be doing it, you see, because it's a usual thing to do. And that's okay. And nobody else thinks it's bad.

But he looks at this or doing something like that and he kind of – it's just not quite right. He doesn't quite integrate why it isn't quite right. He doesn't think the thought through. He just sort of snarls a little bit to himself quietly, or he thinks of it as an overt or as something and he's disturbed by it. Well, it's against the mores of the biological survey. That's all.
"Thou shalt plant and populate planets, pard." They kept the life cycle going and balanced. Also, I imagine any one of them that ever gets in a schoolroom, and the teacher says, "Now we are going to talk about the balance of nature," you see? And they go back into the current biological nonsense about how there was a spontaneous explosion of an atom somewhere in some sea of ammonia that got there by accident, and then, by natural selection, [laughter] and quite by accident, everything got planned out this way, you see?

Well, a person that's been on that line is – somewhere back in his bank, you know, things gonna go whirr, and whirr. Well, it's an awful invalidation: the time he spent on computers figuring out how many petals there should be on a delphinium! [laughter] And of course, then they wog him. He finally doesn't like this explanation, so goes over to the church and they tell him God did it. [laughter] And suddenly he begins to feel sort of megalomaniac, you know? And it's – "I wonder if I did create all these thetans." [laughter] He didn't do anything but run the computers that planned the posies on this particular type of planet.

But you'll find these are overts. When they register on that dynamic then you have to plot out what the overts would be on that particular line; and you ask those questions, you'll find out the fellow has got overts, he's got withholds and there he is. And he'll all of a sudden feel much better. And some odd and peculiar things that he has been doing in his life suddenly come straight. And he remembers things, and so forth.

You see, men are very often so busy being ordinary that they don't recognize that every one of them is slightly, somewhere, extraordinary. And this professional ordinariness that we get, particularly in these socialistic times, is a great repressor. It not-ises the differences. And unless you can reestablish difference, you can never reestablish differentiation. You see, it's very easy to establish similarities and identities. This is fairly easy to do. Man does this very well.

He just dismisses all problems by saying "Everything is alike." You ever hear a girl that's had a bad love affair? She says, inevitably!, she says, "All men are alike." That's her next statement. They walk around, and she's liable to be saying something on this order for some days or... well, hours anyway. [laughter]

And – but she's done the easy way out. The way to solve all of mankind is simply and ordinarily and only to say that they are just all alike and that's it.

So you don't have to worry about it. And then the next thing to do is if you want to – don't want to have to go any further or exercise your wits any, all you have to do is say, "Well, they're all bad." So the easy way to do is to say they're all alike and then all bad, and therefore you're safe. And this is apparently a safe thing to do. You say, "Well, they're all alike and all bad and, therefore, after this I will be warned. And now I'm perfectly safe. Of course, I'm miserable but I'm perfectly safe."

And a person will then try to justify this kind of reasoning. Well, that kind of reasoning is so idiotic and so simple and so stupid and not-ises so many things that it's no wonder that countries cycle down into some – the great melting-pot togetherness of it all. "Pigs are more equal than others," you know? This kind of a – this kind of an attitude.
It isn't that thetans are unequal, but it isn't that they're equal either. Perhaps at the beginning of track this might have been true. But they've been gathering inequalities for some time and then masking them by pretended equalities until they're very hard to separate out.

Well, if you go ahead and look this over in Security Checking, you'll find out that the Dynamic Assessment is a very marvelous way to get a zone of life on which the person has overts and withholds. And you'll find that that works fine, and produce some rather interesting results.

All right. There is another thing called the Problems Intensive that we have been working on, and I'll tell you how to do this Problems Intensive. It's a simple thing to do; nothing much to it.

It's a form. And you fill out the form. And the only differences that you find from this and the first time I told you about it is you don't run the problem. You fill out the form. You get all the self-determined changes of the pc's lifetime. Then you assess those self-determined changes, you find the one that reacts the most and then you ask for the problem immediately earlier than that change. They give you a problem. If it's the right change, they will give you a problem which is a tremendous overwhelming problem that they have had for many, many years and that is their present time problem of long duration. And they would recognize that as such and that gets out of the road very nicely. The statement of it, of course, makes it easier. But now there's a faster way of auditing it than running the problem. A problem is too close to still to be audited swiftly. It isn't that a problem can't be audited. A problem can be audited but it audits more slowly than approaching it through motion.

In other words, it's close to a still, a problem is. You ever notice a workman when he runs into two pieces of timber that are going the wrong way in the structure: he stands back and looks at it. Yeah, he inevitably stops. And problems are associated with stops.

So what you do is take it as a still point on the track and find the area of prior confusion and then you sec check that area of prior confusion. Find out what the person was doing at that time, find out what he withheld and from whom and how he did it and what he did and why he said it. And you know, that – you just find out all of the things and stuff in that particular area which preceded the problem. And all the change in the problem, all you do with the change he made in life and the problem is use them as a milepost in time behind which you look for the confusion. And then you sec check the confusion. And you'll find out, then, the problem will blow unless it's gone back fifty thousand years and you're actually trying to sec check his life as a student barbarian or something – which you can run into.

You get that area of confusion unraveled and you'll find the problem blows, the change blows. And what do you know? It's usually accompanied by a somatic of some kind, and it'll be some kind of a chronic somatic, and that will lessen somewhat or sometimes even blow entirely. Don't be disheartened after you've got the person a goals terminal, and you are running him on the line, to have the somatic reappear where it really occurred on the track. And it'll reappear and blow.

Now, Sec Checking, however, will alleviate and get it out of the road and it usually stays out of the road, so – it stays lessened anyway.
And so doing a Problems Intensive, then, merely consists of finding all of the self-determined changes a person has made in a lifetime, listing those, assessing those, finding that change which gives the most reaction, finding the problem stated by the pc which existed immediately prior to that change and then finding the area of prior confusion to the problem. Find that area and sec check the living daylights out of that area.

What was he doing at that time? And who'd he know? And all this sort of thing. And basically and principally, what did he do and what did he withhold from whom?

Now, you don't have to do it person by person. You actually can delete the assessment of the people in the list. You needn't do that, there is no real point in it at all. You needn't make a list of people on a Problems Intensive and then assess that list of people, because it's a violation of a goals terminal.

What you should do is just go in on the basis of an area of confusion, find out who was present in it and then find out to whom he did what and from whom he withheld what. And all of a sudden the problem in a majority of cases will blow. Now, that is a – you call that a Problems Intensive, you see?

Now, a dynamics – Sec Checking by Dynamics is an entirely different activity and it is an isolated activity of its own. And a Problems Intensive is an isolated activity of its own. These things are distinctly different activities.

Sec Checking usually depends for its workability on the ability of the auditor to ask the right question at the right time. Now, when we're making the basic class of a very functional type of auditor – I mean, an auditor that we would depend on the skill of, that basic Class II Auditor – we're not going to say that the Class II Auditor is a muzzled auditor, and so on and so on, you see, the way we used to say there was a class. Class II is above that. This person has got to have enough imagination to ask the right questions and put together the right questions in order to knock apart this mess; that'd give him enough to think about. And you have to be very good at it. As a matter of fact, several members of this particular class are extremely good at this. I'm very interested in watching it occur. "So we found the hidden confusion and that was the end of the problem." You know? Bang-Bang - Doing it very well.

Now, what's interesting is, is that you could sec check out of existence every out-rudiment. Isn't that interesting. You could take the room and you could take the present time problem, you could take the auditor, you could take the ARC break, and naturally the withhold, and you could sec check out of existence all of these out-rudiments by just asking for the prior confusion. You find the rudiments out so you find out what went on before it.

You see, a rudiment can't hang up unless there's an unknown in it and an unknown can't exist unless there is a withhold.

These people who walk around being fond of being stupid should get wise to themselves because all they're doing is declaring that they have withholds. Here we have a class of thing which is all of a – all of a piece: unknowingness, forgettiness, withholdingness and stupidity. These all go together. These are all of a class. They are not the same thing but each one interdepend on another. It's kind of another triangle like we used to have in ARC and still have. But unknown and stupidity and withholds go up and down accompanying one an-
other. They are hand in glove. The more withholds a person has the more stupid he'd be; the more unknowns he will have. And you've got these three things just marching up and down beside each other. And as you improve a person's withholds, if they're actually withholds, of course he will get brighter.

But if you think you're going to take a member of the Bank Robbers Security League and see check him on a churchman's moral code and wind up with an increased IQ, of course, you're quite mistaken. This will not occur.

What you've got to do is see check within the reality of what the pc is and what the pc has done. You have to see check within that reality.

Well, there is one method of finding the zone by dynamics, and another method: zones of action by change. That is the Problems Intensive.

Well, the hidden confusion was when he was in school. All right. Now, that is not anything but a school mores. It couldn't be anything but school mores. It is not familial mores, particularly; it's school mores. The confusion immediately before this change that you assessed out was going to school. So therefore it's a school mores. It's a schoolboy's attitude toward the parents; a schoolboy's attitude, you see, toward teachers; a schoolboy's attitude toward all the other aspects of existence. Well, what are these, what are these? And what's the morals? What's the mores of a school? "Thou shalt not give the headmaster an even break," you know? It's the thousand-odd commandments of the schoolboy. "Thou mustn't peach. Thou mustn't inform on thy worst enemy." All kinds of weird moral codes, one kind or another. "Thou shalt take revenge." It's quite weird, you know? Somebody was mean therefore all the other boys enforce the fact that there must be a fight.

You know, it's quite weird. But so is any of these moral codes. And if you're living comfortably, ensconced in a sort of a even, easy-go sort of a society, and you'd say, "Well, I know what's moral: 'Thou shalt not, thou shalt not and thou shalt not and thou shalt not,' and that's about all there is to it. And, of course, I am a moral person." That is the emptiest remark that anybody ever made. "I am a moral person." There isn't any other kind.

It doesn't make him a well-behaved person, except in one group: the group that happens to have the same morals. See that, and then he's a well-behaved person only in that group. It's very interesting. The auditor's viewpoint can be thrown out. The auditor can see check securely from the fact of the Presbyterian church and then with what amazement discover that nobody but Presbyterians ever lives by the Presbyterian church. Always discovers this with some shock. And never under any circumstances realizes there's a moral code amongst marijuana addicts. See, so that is immoral.

Well look, it's only immoral to those groups that have a moral code that says what the other side is doing is bad.

I'm not now trying to tear down and rip to pieces every single moral code that has ever been developed anywhere. As a matter of fact, we have the only means that has ever been discovered of straightening them out. I don't know how anybody can be a Presbyterian after having been a Roman Catholic for fifteen hundred years. [laughter] If the Presbyterian church was smart, if it was very, very clever, why, it would come around and find a bunch of us audi-
tors and get us to sit down with our E-Meters and put the congregation up the line out of the moral area that they are stuck in so that then they will hear something of what the preacher is saying. I think it's a waste of air and church heat and a few other things. He's standing up there and he's ranting and pounding the pulpit and telling them they must not sin. And just think of this fellow who is totally stuck in the Never-Give-a-Planet-an-Even-Break Space Jockeys Protective Association. [laughter]

And here's this preacher ranting at him, "Thou shalt not sin. You must learn to become a moral person."

And something in the back of his mind says, "You know, I don't want to kill any more women." [laughter] "And this fellow is standing up there demanding that I kill women. And that is why I left the Space Jockey Protective Association because it was just too much – just one too many women. Now, why does the Presbyterian church want me to kill women?" This is what goes in crosswise, you see, in the reactive bank. And the fellow is very puzzled about Presbyterianism. And he can't articulate what it is and he can't understand about it. He just thinks that, well, it's not quite for him.

And if you ask him about it, almost [snaps fingers] on a flash response, "What does a Presbyterian church want you to do?"

[snaps fingers] "They want me to steal ships and kill women." And even he at this point looking at that would say, "You know, that's peculiar." Because they don't want him to commit sin.

If you raved and ranted at a large group of people with great force and decibels of sound that they must not sin, that they must be moral people, and never at any time held up what you were talking about or defined morals or showed them any moral code or anything – you just collect them at random and then just start screaming at them that they mustn't sin, they mustn't be immoral, so on – people would walk out of there and do some of the weirdest things. [laughter]

You should realize that there is no act pronounced immoral in any one part of Earth which cannot be found to be moral in some other part of Earth. So remember that, when you are doing Security Checking. Security check against the moral code of the prior confusion.

And, well, if your prior confusion, let us say, is a period after the person has been an auditor for years and it's a big confusion and it has something to do with auditing in an organization or something like this – there was a big confusion at this time, and after that he changed something or other, and that's the confusion you assessed, and that is the confusion that you are security checking. And you've learned that in his early life he was a Presbyterian or something. You know he's probably crossed up one way or the other. But probably the code he has gone against is the code he understands to be the code of a Scientologist – not the written Code of the Scientologist. The written Code of the Scientologist is not the code of a Scientologist, oddly enough. It is simply something that is held up as a – as some kind of a model of action to keep us from getting our heads kicked in. But we have developed quite a structure of morality, you know? "Thou shalt not audit badly." That's one of the foremost of them.
"Thou shalt not audit a pc with a PT problem" – it goes off into technical things, don't you see? And it – so on. A person, actually, is getting into a moral structure. He's not into a technical structure; he's also into a moral structure. And by sec checking him, you will find out that he thought of it as a moral structure. That was a moral structure to him. You look on it as a technical structure, but no, it's a moral structure.

He knew very well, he knew doggone good and well, that he shouldn't keep auditing this person badly after 3:30 A.M. He just knew he shouldn't ought to be doing that because it was against all of his principles: what he wanted to do and what anybody else wanted him to do and so forth – it was just bad. Pc was getting tireder and tireder and tireder and practically finally spun in. This gets to be a hell of an overt.

Somebody walks into the front room and swears and damns and screams and raises the devil about something or other and practically knocks the person's lease to pieces, don't you see? And you get that as an overt amongst Scientologists? You don't get it as an overt until they find out that they disturbed an auditing session that was going on. [laughter] You see? All right. They disturbed this auditing session. Well, that's an overt. Something they shouldn't have done.

So gradually out of technical lines and out of behavior actions and group associations, Scientologists are building a moral code of what they consider proper behavior. And it's built exactly and entirely against their experience, not what they've been told or what they've been dictated to. It's built against the experience of what they know to be survival and what they know to be nonsurvival. So you see, you check against that moral code one way or the other.

Now, you have a Security Check for an auditor. Now, whether it embraces all those points or not is debatable at the moment; I haven't got the thing to hand. Possibly it doesn't. But you see, you're in the driver's seat if you're security checking a Scientologist. You see, that's easy. That's nothing to it. Just all you have to do is say, "Well, what would I consider wrong?" You see, "As an auditor, what would I consider wrong? Well, all right. I'll ask him if he's done it."

"You ever disturb an auditing session? You ever done this? You ever done that? You ever written a nasty letter to Ron and couldn't get it back out of the post?" [laughter, laughs] See, anything, anything, you just bing, bing and think those up, just bang! bang! bang! That's because, you see, you're auditing in the same sphere of the moral code.

Now, let's move it just one out. You're security checking a person who is your fellow countryman and who has gone to similar schools to you, and so forth. Well, this is pretty easy. You know what you'd consider wrong so you can ask him what's wrong, and bang – you'll get all kinds of withholds and so forth, and that's dandy.

All right. Let's move it out just a little bit further. You're a member of the human race and you're checking – security checking a member of the human race. Well, you get past the language difficulties; you could dream up a security thing. You could – you know, you know enough about it – vaguely, other races and things – and you could dream up something. Even if it was only "Have you ever done something that a Chinaman would consider immoral?"
You know, you had to be that stupid about it but you could still brace it in somehow or another here and get it through.

All right. Now, let's security check a monkey. Well, what do monkeys consider moral? What do they consider immoral? I don't know. I haven't talked to one lately. But they go on a monkey code. They must have one because they all behave alike as a species. Don't they? Well, they must have a moral code of some kind or another which is a racial code of some kind.

All right. How about security checking a blade of grass? I can show you that a tomato will register. I can show you that a cabbage will register on an E-Meter. Well, the only problem there is not just how to get in communication with the cabbage? See, that's not the major problem. That's not the only major problem. The other major problem would be well, "What does a cabbage consider immoral?" That's from a Security Checker's viewpoint. I imagine "Not to be eaten," or something. You never know about these things.

The basis of which you operate must be the viewpoint of the pc, not the viewpoint of the auditor – the only point I'm trying to make here. You must – you must security check from the viewpoint of the pc, always. Doesn't mean you've got to be in his 'ead, but it means you've got to do some dream-up.

All right. If this person was a WRAC, was a WRAC for years, and the incident you're security checking and the zone of confusion – the prior confusion that you're security checking – finds that she has been a WRAC for some years. What is the moral code of a WRAC? Who knows? Well, you could ask some questions about it. You could dream it up.

"Have you ever spoken pleasantly to your commanding officer? Have you ever failed or refused to make catty remarks about a sergeant?" See? Who knows what their moral code is? But it might be immoral, see, it might be immoral to apparently be on good terms with your sergeant.

See? It might be. All kinds of wild things might be going on. You're not sure, because there are different standards of survival. And the standards of survival can be so different that there it is. It's laid out in front of you. Your work is cut out for you.

But you always – the rule is, you always security check within the moral structure of the pc, not the auditor. You never security check within the moral structure of the auditor. You just make a damn fool of yourself if you do that. You sound like a parson yapping. You've got a moral code. Well, what's so moral about it? I don't know. But there it is. You got a moral code.

Now, all moral codes tend to propagate themselves and people try to force other people into a moral code within a group, and so on. So an auditor does have a latent impulse to force some old moral code of his off on the pc while he is security checking. It's perfectly all right to force any moral code you want to on anybody, but not while you're security checking. You security check by the moral code the pc has violated and you'll get some terrific case gains. You'll get that tone arm coming down, and so on.

Well, I've given you two excellent methods of doing this; they're very, very good: your Problems Intensive to find areas of confusion; your Dynamics Assessment followed by a Se-
security Check along that particular dynamic line. I think you will find these things are quite productive of interesting results.

The question very often comes up, extremely, "Well, aren't you just running perpetual withholds, withholds, withholds, withholds? Aren't you running withhold on the Prehav Scale?" No. It never flattens; it's one of these total duration. If you've asked somebody, "Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George?" Yes, that will flatten and that will run out. But "Have you ever in the last two hundred trillion years restrained a communication or restrained a reach or restrained anything? Have you ever done this?" I'm afraid would take a long time to flatten.

Now, it is much more rapidly flattened if you say, "Have you ever overtly acted against or withheld yourself from some moral code that – ?" so on. Now, we've got what his real withholds are. We can get those out. So it flattens as fast as you've cleaned up all the moral codes which he has violated.

How many groups has he belonged to? I don't know. It's an inexhaustible amount. Fortunately, you don't have to do it that particularly to get a good result.

Now, there's one thing more here and that is the subject of the use of "blame," the use of "make guilty," in Security Checking and the ways of doing that. And there's one more item: is the use of critical thoughts in Security Checking.

Blame has nothing to do with a Security Check. Just forget it. It's just a part of the Prehav Scale. It comes under the heading of irresponsibility, by the way, not under the heading of overt and withholds. To "make guilty" – I notice there's a tendency to ask people if they have ever blamed anybody as a Security Check and so forth. And this just doesn't exist. It isn't anything. It's nowhere.

Now, if you ask somebody "Have you ever made anybody guilty of...?" and Security Check question – if you ask that bluntly just like that, your chances of getting a factual answer are something on the order of a roulette wheel in Las Vegas. There it is. Because the thing that is wrong with your pc is that he or she has never really succeeded in making anybody guilty of anything, anytime, and they are still trying. And the basis of their aberration is the effort to make others guilty, not the fact of accomplished guilt. You always use "tried to make guilty," "attempted to make guilty." Such words as that must modify this "made guilty."

"Have you ever attempted to make anybody guilty of rape?" That's a perfectly proper Security Check question.

"Have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?" Well, this is Las Vegas. This girl and – I don't know, she's been raped by the firemen, the police; she's been raped by most anybody and everybody, and just been raped for years. And all during this period of time, she has been saying, "You beast! You dog. Get thee hence. Take thy dark shadow away from my doorstep" and other equivalent remarks, less ladylike, in an effort to make fellows guilty. And she has never succeeded in doing it.

And you ask her, "Have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?"
Well, this is nonsense. No, she never has. That is the answer and that's the reaction you'll get on the needle. No, she never has. Tried for years. Never succeeded yet. [laughter]

But you ask, "Have you ever tried to make anybody guilty?" Ahhh, well. Now, that's a guilt of another hue. And you'll find your tone arm is reacting to that one. It can go up and down and back and forth. Do you realize that the only reason anybody has a victimish, motivatorish attitude is just an effort to make somebody guilty. But remember, it's only an effort to make somebody guilty. It is not successfully having done so.

Now, you can actually produce a considerable change of mental attitude on the part of a pc by saying, "Now, all right, get the idea of your mother and father standing in front of you and saying they're so sorry, and then have them fall away and die. Thank you." And the person will just cheer up.

There's a tremendous effort to accomplish that exact end. There's a tremendous effort. Everybody has it. It's not singular. They've got something they wanted to make somebody guilty about and they haven't ever made it. And it's still hung on the track.

So it's always "try to make guilty," it is always "attempted to make guilty." It is always a modifying word of that character and it is never, "Have you ever made so-and-so guilty?"

You ask a judge in sessions. You take him and you say, "All right, judge," and you put him on the E-Meter. And you say, "All right. Now, judge, we're going to find out if you ever made a prisoner guilty." And it gets no fall. Man, he has been sentencing them to be hanged, he has been sentencing them to prison, he's been banishing them out of the society, he's been shooting them from guns for years and years and years. Why, they've been sent to Old Bailey and Wormwood Scrubs, and here they go. And he's never, in his estimation, succeeded in making one feel guilty. They always have the insouciance as they walk out the door, "Well, I really didn't do it," you see? "And he's just a dog. And somehow or another, I will bear up with all this," see?

He's always got this as his image: he didn't succeed in making the fellow guilty. He pronounced sentence. You say, "Have you ever pronounced sentence?"

He will also say, "Yes. Oh yes, I've pronounced sentence, pronounced sent..." You probably won't get any fall on the meter either. That's what he's supposed to do. Pronounce sentence.

But you say, "Have you ever tried to make a prisoner guilty?" The thing will fall off its pin. Just run by the hour.

You just – well, how many prisoners do you want? Just one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, oh, Joe and Pete and Roy and masses, masses and masses of prisoners. Because every time one of these ones would come up accused of some very hideous crime, he didn't think his punishment was adequate half the time or he didn't think the person would experience it in any way, and he's busy pounding with the gavel and screaming at the fellow, "Hang him by the neck until he's dead, dead, dead!" And the prisoner looks at him, you know, and goes kind of white and walks away. All the judge gets is a reaction after that, that somebody won't speak to him now. [laughter]
See, the fact of making the other fellow guilty may have been accomplished, but the person seldom finds out about it. May have been accomplished. But what he does know for sure is that he attempted to.

You could get a great deal of response, but it's always "try" and "attempt."

Now, another little point I'd like to bring up about Security Checking is a debatable one – this isn't a clear-cut point: whether or not you should ever take an unkind thought as an overt.

I say it's debatable just for this reason: that sometimes it's the only thing that is available on the pc. Apparently you can find nothing else, but they thought an unkind thought about somebody and that was an overt and they withheld it, and it sort of frees up. And it – a few of these gotten off will make the person feel more friendly and so on. Yes, there's some reaction to it.

But apparently – and this is not on my own observation – but apparently, there is evidence to the effect that a person with a body of unkind thoughts against something or somebody has an actual overt which he is wi... or she is withholding underneath those unkind thoughts. And just like you see a little flag waving above the powder mine, you go along and flutter at the flag, you see, and you don't pay any attention to the mine, you just don't get anything done about it, you know? You just monkey with the flag, you know? "Well, I had an unkind thought." So you make the flag wave a little bit more, you know? And factually, there's a powder mine there.

And you say, "What have you got underneath this here critical, unkind thought?"

"Nothing. I have been a pure, honest, good Samaritan, washing my feet properly morning, noon and night, and drying it in my wife's hair. I've been doing all the moral things I should be doing" (you'd be surprised how many moral things there are), "and I have never done anything in my whole life to that person and I have no withholds of any kind."

Well, there's little plumes – there's a couple little openings we're going to have to put in up here when we start this type of Security Checking to let the smoke out of the E-Meter because it's going to react.

So there is evidence to the effect that if you get some unkind thoughts, you ought to whistle up for the bulldozers and the cranes and the big grab hooks to reach in and find out what the devil the overt is because the unkind thought is apparently the indicator which shows that an overt and a withhold exist. And if you audit unkind thoughts in Security Checking as themselves, you are doing the same thing as leaving a Security Check question unflat.

So this is another reason, apparently, why a pc can be given a Security Check, and they get off a lot of unkind thoughts, unkind thoughts, and then all of a sudden, why, the needle gets all gummy, and they just don't feel so good and they aren't so good, and so forth.

Well, actually, the unkind thoughts were indicators. The little flag was waving in the breeze, and the auditor never really asked a comprehensive question such as, "What have you done to William?"

"Nothing" – thooong.
"What was that? What are you withholding from William?"

"Nothing. Nothing but his inheritance and his wife and all of his baggage and a few things like that," you see?

But it comes up as "Well, I thought William's tie wasn't so nice today, so that's a big overt." Actually, those things are not sufficiently important. They are not adequate to aberrate anybody; they won't do much for a case. But they are indicators. And there are several things in life which are these little indicators and something big lies under them.

Now, it isn't necessarily true, though, that the pc can get to it at his state of case now. It's something that you could kind of – you may not even get a reaction on it on the meter. It's too unreal to the individual, see? But a little X across over in the border on the Security Check indicates to you that sometime, someday this pc is going to come up the line and then you're going to find out, "Well, William ..."

Well, actually, he didn't do anything to William, really. But when William was dead broke and didn't have any train fare, he made him walk from London to East Grinstead. And when he got to East Grinstead, and so forth, had made sure that the place that was going to employ him had a bad reference on him. Yet he hadn't done anything to him, you know? And it was in the rain. And he got pneumonia and died. [laughter] Otherwise, he's done nothing to William. But pcs are not good at facing up to overts, so they miss them in that particular character.

All right. Well, there you are, and I hope this gives you some more data, some more interesting insights in Security Checking. But remember that Security Checking belongs in the category of metering. And unless you operate the meter, Security Checking is a very dangerous pastime, and I wouldn't attempt it if I couldn't run a meter.

Thank you very much.
Thank you. Well, you're lucky people. You're lucky. [laughter] You are. You don't know it but you are.

What have you done in the last two hundred trillion years to make you this lucky? [laughter] Hm? Now, what have you done?

_Female voice: Got smart enough to come here._

Aha. Got smart enough to come here. All right.

[part missing]

Now, your immediate, direct business today which is the – what is this? The 7th of...

_Female voice: 7th of November._

November, AD 11. All right. Your immediate, direct business today is Routine 3A and the talk I'm going to give you is totally concerned with Routine 3A and you should have in your possession HCO Bulletin of November 7th, 1961. This is one of those rare occasions where the lecture, the bulletin, the data and the cases are all assembled [laughter] at one point of conjunction.

Now, may I call your attention to a safety table which I think was the 26 October – hm?

_Female voice: 29th of October._

29th of October. The safety table – what it is safe to process. Well, it is safe to process a goals terminal. It's quite safe to process one. But it's not safe to process any other than a goals terminal. Therefore, the only people who should run Routine 3A are, of course, those people who have been trained, and the only terminals that should be run are those that have been checked out by a graduate of Saint Hill, period.

That puts a sort of a limiter on the amount of auditing done until you realize that I have simply said checked out. Checked out. That takes those zones and areas of the world that are too lazy to send anybody to Saint Hill or something of the sort and that leaves them unclear, but they can go ahead and beef up their banks and have a ball.

But we're not going to worry about them. Our next concern after this is after all of the bad assessments have been done and all of the bad runs have been done and everything is all messed up, how to salvage a case that has been put into that condition by auditing which is unauthorized.

And I call to attention a Class II at this moment is the only authorized auditing anywhere in the world where a Saint Hill graduate is not. That means all the field. That means all
organizations, and so forth. That means Class II, which consists of Security Checking, problems, getting rudiments in. There's tremendous numbers of things that can be done under Classes I and II, and we've been doing them for years and getting good wins on them. So why everybody has to stretch up against a Class III activity is a little more than I can comprehend. Because when you get up to this level of Class III, if you don't know your business you can really tear somebody to shreds.

Now, hitherto we have been running Routine 3, and this is one of those milestones in a line of research and we cease as of now to run Routine 3. It has ceased and desisted. We will never again run Routine 3. It is ended because it is modified.

And the modification of Routine 3 is extremely simple and all it consists of is simply adding a step to Routine 3. There is just a step added in.

Now, in Routine 3 we found a goal. And we did this by getting the pc to do a list or we wrote down the list the pc gave us. And we didn't do it, by the way, by taking the pc's list and then filing it and saying, "Well, of course, the pc doesn't know what's wrong with him so his goal can't be on this list, and so we put this away in the files. Now we get another list and we ask him if he has any more goals. And we can't find any more of those goals. So we try to find were the rudiments out. And then, of course, the rudiments are out. Nobody can get the rudiments in. And so – and you don't have to look at an E-Meter either because it doesn't know either." And then decide that the person has lots of marital difficulties so that their terminal must be, of course, a husband.

That is not the way we do – did – should do such a thing. What we do is get a goals list. It's all too elementary. I get at this point and I go into a little bit of confusion about this point, because I never can quite guess what people are going to add to something. They can always add something like, well, what I just said, you know: "The pc never knows what's wrong with him, so therefore his goal that he gives you couldn't be right, and you have to make up a goal for the pc." Don't think it hasn't been done. I mean, that's how they miss Goals Assessments. Terrific invalidation and all that sort of thing.

But we learned in Routine 3 that it was very difficult to get a goal. We learned that you had to get a goal with the rudiments in, in, in. And we had to be very careful of this, and we had to not invalidate the pc, and we had to be very, very sharp in getting our goal. And nothing of that is altered in Routine 3A.

In fact, it might now become just a little bit more difficult. Because we have found another piece of the puzzle.

Now, having found the goal – having found the goal, by doing an assessment as in steps 1, 2 and 3 of Routine 3 – A, also – same thing. We got it checked out of course by somebody else. We made sure that this was the right goal. And then we asked the pc, in Routine 3, what terminals would answer up to that goal, and we had cause and effect type terminals. And we made lists of these. And then we assessed this by elimination, and we finally came up with one terminal – only one terminal sounding. Just as we had only one goal remaining in, then we came up with one terminal remaining in. And that thing stayed in and was not sporadic or fluctuating. It always gave instant reads. That was the pc's terminal.
And then we assessed this on the Prehav scale and having assessed it, we put together a – found the level of the Prehav scale and we put that into a five-way bracket. And having put it into a five-way bracket, we then ran the pc on this. Along with this, we, of course, did Security Checking. That's Routine 3.

Now, if you've learned Routine 3, it is absolutely nothing to do Routine 3A. There's a wild difference between these two Routines, but not in the way you do them.

Now, we come to this problem with Routine 3. Difficulty of assessment. Skip it. That is merely a matter of auditing skill. You can assess or you can't assess. You can audit or you can't audit. I mean, that's all there is to that.

Given assessment and then assessment of terminal and then run on the Prehav Scale, we had only a small percentage of the people running in this particular fashion going Clear rapidly. Why? Why? What was this – rest of this percentage? And this has been my action and activity through April, May, June, July, August, September, October of 1961. Why?

They all would – apparently running on the right terminal. They all obeyed the rules of terminals and so on. So we went off into hidden standards and we investigated that very thoroughly.

And we did a lot of good for cases, and we found a whole new chapter in processing. And we found out that you get the prior confusion and blow off the stuck circuit, and you could do a lot of tricky things with this hidden standard. We learned how to take problems apart this way.

And actually right now all you have to do is just find the prior confusion to an out-rudiment, and the rudiment will go in. I mean, this was a big gain. So it's easier now to get rudiments in. If we just did them by prior confusion, we would get our rudiments in. These were wins and cases ran a bit better. We had the idea of group mores and that the individual was breaking down a third dynamic mores, and all of a sudden we have moved Clear from the status of first dynamic Clear through second dynamic Clear to third dynamic Clear. We've gotten that far.

In other words, we're cleaning up the first, second and third dynamic. Clears made prior to this date are beautifully cleaned up on the first. And just between ourselves, they sometimes act like it. So without graduating somebody up through a first dynamic Clear, we can at this particular stage of the game ... That's no crack on the thing, but I have actually had some backlashes in this direction that were very first dynamicy. They're very reasonable, but very first dynamicy which was no objection on my part. I never rolled them under because of it, but that was the way it was.

And we have here – we're looking at a third dynamic Clear, particularly in Routine 3A because we're going to run it in this particular direction. We keep broadening this concept of Clear and we keep broadening the stability and the expected stability of Clear and we keep shortening the number of hours to Clear. And shortening down the hours to Clear has been my main action, but it also has "Let's just knock out all of this slow gain." And I have been fighting on that research front here all during this summer, working with students and so forth. Notexperimentally – we were always doing exactly – where we were going and what
we were doing, and the most that we knew. But all of a sudden, all of a sudden there was a violent blue spark, and it went from one corner of the Saint Hill to the other corner of the Saint Hill, and it left ozone behind it all the way. In short, I had a cognition of some magnitude. What on earth keeps a goal hanging? Why does a goal – why is a goal alive at all? I mean, how has this goal come down the track endlessly, endlessly, endlessly, endlessly, eons and eons and eons. What is keeping this goal there?

Well, we know of only one mechanism that does this. Only one mechanism does this, and that is the mechanism of a problem. Problem definition: postulate-counter-postulate. And because they're postulate-counter-postulate, the thing gets suspended in time. In other words, you have a postulate, and that postulate would just evaporate unless it had resistance.

And there are two postulates counter-opposed, and each one of them are of equal force, so if these two postulates are of equal force, you get something hung up in time.

The way you can unsettle this postulate-counter-postulate, of course, is very easily, as we have recently discovered, just find the area of prior confusion. And of course, it weakens or strengthens one or the other of the two postulates as you get the overts and the withholds off, and the thing tips over, and the problem disappears.

But let's look at the difficulty of keeping a problem alive – the great difficulty of it. It has to be two balanced forces. Otherwise, one force overbalances the other force and ceases to be a problem, becomes a solution or ceases to exist.

We have a husband and a wife, and they have fought, and they have fought, and they have fought. And finally one of them gives up. They don't fight anymore. Maybe they aren't – maybe one of them isn't happy, maybe the other one isn't happy; but that's beside the point. They aren't a problem any more. They're a solved situation. It's a solved area. Or they get divorced and separate, and they aren't a problem any more there either until an auditor comes along to it and tries to settle why they're having difficulty in their current marriage. And he finds this past marriage still hanging fire somewhere in the bank.

But the problem has to have two more or less – two or more, more or less balanced, forces counter-opposed. You have a bull weighing twenty-seven hundred pounds with his forehead pushed up against a bull weighing twenty-seven hundred pounds. And these two bulls are pushing with twenty-seven hundred foot-pounds of thrust. And they're trying to collapse their heads into each other to the depth of one foot, in other words, but there they are.

And if you consider them from the standpoint of a problem, there they would be. There's nothing going to happen because one twenty-seven hundred pound bull is pushing against one twenty-seven hundred pound bull. And unless somebody makes their foreheads skid or trips one bull or something like that, there they are going to stand in the pasture. Now, that is a problem. And that is the problem. And that is the anatomy of a problem.

When the pc says to you, "I have a present time problem," and you get a fall on your meter and so forth, this is the kind of thing that's happening. The pc's effort to go in some direction is being countered by an effort of him not to go in the direction or somebody else's effort to go in a different direction. And these two forces are counter-opposed. And you get an nonresolved situation. It's nonresolvable. It is not nonresolvable as some pcs would have you
believe. It just doesn't happen to be resolved because it's in counterpoise. And that's what happens there.

Now, you run off, of course, the pc's end of this, and it then will cease to be, very often, a problem with the other party. Now, why does it cease to be a problem with the other party?

Well, it takes two twenty-seven hundred pound bulls. And you've just taken one twenty-seven hundred pound bull and you have either made him go up to three thousand pounds, you see, or you have headed him in an opposite direction with regard to this sort of thing. And of course you don't have postulate-counter-postulate now. You have something else.

And the other person who has the other side of the problem in present time, of course has nothing to push against, and so that postulate evaporates.

You see why this mechanism exists. This happens very often. I mean, all too often for just happenstance.

We process a pc on her family. And we process her on her family, and we spend hours at it and so on. And we finally finish up, and she seems all cleaned up on the family. She's not worried about her family now. She doesn't – not trying to make her family guilty, or not not make her family guilty. And there she is, and she suddenly receives a letter, a telephone call or something. And it says, "Dear Amy, All is forgiven. Come home." Or something like this will occur, you know. It's quite amazing.

One particular instance, there was somebody worried about money disappearing out of the cash box in an organization. Money disappearing out of the cash box. Money disappearing out of the cash box. This person was worried about it. Blaming herself. Blaming herself. Blaming herself for money disappearing out of the cash box. Couldn't figure out how the money was disappearing out of the cash box. Thought she must be guilty about it. Worried, worried, worried, worried, worried. Got it run in an auditing session.

The second that she had it run in the auditing session, almost within the hour following it, the person who had been taking the money out of the cash box came in, paid the money back. Mysterious, wasn't it. Well, apparently, the person worrying about it all the time, and force and so forth, had this interlocked in some peculiar way in the theta universe in some fashion where nothing resolved. Nothing was happening. Now, there we're getting a little esoteric. Do you see? That's a little bit out beyond the understandable boundary.

But we have this, of course, as the most obvious thing: There's the husband, and he goes home. And he has an awful fight with the wife, and they chop each other up. And then the husband gets audited. And then all of a sudden, why, he's nicer to the wife, or she hasn't got anything to push against. Or she's baffled, she has a new problem maybe – "Who is this?" You know? [laughter] Something on that order. And of course, the problem has ceased to exist by very material understanding. I mean, we can understand how that problem would cease to exist. We've changed one of the protagonists.
But how about this other one? Five thousand miles away the girl's family haven't written to her for years. We process her on her family and all of a sudden the family goes into communication with her. This happens all too often.

But these are all examples of things suspended in time. As long as you've got two interlocked forces, you get a time suspension. And when you're dealing with the mind... This is not necessarily true in the physical universe. These two bulls actually are moving on the time track. But in straight thinkingness, there is no apparent motion on the time track where two things are interlocked.

You've got postulate-counter-postulate, and it's all mental, so it's not really tied down to the physical universe anyway. And it just goes on drifting in time. Well, an examination of this demonstrates that there must be something on the other side of the goal. If this person has had a goal for the last eighteen trillennia, what has kept it there? You see? That's just the – how come? How come it doesn't as-is? How come he never realizes it? How come he never backs off of it? How come he never quits on the subject? How come he never wins on the subject. It just stays there. He's got a goal – "to pick gooseberries" or something. And there it is.

And if you'd put him on a meter six trillennia ago, I'm sure that you would have gotten some kind of a reading "to pick gooseberries," you see. Well, how come it stayed there that long?

Well, it's the same anatomy as the problem. There is on the other side of every goal a thing called a modifier. The exact definition of a modifier you have in this bulletin: "A modifier is that consideration which opposes the attainment of a goal and tends to suspend it in time." That is a modifier.

Just as you have the husband fighting with the wife and the wife fighting with the husband, and their equal velocities of fighting, then, suspend that fight in time, in the same way, let us think of the husband as having a goal and the wife as the reasons why he isn't going to make one. And you get their counterpoise, then, carrying forward the whole thing as a problem, don't you see.

All right. Or let us say the wife has a goal and the husband is damned if she's going to realize it and so in similar circumstances you've got this whole thing carrying forward in time. In other words, you've got these two people locked horns to horns and they're not moving. Well, a person's goal found by a common Goals Assessment – you don't do anything different in a Goals Assessment. You do it the same way you have always done. When you get the list of goals and so forth.

The next step to that is to find out how come it is locked in space. And you find out how it is locked in space by finding the modifier. Modifier is a technical term. I invite you to use it as such. You could call it lots of other things, but we don't happen to have called anything a modifier, so it doesn't mess up our [laughter] – it doesn't mess up our nomenclature. But it certainly does modify the goal. And that's what it sounds like when you get one. The thing it sounds most like is modifier.
Now, in doing Routine 3A, after getting your goal proved out and totally checked out on the person, you would then do a list of modifiers. This list, I think you will commonly find, is very short and I think the modifier is very easy to attain. But the reason the modifier does not come about is by the pure mechanics of its not-as-isness. It has a characteristic of not as-ising. It's a denyer.

If you know your old Dianetics, all pcs have denyers. And they'll go running along through an engram, yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yop, and then skip. And they obviously – there's something else went on there. And then they go on to the end of the engram, yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yop.

And when you finally find this middle of the engram, it'll be something like, "It isn't here." You know, somebody has said at that point, "It isn't here." Or somebody has said, "Well, nothing is happening just now." And the pc runs down the engram, hits this "Nothing is happening just now," never notices it because, of course, nothing is happening just now.

In other words, they take it literally, dramatize it, and it becomes truth, you see? So if there's nothing there, why, of course, the pc never runs that part of the engram. And after you've run it and run it and run it and run it and run it, a clever auditor in the old days would eventually ask for the bouncer which made him get out of it or the comeback, the pullback, or something like that. He'd ask for one of these types of phrases. And amongst those that he asked for was a denyer. Something that says it isn't here. Something that says it doesn't exist.

And he'd ask, "Is there a denyer there?"

And the pc would say, "No, there's nothing here."

And the clever auditor would say, "Repeat that."

And the pc would say, "All right. There's nothing here. There's nothing here. There's nothing – well, what do you know? That's my mother talking. She is saying, 'There is nothing here.'"

Similarly, I have – you can get phrases and that sort of thing, and meanings and senses, doing all kinds of queer things.

I ran into a case one time that had sonic only on one section of the track for one instant. And he always had sonic at that point of the track. And you run him along through engrams and so forth, and he had no sonic, but he'd get into this one particular incident which he just couldn't seem to run, by the way. And he kept it around; it was a good showpiece. And run it down, and just before the sonic turned on, we finally found out, it says, "Get away. Listen."

And the pc, of course, listened, and he heard for the next few words. He'd hear pure sonic for the next few words. He'd hit this bouncer, and then he'd hit the listen command, and then he'd have sonic for a few words, and then the sonic would disappear.

People can become totally obedient to this type of phraseology. An old-time Dianetic auditor knows this very well. There's nothing – not much mysterious about this, but people who have – later on the line, have never had too much experience with this particular type of phraseology and so forth. So when I tell you that all modifiers found so far were denyers at
the same time, you'll realize why the pc's intelligence doesn't go on over into them. They're all a "It isn't here." See, they're all a "Doesn't exist."

"But you couldn't have any money anyway," you see? "But you couldn't have" – that is one. "But you couldn't have any money anyway; they would take it all away from you."

Well, of course, the pc states the goal. And then there's the rest of this thing over here. If it occurred in an engram, that would be the way it is. Occurring as a goal, he runs along and he says, "Well, the goal is to rob banks."

And you say, "That's fine." You assess it. You go find a terminal for it and everything else. Well, "To rob banks," but there's a little more to the goal, and it's a denyer.

"But you couldn't have any money, and they would take it all away anyway." See, so that end of the goal disappears. That's a disappeared end of the goal. Now, actually it doesn't take any real skill to get these modifiers once you've got the goal. The skill is to get the goal. The goal is what is important here.

But as you get to step 4, you ask the person to make a list of modifiers. Maybe there'll only be ten of them. Maybe there'll only be one. Maybe they'll come up with the first one, bang! And so on. But they get maybe eight, ten of these modifiers.

They've got a goal: "To play a violin." And you find that all assessed out. It proved out just the way you've been doing it. Now, when you come to step 4 here, you say, "All right. Now, what would make that goal difficult to achieve? What would be the consequences of achieving it? What would make it impossible to realize that goal?" And write down anything the pc says and make a list of these. And that list – you don't write down "To play a violin and - " so forth. You just write down "and" and the remaining tail, you see. Just write down the tail. Don't keep chugging the goal down his throat because you'll never be able to assess the modifier if the goal is in as part of it.

You've got to assess the modifier – the tail of the cat has got to be assessed all by itself. You keep saying the goal each time, and of course you're going to get – the thing will stay alive and you'll never find the modifier because the goal, of course, and the modifier react alike. You've got to assess the modifier as itself.

"To play a violin." And you've got that now. You've got it all proved out. Everything is fine. Now, you're going to come back to step 4, and you're going to ask him, "Well, what makes it difficult to do that? What would make it impossible to do that? What would be the consequences of playing a violin, and so forth?"

And every time he says something that this would be, you write it down on this list. And of course the pc actually is much more likely, if you've got the actual goal, to give it to you. Just bang! you see. And it's just a matter of whether or not it's an "of" or an "as" or just some little wording change.

So you write it down every way that the pc tells you, and you've got this list of tails of the cat and their modifiers. And now you turn around and assess those, and you assess those by elimination just exactly as you assessed the goal. But don't call the goal off every time
while you're eliminating them. Because, of course, none of them will ever eliminate if you keep calling the goal. You just want the tail.

All right. And you finally find out "to play a violin, but all the strings are missing." You know, the pc's intelligence never gets on to that type of a phraseology because it's missing. There's no way you can get to it, the pc will tell you. You're liable to get into arguments with the pc, but he says, "But there isn't any more of it. There isn't any more to the goal, you see."

And then eventually he'll say, "Well, it – well, it does seem there's something missing here. Oh, I see what it is. Oh, well, yeah. Well, it's 'to play a violin but all the strings are missing.'"

Well, that's the modifier: "All the strings are missing." And you write down "All the strings are missing." And then you say, "Well, is any other thing that'd modify and keep you from doing this?"

"Well, 'the instrument is gone.' That might be it. 'The strings are gone.' Or 'to play a violin that doesn't have any strings on it.'"

All right. You write down "doesn't have any strings on it." You see, you write down any way he phrases this thing. All right. You get a dozen of these things or whatever it is.

You ask him if there are any more modifications than he has given you. You get no knock on the meter. You get no knock on the thing You've got the modifier list.

Now, you simply go down this modifier list, one, two, three, four, five, six. Just do it by elimination. Just read them off to the pc the same way you assess goals, and you'll find that one is left alive, and that is it.

Now, having done that, you combine the goal and modifier. And you write that down. You combine the goal and modifier. That's step 6 here. And you combine the goal and modifier as the question for the terminal, but it's "to play a violin but all the strings are missing." And that was what proved out.

Now, you want to know "Who or what would play a violin with all the strings missing?" [laughter] Now, this is very tricky stuff you've got with this sort of thing. Because it gives you a different Terminals Assessment than a plain Routine 3 Assessment. It gives you a realer, completely real, terminal to the pc which scoops up, if you've done it right, all of his hidden standards at the same time. That's what I've been gunning for.

Now, it is true that the terminal the pc has been running – which was "to play a violin," and you have assessed out "virtuoso," and "virtuoso" did prove out. There's no doubt about it. And you've been running "virtuoso."

And "virtuoso" has been running, and it runs hard, and the pc goes vague on it, and there's sort of circuitry stays in, but the pc goes through it, and you're winning, and so forth. Well, there are many explanations for this, and I don't particularly care to be nailed down on the exact explanation, but I would say that you had, offhand, a more general terminal, or you had a terminal too early on the track to as-is easily, or something of this sort. You've got something else. It is on the goals terminal line, there's no doubt about that!
But you probably have the original form, or you've got something there. And the earlier you go on the track – you might know this rule – the earlier you go on the track, the tougher the energy masses are, so you get a rougher run. And you've been running "virtuoso" very nicely, but "to play a violin with all the strings gone" ... And of course you assess, "Who or what would play a violin with all the strings gone?" and of course we get something of the order of "a circus clown."

And then you assess it, "circuit," "clowns," "clown," well, it's "a clown." And you've got it. It's "a clown." Well, maybe it's a very decayed form of the terminal you were running originally, but it runs like a bomb because it's very close to the pc's reality, and it's very close to his circuits. So it runs more easily. And you'll find out it integrates more easily to the pc.

I'm not trying to tell you that Routine 3 terminals are wrong. If they are, hang me but it doesn't matter. All I'm trying to tell you is that they are apparently very resistive. They are quite hard to run and the pc bucks into them and he goes through big energy masses. And most of this to me is the symptom of trying to run too damn early on the track. Trying to run into the whole problem all at once.

Because look, if he had this goal for a while, and the goal was actually a pure goal, you, of course, would get a different kind of a terminal for the pure goal than the goal modified, you see. Now, you've got a different kind of a terminal. You may have a kind of a degraded type of terminal. You may have a different terminal anyway. It'll make different sense to the pc. And it actually assesses faster, and you will get a faster Terminals Assessment with it.

So you take the goal modifier – you say, "All right. Who or what would play a violin with the strings gone?"

Well, obviously, you could have got hundreds and hundreds of terminals for "Who would play a violin?" but you don't get too many for "Who would play a violin with all the strings gone?" "An idiot. Uh – a clown. Uh – a party cutup. Um – a fake." You see, a few things like that because it's so restricted. And you get a much shorter list. And it assesses rather easily.

So now you make up your terminals list combining the goal and modifier as the question "Who or what would (goal plus modifier)?" "Who or what would play a violin with all the strings gone?" And you make a nice list of these, and then – just exactly the way you've handled any other Terminals Assessment – you do this one now by elimination, and you'll wind up at the other end with a terminal, which is the only terminal in the lot that would react on the meter.

Now, you, of course – there are several things you could do. Now, we get in, because we accumulated more technology, we were doing it the hard way, we accumulated a lot of technology to do it the hard way, you could do several things. You could address it to groups with this group type of command. You could address it to – you could simply date it on the time track and find a prior confusion to it and do a Sec Check on it, and you'd probably blow the whole goal terminal mess.

You know, "When's the first time you ever ran into a clown?"
"Oh, well, that's different. The first time I ever ran into a clown – yeah, who was trying to play a violin with all the strings gone. Oh, oh, oh, well, you mean that, that type of clown. Well, all right. Let's see. That particular type of clown, well..."

And you could probably date the thing and you could find an earlier area of confusion and so forth. You see, a door opens there. You get easier processes. Or you could run the terminal on a Sec Check sort of business, or fool around with that. Or you could find out how you wouldn't make the terminal guilty and how the terminal wouldn't dare make you guilty, a negative-guilt run. I can just think of dozens of ways to handle this exact situation. Why? Because it handles exactly as a present time problem handles.

You're now getting rid of goals and terminals with the modifier in there – you're getting rid of them on the same basis that you would get rid of a present time problem. So how many ways are there to handle present time problems. Well, it'd be that many ways to handle a goals terminal. It all becomes – should become at that moment very comprehensible to you.

You know that a present time problem is rough to handle. You know that it's sometimes very difficult to get rid of them. You know very often that they blow very easily. You know several processes that get rid of present time problems. They don't dismay you. You know that they take a little bit of monkeying with sometimes and it takes some two-way comm and so on. So don't be surprised if any of these things went. Don't be surprised if any of these things blew the goals terminal, see. So there's no reason for me to say didactically there's only one way to do this. No. We have just opened a wooden door and found that an iron door was there. And then we opened the iron door, and we're on our way, you see. There are many ways to do this.

Now, the proven way to do this is to assess on the Prehav Scale, get a five-way bracket and do a run. And that is a proven way to do that. So that is the way we will say you had better do at the moment. Because it shouldn't be too long a run. It shouldn't be as difficult a run as you've been doing.

All right. I just wanted to make it plain to you that there are other ways that you could handle the same situation because I think now you can understand what a goal is and what – how goal stands in space, and then, therefore, what a goals terminal is.

A goals terminal is something that epitomizes both the goal and the resistive modifier. That would be the goals terminal you're looking for. It's the thing that epitomizes both of these things in one terminal.

Now, we admit that at one time or another one terminal had the goal and another terminal had the modifier and that there was a collision someplace along the two, and so forth.

We admit that there – you could dream up all sorts of anatomy to all this, but where the pc is concerned, he never as-ises postulates which aren't his own. And we must consider that neither the goal nor the modifier are the pc's if they're still in suspense. They must belong to a terminal, ha-ha. You see that?

Actually, it's just the goal has been hanging out like a little, tiny red flag showing what the terminal was. Now, when we get the modifier, this really puts an enfilade fire on what the terminal is.
In other words, we got two tags on the terminal now. So we can get a more finite, squarely placed type of terminal. And admittedly, the terminal may be later on the track. Admittedly, the terminal may not take care of the entirety of the entire entire. But it'll certainly unbalance the goals terminal modifier – pardon me, the goals and modifier situation. That'll certainly become unbalanced. And as fast as it does, you can expect a blow of that goals modifier situation. And as soon as that situation is gone, you of course are in the position of being able to do another complete Routine 3A. As soon as you can't get a knock on the goal, you can't get any reaction out of a terminal anymore, and you can't get any reaction out of a goal anymore and you can't get any reaction on a modifier anymore, that's it. You test all those things.

Now, how you do a repeat on this thing might prove a little more complicated than Routine 3 because you got to check the modifier and then check the goal. And then check the modifier and then check the goal again, before you give it all up. Because you could be fooled if you didn't.

You check the modifier. Now, the person has blown the terminal but still has the idea. You check the idea and the person looks at the idea and that idea sort of surges. You see, you look at the goal, let us say, and you get a surge on the goal. Now, the goal has surged, so you say, "Well, it's still alive, so we'd better do something else." No, no. It's not. It may not be at all.

You check the goal, then check the modifier, and we get a bang, bang, surge on the modifier. Now, we go back and check the goal, and we find it isn't there. Then we go back and try the modifier, and we find it isn't there. Because they will still stay hung up, and you've got to check both sides a couple of times to get them separated. The pc may still hang onto the idea after the terminal has gone.

You see, the pc's been living this life for a long time. But if you checked it off that way and thereafter couldn't get the goal to react and couldn't get the modifier to react, and then couldn't get the goal to react, and couldn't get the modifier to react; you get all of your rudiments in. You get all these terminals that you had. You check over all these terminals the pc also gave you. Make sure you got all that old terminals list straight. Then we'd better get all the rudiments in like mad and we'd better check that goal again. We'd better check that modifier again. We can't get any tick out of them. We can't get any tick out of any of the rudiments. Then you go into a new Routine 3A. You got it? And you just go right down from the beginning again.

Of course, you use the pc's old list, the first goals list the pc gave you. This has to be assessed again. You will now find that some of those are alive. You naturally add to it anything. But you do the same thing you did, see. But instead of having pc write a goals list, your next run on this is take the pc's original goals list and anything that you added to it in assessing it. And then you add various types of goals to the list – you know, new goals. And then you assess the whole list locating a goal by elimination. And then you go into it again. You ask for modifiers to that particular goal.

Now, when you've found the modifier for that goal, then you get a list of terminals for the goal and modifier. You assess the list of terminals, and here we go again. But I don't think
you're going to be able to do that very much. I think after you get the first one, two or three, all of a sudden you're going to start getting blow, blow. And you'll find the goal and you'll get the modifier and it unsettles the two. And you never get to a Terminals Assessment. And you go boom, boom. And there you're left with empty hands again. And you keep on blowing these things, and I think you'll eventually blow most of the pc's goals list.

I think every one of them had a modifier. Tiny one that was overridden by the fixation of attention on the goal, don't you see. But once the goal is gone, these other ones start getting a little bit live, too.

Now, that's the way you would tackle this picture, and that's Routine 3A.

Now, you get – let's take a case now that has been run with a goal. And let's say that goal was "to be a willow wand." Let's look over here, and we find that some cases will have just a modifier and we will have gotten the modifier before we got the goal. Now, I'm just only prepared to find that. I haven't found it, but I would be prepared to find it.

The person has come up on the goals list with a modifier. And you've got a pc sitting there who has a modifier. Now, you have to find the goal. But the goal will be right adjacent to the modifier and probably be in front of the modifier and not – instead of behind the goal. Let's say somebody has one – well, let's put something fairly factual: "To leave all hospitals alone." And we've gotten this as a goal. And it checked out on the goals list. And that's what we have: "To leave all hospitals alone."

Well, hey! You know, that really sounds like a modifier, doesn't it. So what's on the beginning of this thing? That's what we want to know now. We'd come over and we'd say, "All right. Well, what would you want to be doing which would be modified by leaving all hospitals alone and so forth? What would be the front end of this thing?" I think you'd probably come up with the terminal or some terminal that the pc has already given you. You got the idea?

It possibly is – let's say the terminal was "a willow wand" and "to leave all hospitals alone." Okay? "Leave all hospitals alone," and you want the goal. Well, the pc assessed out on a terminal, "a willow wand." Well, it may be something on the order – you just ask the pc about it and sort it out.

"Who would want to leave all hospitals alone? Why or whatever – what other goal would a person have? What goal would this modifier modify?" You know, ask him any type of question which is just straight on. Explain to them anything that you want to explain to them, but try to get the front end of this thing, and you possibly will find it's "to be a willow wand and leave hospitals entirely alone."

Now, your terminals list is no longer the pc's terminals list. It's going to be different. And you say, all right. "Now, who or what would want to be a willow wand and want to leave all hospitals strictly alone?" And it doesn't make any sense to you, but it'll make sense to the pc. They've been living with it for trillennia.

Now, you'll get a very finite terminal. You get a very sharply defined terminal. It'll be distinctly different and well within the pc's reality of the situation. You should – that's what you should do.
Now, I don't know that that has happened. And I haven't any case histories of that happening at all. I am just prepared for it to have been done. I'm just saying, well, there's a possibility here that after you've done – I mean, in the future not just in the past. And you've worked and slaved, and you've sweated away, and you've gotten your goals list, and your goals list "to always jump out of second story windows." All right. Take it as a goal. And write it down. But remember, it's probably the modifier.

Now, just how you get around to that other end of it will be proved out in time, if we have to face this problem. I'm just facing the problem before we come to it.

And you say, "Well, what else – what else would this goal consist of?" No reason to work hard at it. The pc very well might give you something idiotically simple like "Well! Well, to burn down houses, of course."

And you say, "Well, what would that consist of?"

"Well, to burn down houses and always jump out of the second story window." "Didn't I tell you before?" is liable to be sort of the idea behind all this.

Now, these goals that are total occluders like "and never find out about anything." If you had a goal like that, "Never find out – to never find out about anything." It sounds to me like they were – they wanted to or wanted to be or wanted to have, you know, and never find out about anything. See, that's the whole goals modifier situation. So these things could be found backwards as well as forwards.

As I say, I don't know of these conditions. I've no experience with that at this particular time, but there's a provision for it.

All right. Now, how about the terminal that you are running on the pc right now? Will it do any harm whatsoever to leave it unflat? I don't know of any harm it'd do to leave it unflat because certainly the horribleness of this situation is this: is, that which is unknown to the pc, he tends to dramatize, he tends to be aberrated about. That which is unknown to him and is close to him and influencing him, he tends to be aberrated about. All right. What about this?

Well, if you've got a terminal on the pc and it's "to collect gold bricks," and we audit this pc, and the pc says, "Well, I'm very sad, and it makes me very apathetic" – and we go on auditing the pc and gradually they climb out of this, but every once in a while he mentioned being apathetic about it and they're not quite happy about this and so on – when we get the modifier, we are very likely to find out "and to act apathetic enough so nobody will find out I have them." See, "to collect gold bricks and to act apathetic enough so that nobody will find out I have them," see. That's the modifier.

Yeah, but by having the goal, you've been kicking the goal, kicking the goal, kicking the goal and of course it's restimulating the modifier all the time. So the pc is acting like he doesn't have any engrams, acting like he doesn't have any bank, acting like he doesn't have any anything, don't you see, apathetically. It's all part of the modifier situation. Interesting, huh?
Well now, I think possibly some goals have been found which are the goal and modifier. I think this condition already possibly exists. "To be a willow wand and have everything go crazy." That's obviously a goal-plus-modifier situation.

There's numerous conditions of this, but if you just get down the basic anatomy of it, you're all set. You've got to find a goal. See, you've got to find a goal and that's just routinely. And then, having found the goal, you've got to find the modifier. Or if while doing the goal you got only a modifier and it was only the modifier available, now you've got to find the rest of it which is the goal. You've got to get this package.

And then you've got to get the terminal that fits both. Your pc may have a struggle giving you one that fits both or he may not. But the terminal that fits the both of them, of course, is giving you seven-league boots in the direction of clearing because it's got both sides of the problem. And it's got the individual who epitomizes both sides of these things and you should be able to roll along with it rather well, rather easily. It should be a faster run, in other words. You haven't lost any ground, particularly. You've just won some ground here in this particular wise.

Now, we take – what I want you to do if you have found – if your pc has a goal, well, just enter in here – you've already got the goal proven out – I don't care if they have a terminal and it's been run or anything else – just enter in here at step 4, take that goal, compile a list of modifiers, and go right on down the remaining steps of Routine 3A. You'll find you'll shortcut this situation.

There is the rest of the package is what you've got to find. Instead of running off one-half of this thing to unsettle the goals-modifier situation ... You see, actually, it would unsettle if you just ran off half of the problem. It's a longer run. Let's find the one that unsettles both sides of the thing simultaneously and is contained in one person. And I think you'll find in that all of circuitry the pc's been packing around and all of the hidden standards and anything else will probably be combined in these things.

This is not very hard to do. This is not very hard to do. It shouldn't take you very long. I'll go over it once more. I just – you know what the pc's goal is, and just say, "Well, what would make that goal difficult to attain?" "What would make it impossible?" "What would be the consequences of attaining it?" Any such question as that, or if somebody's heard this lecture, say, "Well, what's the modifier to your goal?" It's as elementary as this, you know.

And then you make a whole list of these things, you see. And when you've got your list done, just assess 'em by elimination. Then you find yourself with your goals – goal plus modifier. And now that whole thing, by the way, will react. It'll react very nicely. You never saw a goal react as nicely as when it's combined with a modifier. Bang! Bang!

All right. Now, take that goal plus modifier and ask for a terminals list: "Who or what would want to be a willow wand and jump out of second story windows? And, you know, who would want to play a violin without any strings? What would? What would play a violin without any strings?" and so forth. And he'd give you a very short list. Doesn't matter whether the list is short or long, the idea is just to get a complete list.
Well, you shake that list down. You shake, of course, the modifier list down. You say, "Well, are there any more modifiers?" You get no reaction on the E-Meter. Similarly, when you've got your terminals, you say, "Well, are there any more terminals that you can think of now?" Well, that's blank.

All right. Do your Assessment by Elimination. Get your rudiments in, of course, frequently and routinely if you want to do a smooth, fast job of it. Do your Assessment by Eliminations, and you'll wind up with his terminal.

As soon as you've got that terminal, the easiest way to handle a terminal and the one that you understand best is to assess it on the Prehav Scale and you will find that there it sits, and put a five-way bracket together or something on that thing and just run it. And it's simple. There's not too much to that.

It requires auditing skill, however, to do this. This is what fools the untrained, relatively, or partially trained auditor. Everything I have told you sounds very simple. And it is very simple. But that is the trouble with it. So many things can be added to it, so many complications. And what people always neglect -- and they won't admit this about themselves -- is good auditing requires a superb auditor.

You have to have good auditing skill -- just the mechanics of auditing have to be excellent -- in order to audit. And you can't do one of these things with a halfway-through-HPA mechanics of auditing. That's all.

I mean, your pc is too far out. Your rudiments are too far out. You're juggling with the E-Meter in one hand and something else in the other hand and trying to smoke a cigarette at the same time with your feet on this window sill. And just somehow or another you just can't seem to get anything to work so you eventually -- and you say, "Well, it's perfectly all right." Don't know the Auditor's Code, you see. You say, "It's perfectly all right. I know what this person's modifier is. I know what it is already," and evaluate for it and say, "Well, it's actually 'a husband.' That's what I ought to be running. Assess for a husband, you see, and just kind of pick out the level at random and put it in the command and run it all."

Yeah, obviously the person has done Routine 3A, only there's no visible result. It's all mysterious. It takes weeks and weeks and weeks to do the Terminal Assessment. They just can't seem to get a terminal, or the terminal they got -- you get ahold of a sheet they did the terminal on, it hasn't got any marks on it. You say, "Well, what is this? What is it?"

And they say, "Well, that's the terminal list."

"Well, what did you do with it?"

"Well, we picked out the best terminal, of course." [laughter]

It's the complications that foul this up, but basically, as a hidden background to all of this type of activity, is superb auditing skill. It is good auditing presence. It's being able to hold a pc in-session.

Why so particularly with this? See? I mean, you can go halfway through an HPA Course and give a Security Check and miss a question, the guy's upset for a couple of days,
and somebody else gets the question and straightens it out, and so forth. And everybody lives, you see. And it's all all right. But what makes this so peculiar?

Well, in the first place – I've been asking this question, you see, myself from the first time it happened that Peter – who I just got through training in running a course in South Africa, and he got well trained running that course and he did very well and the students did well and Peter goes home to Australia and he has a six-weeks course – I think it was during the first week we had nearly all the goals and terminals. We were very upset because there were two or three students that didn't have any goal or terminal at the beginning of the second or third week down in South Africa, wasn't it? Oh, we were quite peeved. And he goes through six weeks, and I don't think he had enough goals and terminals to put in your eye. He had three or four. He made two Clears on a particular unit which was very well done. But he didn't get any goals and he didn't get any terminals worth a nickel.

And it's worried him sick. He says, "Why does everybody take forever to do it?"

And I was sitting down here at the beginning of this summer and so forth and everybody was having such an awful time doing it. Relatively skilled auditors. So we started shaping up auditing skill. That's what we started working on – the smoothness and the skill of the auditor and sure enough, when I finally got down to it just relatively a month or two ago (a couple of months ago) I said – you remember how discourteous I was – I said, "Well, you're in a games condition with the pc, and you just haven't got the rudiments in, and that's all there is to it and find them." Remember? Everybody all of a sudden busily got the rudiments in and bang-bang-bang, everybody had their goals and terminals. Remember?

It's a crime now if at the end of two weeks of two-and-a-half-hour-a-day auditing when we haven't got somebody's goal and terminal; it just seems to be very, very peculiar. And we begin to think of the case as peculiar and we wonder what the auditor is doing, really. And so on. Lots of questions get asked. Well, what is that basically? That's twenty-five hours of auditing.

If it's gone twenty-five hours without this result, why, "What? Oh, don't tell me that case hasn't got his goal and terminal yet. Hey, wait a minute. What's this?" And it's just all based on this one thing: Superb auditing skill. That is all.

Why? All summer long I wanted to know this burning three letter word why. It's because every time you ask for a goal, the modifier restimulates and the modifier is usually a disability. It's as silly as that. So you're walking uphill the whole distance that you're doing a Goals Assessment. But, of course, it becomes dead easy after you've got the goal and the modifier because you're no longer kicking against the modifier.

Let's say we're looking for this goal. Now, we don't know what the goal is. We have a list of two hundred goals and we don't know what the goal is. But beforehand, before we find out what the goal is, let us take a future peek with a crystal ball, and we find the goal is "to be a lute player and hate everyone horribly."

Well, that's fine. Now, we're looking down here, and we finally get down... We've gone across "lute player" every time we turn around and we go three or four goals further than
"lute player," and we found that the rudiments all out. Why? Well, the pc is hating everyone horribly.

Now, we don't know that the pc has got this as a goal and we didn't even know the modifier was there. So as we come down the dress parade, see, we keep crossing this. And every time we hit the goal, we restimulate the modifier. So the pc goes out of session.

Now, in view of the fact that all the other goals on the list have modifiers, too, look at the potpourri which finally finishes up here. Oh, we find this pc ARC breaks with the greatest of ease and we finally find out that we have dug up a goal which says "to be a lute player and hate everybody horribly," and we had "to hate everybody horribly" in full restim the entirety of the Goals Assessment, right down to the time when we got it as a modifier. It's right there.

And you have to be good enough as an auditor and smooth enough as an auditor that this thing never has a ripple to get moving on. It's got to be done perfectly. And when it's done perfectly, it never, of course, knocks. And if it does, you put it straight back in place. And you get down to the end of the list with perfect auditing, of course, you found the person's goal and terminal rather easily.

Ah, but let's look at somebody else someplace who is not that well trained. Every time they drop the command, drop the ball, drop the E-Meter, let the cigarette go out and so forth, and make noises as they remove and take off and put on their shoes, you see, during the auditing session, and some things like this, and just miss, miss here and there, you know, like – well, miss clearing the command and miss starting the session, and, you know, few misses of that character. And what happens?

The pc goes dus-duz-uzz-uzz, you know? Because remember, even though you don't know it, you haven't pushed the pc into this valence. The pc was sitting in this valence all the time from the moment he walked in and got his first auditing. He is solidly in the valence. And the closer you get to the valence, of course, the less he is in it, but until you've got the whole thing, you're living right on a borderline. You see, you're not in it, you're in it and so forth. And if there's a hidden part of it that you're never mentioning, that thing will just start going alive like a small volcano.

And anything you do which crosses the goals-terminal-line mores throws the thing into full panoply. So here we go. And we find him hating you horribly. He doesn't know why.

"Never, never find anything anyplace." Well, of course, this makes a tough, tough assessment. But what do you know? You can actually assess across such a level. You can actually assess across such a modifier.

Now, let's say we had a modifier like "and never to let anyone come close to me, ever." Oh, man, think of what that would do. You'd do a sort of a detour around the goal every time. You'd get down toward the goal – now that it's position is known by the pc reactively – you get down toward the goal. The second that you got on the goal, you'd get an ARC break just before you got to the goal. Or you'd get something going here, and you'd never – the pc'd never be reached. He would have made his modifier. It isn't his goal. It's his modifier.

So you finally get the goal, but the modifier is still there, so the pc is therefore hard to audit. So I can get you to look forward to some much easier auditing. It isn't so difficult to get
the terminal or hold the pc into a Prehav level run if you've got the modifier. That becomes very easy auditing.

Why? Because the fangs are gone out of the situation. You're just auditing both sides of it. The pc knows full well it's "to hate everybody, horribly." And he'll even make a wisecrack at you. You'd better not make a wisecrack at the pc. [laughter] The pc can always make a wisecrack about his own ... There's a little rule in this that's almost a technical fact. The pc can always joke about his own goal or terminal, but you'd better not. [laughter] You get some of the sourest looks. It's quite amusing.

But anyway, there was the trickiness back of it all. But this doesn't say that it requires less trickiness in the future. It requires the same amount or better auditing to get that goal. Particularly if the pc knows you're now going to pull his modifier, and the pc is liable to sit there saying, "Well, let's see. Oh, that's my goal, huh? To be a lute player. Well, that's pretty good. I wonder what the modifier is. Hm, do you suppose it's so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so? I hate everybody horribly." Pc is kind of doing a self-audit on it, you know. And you've got to hold him in line and get it anyhow.

So it might be a little tougher to get the goal than it was before on somebody that's aware of this. And it might not be. But some of you are going to laugh madly about the final modifier that appears after your goal because this is the craziest thing anybody ever heard of. It'll be something that makes it just – it's just the complete volte-vis. There you were minding your own business and all you wanted to do was play the violin and so forth. And yet there's this whole long tail on this kite – particularly hit people over the heads with it or something like this, you see. Or "to play a violin so that I will never under God's green earth become God." Oh, that kind of thing, you see.

It's "so I will never become," "so I will not have," "so it will not happen." These are all deniers. Now, the mechanics, the basic mechanics of this, are pretty easy to see. You don't have to say that these things were implanted into the pc. You don't have to say they were. You don't have to figure it out this way – or that the pc implanted it into somebody else.

The pc will immediately realize that this makes quite a game. But in the past, when you started to run the game out, you were running up against the modifier. And the first few levels of the Prehav Scale would find a pc pretty – feeling pretty bad because the modifier was in and it wasn't as-ising.

But the games condition involved with it gives us a great understanding of it. The pc has a goal "to build" or "make violins," let us say. Well, what do you think happens in the course of existence? The person goes on for millennia and he's a good violin maker and he's going to make violins. What do you think'll eventually happen? He'll eventually, certainly, pick up a packaged counter-postulate, won't he? Thetans being thetans.

For instance, we're building a beautiful fireplace out here. People have been coming by making the wildest cracks about that sort of thing. You've got to be awfully careful because it – the estate bricklayer is about to drop a brick or two on their heads, you see. But it's a perfectly nice fireplace. Very effective and so forth. It hasn't got any of its trim or anything, so it merely looks massive. But they can't see something like this happening as a forward goal without adding a counter-postulate. You got the idea? They just can't do it. They're in a games
condition with life, and any degree whatsoever, why, somebody says, "I would like to teach cats to race." Somebody – the least somebody's liable to say is, "Well, it's been tried," or "I don't think it'd be easy to do that." And if you had a mother or a father who was particularly in a games condition with life, everything you said got something of this order, don't you see?

So your overt, of course, is that you've been doing it, too. And one gets into this sort of thing – somebody has an ambition to shoot your head off, you're liable to get a counter-postulate on the subject. And you're liable to say, "No, you shouldn't have such a goal." And you're liable to dream this up in such a way, "Well, only madmen have goals of that character."

And eventually you could see that the person would wind up with a goal something on this order: "To shoot everybody's head off, even though only madmen do it." You see, he'd get the same combo. He'd get – the goal and the modifier would get united to some degree.

Well, that's all well and good, and that would apparently work out all right, but there's this other piece of nonsense connected with this thing. One must have overt on the person who has the goal and modifier. See, it's the other person that has done that, and the overt of the pc are against the person who has the goal and modifier. It's very complicated, isn't it. Somebody else has to have the goal and modifier. Otherwise, if they were the pc's terminals, they would have as-ised. I mean, if they were the pc's ideas or postulates, they would have as-ised right now. But they haven't; they're still stuck there. So the other way of sticking them is to have them in a terminal.

And you get the goal plus modifier in a terminal which doesn't have the postulates that the pc has, see? So the postulates, goal plus modifier, belong to a terminal, and now the pc is against the terminal. And that's the way you get that out. The pc's overt and other rambunctiousness against this terminal and the overwhelmingness of the terminal toward the pc, eventually winds the pc up in this terminal which has this goal and modifier.

We can see how the goal and modifier got together. That's very easy to see. But how did they get perpetuated to this degree so they never got as-ised; well, you put them in a valence, see, and you had nothing to do with the ideas of the valence and of course, they didn't as-is. That's about all there is to the mechanics of the situation. It's not actually a very difficult, mechanical situation. It's more humorous than not, because once you start looking over the modifiers which are actually on the ends of the purest of goals – why, this goal is the purest, sweetest goal you ever saw. You could just hear Brahms playing in the distance, you see. It's just marvelous, but it winds up with something like "and never tolerate anyone if I can kill them first," you know. See, or something weird like this, you see.

"To benefit all children – " I just leave it up in the air. [laughter] What you can count on is that it will be a denyer – there'll be a denyer about it. It'll be something missing about it all. The thing will be worded in such a way as to say it isn't there. And that it will modify the living daylight out of it and it'll give you an entirely different, more finite real terminal picture which is very central to the pc's immediate case and worries.

All this is pretty easy. Do you find anything difficult about it? HCO Bulletin of November 7, 1961 covers all of this data. I've been going over it with you because I want you to
do it now. As soon as you audit your pc again, I want you to perform those actions just like that.

Now, you can go ahead and get these things checked out and go through them as before and so on because they're relatively easy to check out. You think you can do this all right? This thing – this thing looks pretty simple. All right. Might not look simple to you. Does it look simple?

*Audience: Yes.*

All right.

You can see that a funny thing has happened here is: the front end stays as hard or even harder and all of a sudden the routine gets much easier down toward the end. Well, let me say that this thing only works when accompanied by Security Checks.

I was rather interested in a very well known auditor who won't come near anybody for any training. Hasn't for years and years and years and years and years. And he was insisting somebody find his goal and terminal for him. But he wouldn't have it done if he were going to get a Security Check, too. And somebody has actually consented to do a Goals Terminals Assessment on that person on those conditions. I imagine the tail end of that goal is "to get help and kill myself in the process," because he actually would know better than to do something like that – even him. But I think that's quite amusing. So a Security Check must go along with Routine 3A, and you'll find the most fruitful Security Check that you can run on a pc – it requires a bit of an imagination and skill – is to do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc. We've been doing this – you've been getting this in your auditor's report notes and so forth, and I've not said too fabulous much about it. But if you can get a Dynamic Assessment and get the dynamic that is out and then compartment the dynamic – I gave you a lecture on it but I'm just saying you do this off the cuff. You don't need a lot of paraphernalia. And sec check that dynamic smartly on the pc, you actually will pull what the pc considers withholds. You will pull those much more strongly.

And I'd like to add one more note. This is almost enough discoveries for one lecture, wouldn't you say offhand? The Earth shakes when you look at something like this. I actually – I feel a little bit contrite about suddenly giving you a steer to this degree. It was quite startling to me that a piece of the jigsaw puzzle was sitting right there. There was a missing piece of the puzzle right there that was making it much harder and it was making it much longer and much more arduous. Yeah, you can do it by running out one side only, but it is evidently much harder.

Now, there's another piece of the puzzle. That's enough, and I should say nothing more about it, but I can't forbear, as long as I brought up Security Checking, to give you an interesting little discovery on the subject of Security Checking.

The person who will not – I found this out the other evening – a person who will not admit to overt or withholds or react on overt or withholds, will react on a direct not-know question. You know, they don't consider it an overt, really, and they don't consider they have a withhold and the sec check question would be clear, otherwise, will apparently react on a whole channel, particularly on another person with a not-know question.
But it's a simple one. Not the original not-know version that came out two or three months ago, but a very simple version such as – well, let's say we're security checking an employee, and we'd simply say, "Well, what doesn't your boss know?"

Now, you could have said, "What have you done to your boss? What have you withheld from your boss?" and you wouldn't have gotten any reaction on the needle.

But if you say, "What doesn't your boss know?" Or "What have you done that your boss doesn't know about?" You get needle response. That's quite interesting. That's an interesting thing to know. Just this little piece of stuff.

As you go down the line, you'll very often find this girl. She's been very unhappily married for years, or find this guy and he's been having an awful hard time, and you say, "Well, what have you done to your wife?"

And he says, "Nothing." He's never done anything to her? "Well, what have you withheld from her?"

"Nothing. Never withheld anything from her."

And I can put this little slingshot in your hands which is "Well, what doesn't your wife know?" BOOM! Evidently it isn't a crime, but it's an awful reaction because it's a basic disagreement. You're asking for the most fundamental disagreement there is – the reason the trick works. He knows something she doesn't know. And, of course, that's the most fundamental disagreement there is. And of course you're asking right at the center of overt and withhold. And after you've got these off, don't be surprised if he explains it all to you that these are overt and that these are withholds, and you do now get reactions on overt and withhold. Never considered them overt and withhold. Never considered them overt before. But now, after you've stripped this one little question off – just "What doesn't (blank) know?" is the clue to all of this. That's the wording that goes into it.

You're liable to get all sorts of ramifications to the whole thing, but they will eventually come down to needle reaction on it. It's a good thing to know, good thing to use.

All right. Finishing off this data on Routine 3A, who is to use Routine 3A. Well, I would say anybody who has been thoroughly trained at Saint Hill can use Routine 3A. Who else can use Routine 3A? Nobody. Is that plain enough? I think we'd save an enormous number of casualties by just laying it down right there. And of course, having laid that down and having publicized it broadly and so forth, just look at the people you could make guilty when they come limping in and saying, "Well, I went around to Glutz up in Chicago. And they get your bulletins regularly. They're sent in to them by the AMA [laughter] and so on. And they found my goal and terminal all right, and ran me on it. And then ever since that time I've had this – this – this odd – this odd leaping sensation, and so forth." Well, at that time, remember you at least have the solace of being able to make them guilty also, and say, "Well, why didn't you get the cotton out of your ears the time you were told nobody was supposed to use this except certain definitely trained auditors?"

Okay? Well, it's all yours. Go ahead. I'm not going to – probably tonight, aside from one or two, I'm not going to do too much with your reports. I'm going to be very interested in tomorrow night when you've had a crack at all this. Okay?
Female voice: Thank you.
All right. Well, it's all yours.
Thank you very much.
CHECKING CASE REPORTS

A lecture given on 8 November 1961

Now, this is what? The 8th of Nov. 61.

Yeah. A hundred years ago, man and boy, I was just getting out of VMI and joining the Confederate army as a young, dashing second lieutenant. Well, times change! [laughter] Now, we are hitting a beachhead of a different character.

Okay, 8 November 61, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And you have never seen me do any of your case reports of one kind or another. And I'm going to go over these case reports. And that's going to step on some of your toes, and that's going to let your pc in on what I think of you as the auditor, and that's probably going to upset the pc because he will say in tomorrow's session, "Well, Ron said ..." [laughter]

But I think it might be a little bit educational to you if you saw how this was done and so I made up my mind that I had better make a lecture on this particular subject at this time. All right?

Okay. Now, usually these things have a Sec Check in them, but the Sec Checks have already been marked and so we're not going to do any Sec Checks because tonight's Sec Check has not yet been done. We are just going to do the daytime auditing.

And this is Routine 3A is what is being embarked upon here and we've got a Routine 3A started on many people whose goals have already been found but who have to yet have the modifier found which may mean some variation or change in terminal, but not necessarily.

Sometimes you get the modifier and you get the same terminal and sometimes you don't. But let's take up some of these reports and see what happened today.

Now, this is a report here, Fred Fairchild auditing Carl Wilson, and he says that, "This modifier was not checked out and the auditor didn't see the notice. And should it be checked straightaway. And pc's attention will now be on terminal."

Well, that all depends on whether or not it is the modifier. And as far as checking out is concerned, it's always a pretty good idea to get somebody else to check something out. See? It doesn't – you shouldn't get this down as a special Saint Hill routine that takes place nowhere else. If you find a goal or a terminal or a level or something like that – not so much a level, but certainly a goal, and in this particular case a goal, modifier, terminal – whether you get them checked out every time you find each piece or before you start in desperation to do a run, get the goal, the modifier and the terminal checked out, all at one time; certainly get it checked out by somebody. It doesn't matter whether you are here or someplace else.

Why? It gives you a certain amount of confidence. Somebody else has taken a look at the thing. It has given you some sort of a feeling that you won't be going off the deep end when you start auditing it. It's a good thing to do, don't you agree?
Now, similarly, every time rudiments cross-checking, see, has been done, cases have made very nice progress. So in an HGC or a center where a great deal of this – of goals running particularly and that sort of thing is going on, if rudiments are cross-checked, why, that would be a very good idea. But to have the Director of Processing cross-check every rudiment on every pc every day is, unfortunately, already indicative of a mess, because the D of P, Director of Processing, never gets a chance to do anything else.

Now, we've already had one tied up in Washington, DC. I didn't realize that they had him strapped to the chair checking rudiments, strapped to the chair checking rudiments. He never got anything else checked. Never got any cases run or anything important like that and his administration dropped behind gorgeously. Well, a much better solution was just to have staff auditors check staff auditors' rudiments, that's all.

The best time to check rudiments, by the way, is midday – not beginning of the day. Why? Well, it works like this: The first auditor the fellow gets that day... See, he's all grogged up, and his basal metabolism is by the boards, and he has got eighteen present time problems, and he is anxious to unload his case, and he hasn't had much auditing lately anyhow – all these things in a sort of a monotone. He isn't too familiar with any of the auditors in this center anyway, and auditor Doakes walks in and sits down in the auditor's chair. That's the pc's auditor for the day, that's it.

Although he then gets up and leaves. You see? You get the idea? In other words, first crack out of the box, all of his anxieties and worries, that he's been thinking up all night are in – he wants to unload these things on the auditor and he's put on wait by another auditor so he can elect that auditor – he can elect that auditor his auditor, and all that auditor is doing is checking his rudiments.

So end of session, or in the middle of an auditing day, or something like that, is a better time to get a rudiments cross-check. In this particular case, the smartest thing to do here, of course, would be to go ahead and find the goal. See? We have no great suspicion of this particular auditor, and just let's let him go ahead. He's got the modifier, the pc's attention is now going to be on the goal – well, there's various reasons why the modifier might not get checked out properly – well, just let him go ahead and find the terminal. And now let's check out the goal, modifier and terminal. Let's get somebody else to check out goal, modifier and terminal before we run anything on it and then we've got a sweeping checkout. That would save time anyway.

So, you could either check them out one at a time as they're found, which of course – if you're operating with very tyro auditors, who are – you know, they're looking at the meter and they say, "Now, let's see. This is the tone arm and when the word 'Hubbard' turns red ..." [laughter] It's a good idea to check out their rudiments three times every session, check out their E-Meter, set their E-Meter so it will read on the proper readings, and hold their hand while they audit. You see, all these things would be there. And to check out the goal when it is found, the modifier when it is found, the terminal when it is found, the Prehav level when it is found and the Prehav level checked every time it is changed. All of these things would be desirable.
But what are you doing? You're adjusting the amount of checking you are doing to the quality of the auditor. Right?

Well, the limiter on this is that before anybody runs anything desperate – you know he actually runs this terminal and so on; any auditor, even me – it would be a nice thing to have somebody else look it over, you know and say, "Well, it checks out! It checks out all the way with me, too." Why? Well, actually, one auditor and another auditor can have different effects upon the pc that can throw the case one way or the other. You see?

Rudiments come under this heading exclusively. Rudiments. Well, rudiments can be in for Joe and out for Mary any day of the week, you see?

So if you have two auditors checking the rudiments of the pc, you know pretty well you're not going to be running the pc with rudiments out. So that has very little to do with auditing skill. It has a great deal to do with a pc's reaction to male, female, auditors with blond hair, auditors with green hair – all these differences, you see. Has a great deal to do with where the pc is being audited, too. It's always better to check a pc's rudiments in another auditing room; but this isn't convenient.

Sounds wild but it's true. It isn't convenient. Of course, you do get him set for the exact auditing room he is in if you check his rudiments in that auditing room where he is going to be audited. But of course, you would detect it much more rapidly that a case's havingness was by the boards if his havingness was out in any room. That point, you could labor far too much.

The point is that on the broad things, before you commit yourself to a long run, you should get checked out the things that have been assessed. Now, whether they're checked out one at a time or whether they're checked out all at once has very little to do with it except this: that inexperienced auditors – auditors who haven't got very much experience – will waste an awful lot of time on the wrong – on finding the modifier for the wrong goal, and then finding the wrong Prehav Scale for the preclear – not the Prehav level but the Prehav Scale; they've got the ... [laughter] It can go pretty far wild. So whether you check them piece by piece is determined pretty well as to what auditor skill is present. And this auditor's skill, of course, is good. So we would just let it go, let him go ahead and find the terminal and go on. So I'll just mark this thing: "Find terminal and get goal, modifier, terminal checked out." [writes]

All right. Now, that's enough for that.

"And the modifier that dropped and react – or reacted most and stayed in: 'But it's someplace else.'" That's a doll. That's an absolute doll. That's a perfect type of modifier. That is a classic case. "But it's someplace else." Of course, a person goes down the line and he gets to this phrase "But it's someplace else" so he never enunciates it. See, that's a nice one.

That's interesting because I was interested in this particular case. I take an awful lot of interest in these cases as pure interest. If you don't mind. [laughter] And I wondered and wondered what this particular goal ... May I say what this goal is?
Male voice: Yes, go ahead.

But I wondered and wondered what was going to modify this particular goal, because every time the pc came toward this particular goal, he kind of – sparks flew out of his ears. He didn't like this one, see? And I wondered and wondered what it would be. It's "to work on radiant energy and field phenomena." And the modifier's – is – doesn't make too much – well, it makes sense, but it – "but it's someplace else." So, of course, you can't work on something that is someplace else. And that's apparently what has been falling and what's made this goal hang up. And you get this, that here you've got an ambition to work on radiant energy and field phenomena, which is counterbalanced with the fact that you can't because it's someplace else. So, of course, this locks up every place the goal is applied because it doesn't have anything to reach, but it is actually balanced. That's a textbook example. That's very nice.

And whether it's the right one or not is – whether it's the right one or not, he said, "He had been telling me that he didn't think anything would happen in the sessions, and I noticed this session he seemed to be more in-session and didn't say this." Okay. Interesting. Were you interested in that particularly?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Okay, regardless of all that, we've got a terminals list started on this and here we have – here we have now a goal, modifier, and we get a terminals list and we get all three of them checked out. So that's it.

The other thing I always look for: Was there any TA action? Now, you normally look for TA action on the thing during the run. You look down the line here and find out what the TA action was. And because he was too interested in the assessment, the auditor here wasn't putting down very much TA read. Ordinarily on a run you put down lots of TA read and on assessments you sometimes flub it. It's a good indicator. So put down lots of TA reads; only err on the side of – always put down enough tone arm reads.

Says, "It was varying from 2.5 to 2.0." The tone arm was varying from 2.0 to 2.25 on his – beginning of his Terminal Assessment. I guess that's what that is.

All right. Now, this general case run here appears to be all right. I was just looking here. You always look up at the top. You see "Goals: none," you know very well that a pc is running with rudiments a bit out, with withholds, with an ARC break – something like that. A pc who tells you they have no goals for a session, and so forth, they must be sitting in some kind of a bit of an ARC break. [writes] See, so on that adjudication I would write down here: "Get your rudiments in." See? It's very clever crystal-ballin' on my part. Pc has no goals for a session ...

There's certain little rules that you follow along these lines. It's like reading profiles. I can look at a profile and tell you whether or not the pc's havingness is up or down, whether the pc has found the auditor or not. Has nothing to do with the textbook about the profiles. It has a great deal to do with something else.

Okay. The pc, of course, feels a little bit bounced around and is having a little bit of a rough time but I have every confidence that he'll straighten out on it and recover. Okay?
Okay. Mary Sue generally, lately – she used to do these mostly by herself. And she'd sit up till four, five or six o'clock in the morning – that's an exaggeration; it was only three-thirty usually – and she would sit there and do these things all by herself. And as soon as I spotted the fact that we did have a breakthrough here and I could shove your cases and your auditing much, much harder, I started to do these things individually a short time ago. I'd always been interested in them and spot-checked them and kept an eye on it and took them up with Mary Sue. But she lately has been relaxed enough to be able simply to hand me the folders. [laughter] She's very good at that. [laughter]

You know why she's very good at that? Because believe it or not, she can tell me the goal and the terminal and the levels run and what process is being run on and what Sec Check is being run on any case out of twenty-six just like that. [snaps fingers]

Female voice: Very good.

It's fantastic, you know. Almost as good as I used to be. I used to remember every engram verbatim that I ever ran off of a pc. And I could tell them years later, and they'd stagger, you know. [laughter]

They'd come in and they'd – somebody I hadn't seen for years, you know, but I audited them years ago – and I'd say, "How are you getting along?"

"Oh, I'm getting along fine."

Say, "Well, did you ever hear any more about that birth sequence?"

"What birth sequence?"

"You know, the one that I audited, you know, where the doctor was wearing the green hat."

"By George! You know..." [laughter] pc had forgotten it but I didn't.

All right. We had Doris Lambright being audited by Ellen Carter. Well, we've got goals here: "To blow off a headache and confusion blowing around my head," and so forth; and evidently they made the goal some better. "To be able to duplicate tapes on one hearing," "to pass tests quickly and easily," and so forth. Good. "To be Clear and finish the course," and "Finish course by January 1st and get back for the congress." Okay. Very good. Okay. I don't see what this is all about here. Apparently Wing Angel – apparently – audited this pc at some time or another and the pc was hung up in it in some fashion.

The way you'd get that, by the way, is to clip the prior confusion, not the auditing. What was the confusion that preceded this. You know, you find what's wrong with the pc and then you get the prior confusion. You know? You get the confusion before it. Don't go monkeying around too much with this sort of thing.

And I don't know whether the auditor did anything about this or not, but that would have been the proper thing to have done. May have started when this auditor was auditing her. Well, there might have – must have been a prior confusion to the turn-on. It might have been a minute before and it might have been five years before but it's prior. That you're sure of.
So spotting the prior confusion to that would have clipped it out. And you, at your stage of training, could consider this as a fairly routine activity. You find the pc is worried about something in the rudiments, and that sort of thing. And they've had some kind of a somatic and ever since, such-and-so. And ever since their great-grandmother died, and so forth, on the sacrificial altar, or whatever it is, why, they've had this somatic. You can get the prior confusion, you know. Well, what happened before that? Do a little tiny bang-bang-bang Sec Check on the thing and blow it. And you can get very clever at that and if you can get very clever at that, you will pull some miracles off that kind of look wild to other people.

By the way, it's – the British auditor is reaching a new low for me. Do you realize that Charlie Drake, the comedian, lost his memory a couple of weeks ago? Still lost!

Who hasn't been up knocking on his door and doing a Touch Assist on his skull? The easiest thing you could possibly do! Now, a Touch Assist, of course, violates this prior confusion. Those are not hard words; that's just a joke. But I should think that somebody by this time would have gone up to BBC and found out where they could find Charlie Drake and gone over and done a Touch Assist on him.

We did one here just a few days ago – boy was seeing triple, wasn't – couldn't remember very much and was mostly blathering. Did a Touch Assist on him for an hour and a half, I think, or a couple of hours – for two ...

_Eleven voice:_ Two and a half, but it had cleared up on two.

Two hours or ... ? Yeah.

_Eleven voice:_ Two hours.

Yeah, just did a Touch Assist on him. His triple vision turned off and that sort of thing. You can do miracles like this.

Well, that actually is addressing the time. See? That violates this prior confusion thing. But, of course, it's the best thing you can do. And if there's anything left after the Touch Assist, there must have been a prior confusion that is still holding it up, but it's marvelous that a Touch Assist can get rid of as much as it does.

But you at any time – that exact thing, that we did on this workman here – done on this Charlie Drake and his memory would be back, you know, right now. It's not even a hard job, you know, I mean, what the heck. The hardest job would be going to find the taxicab to go over to his house. That would be the toughest job.

But finding any kind of a rudiment out or any kind of a somatic that the pc is desperately worried about or that sort of thing – you can take a slap at it, you know, on a prior confusion basis. You know, you find it out in the rudiments and you decide you're going to do something about it. The fastest way to do something about it is just take a couple of fast sweeps on O/W on the prior confusion and it's liable to blow right now. And it's quite quick; it's quite quick.

All right. Now, we're doing some kind of a Goals Assessment here. Start the Goals Assessment and we've still got that. And we found the pc's confront process, "What's the emotion of ...?" And we're still doing a Goals Assessment and it's carrying on here. And this Goals
Assessment is apparently prepared for very well. She started the session and did goals and then came back to and ran: "Who left a Sec Check question unflat?"

"We found out it wasn't a Sec Check question; it was just a nosy question, just before the pc left home and withheld the answer. Somatics lightened up. 'What's the emotion of that object?''

I don't read this – I don't dig this at all. Why have we got: "What's the emotion of that object?" That's a Havingness process – and then the Alternate Confront? I see; I get it. And this is Alternate Confront. And those two, and checking goals, and they're all null. And then it got Alternate Confront and "What's the emotion?" and so forth. Ah! Well, we've got a rather standard auditor problem staring us in the teeth here: The goals all nullled and the needle is rising and the tone arm is 3.75 and so forth.

I wonder how many auditors between now and the turn of the century will be at this exact desperate point of the track. The goals list has been handed over and the goals are all null.

All right. Well, let's get magical, shall we? Let's get magical about the whole thing. This is very tough.

And, by the way, you shouldn't use these report sheets to write goals lists on. Goals lists go on white pieces of paper and they get clipped together and they don't get separated and left on little bits.

Sheets. Get some long, white sheets; don't use these things. And whenever you have a goals list, clip it together because a goals list is valuable – particularly, the first goals list of the pc is very valuable. Clip it and file it and guard it with your life. He doesn't care about it but you do.

What are you going to do for the second Goals Assessment? Dig in here and find little bits of paper all through the pieces of report? Oh, no, you're not. You clip them together, okay? And make them look good.

Now, you've got a Goals Assessment and they all went null. How many goals have we got? This is also a poor job from the standpoint of the goals are not numbered. The goals are not all numbered! Ooo! And the goals are numbered in two different number sequences. Ohhh, Ellen! This is the kind of thing I say at two o'clock in the morning: "If I could just get ahold of Ellen now ..." [laughter, laughs]

Now – now, you take your goals list, and you better recopy this whole goals list in your own script on a long white sheet. And you better put a date at the top of the thing and you better number every goal consecutively so I could look on here, or anybody else, and say, "We are down to this many goals. And the total summation of goals amounts to 199 goals," or whatever the thing is. Because we just look at the last number on the sheet and we see 199. We know that many goals. We already have enough numbers here scattered around – some numbered goal 60, some numbered goal 33, others numbered also goals 20. There's – I think you have several goal 17s here. I don't know whether you do or not. But auditor bookkeeping these days is – yes, you do have. There are two goal 17s. We don't know what this pc is up to, but I would say offhand that this pc is up to about – you know, anybody's guess.
"Oh, well, Ron can do this kind of thing; so go ahead and do it to him." One – I can – I'm very good at cryptography. This is well written by the way. But some of your auditor reports – I have a little microscope and I get it out and I read – you think I'm kidding! [laughter]  
Well, I don't think this is enough goals.  
Female voice: I don't think that it is.  
No, you haven't got enough goals here. And now, that's a main point. You have to get up to – if goals are giving you any trouble at all, get up to at least a 150, 200. Get up into that range before you start worrying too much about it. But probably this has not been shaken down. I can tell you everything that's wrong with this case. I'll just rattle it off: (1) The rudiments are out. (2) An insufficient number of goals has been taken from the pc. (3) The pc at some earlier time has done a goals list. That's a guess. Is that right?  
Female voice: Yeah.  
Where is that list?  
Female voice: I don't know. I did it one time on a train and I ...  
Where is it?  
Female voice: ... threw it away.  
Who threw it away?  
Female voice: Me. It was never used. It was one I did on a train one time.  
One you did on a train.  
Female voice: Yeah, I didn't have anything...  
You sure it is thrown away?  
Female voice: I'm not positive. It could be home somewhere. I didn't look.  
Yeah. There you are. was my guess right?  
Her goals list was done on a train and has probably been thrown away. Her goal is probably on that list and has never been repeated and will never again be repeated anyplace so we just might as well throw ... [laughter]  
I'm not joking. I'm not joking, really. When they do an original goals list and they write the whole thing out, they're talking turkey. After that, they're worrying. And the primary goal that you're after has the best chance of all goals of submerging and never being repeated on a subsequent list. Isn't that interesting?  
There's nothing you can do about it, so we just might as well scratch the pc. [laughter]  
"(1) Ruds out. (2) Get more goals off meter. And (3)..." Now, you got any suggestion, Ellen, as to how we could do that?  
Female voice: Get more goals?  
No, no, no, no. How we can get over this point (3) of the original list having been destroyed. Is there any way we could get over that?
Female voice: Can see if she can locate it.
Hm?

Female voice: I can find out if she can locate it.
Yeah, but supposing it's been destroyed; let's just assume it's been destroyed: Is there anything else we can do about it?

Female voice: Yes, using the meter to see if I can get her to recall them.
Yeah, that's right. Let's get her to duplicate the list by meter which will be a nice piece of metering for you. "Is there any other goal on that list that you have not put on subsequent lists?" Until you finally get all fall out of it. But to do that you'll have to get your rudiments severely in and keep them in and you will have to get everything that appeared on the original list, okay?

"Get original list off meter." Okay?

Now, I'll put down here: "Sorry to call you to account in front of class. Best, Ron."

[laughter]

All right. In that event I'll just put "Best, Ron." [laughter]

Okay. Now, here we are and we have Constantine being audited by John Sears. And here we have Routine 3A. Right.

I wonder – I wonder if this goal still falls. Does this goal still fall, "To be myself?"
Male voice: Yeah.

Does it check out and fall?
Male voice: Yeah.

What do you know. How long did it take you to get that? Forty-five minutes?
Male voice: Yes, about that much.

Interesting.

Male voice: We had a very short list, too.

Yeah. A very short list.

All right. Now, we've got to get a modifier for this and let's see how far we have progressed in the direction here. And he – he was still running a ten-way bracket and still running a ten-way bracket, and he ended rudiments and so forth. What date was this? This was clear back here. This – here's the 8th. What is this all about?... Yes, here's the 8th. Yup, the goal was to find a modifier and so forth and so on. Modifier. There we are.

Now, he did a list of modifiers here. Where is the list of modifiers?

Male voice: Foolscap.

There – here we are! Here's a nice long list of modifiers. That's actually about three times as many modifiers as one would ordinarily have. Let me see what number this modifier might have been here.
Male voice: Five or six.

Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Was it still shaking down by meter after number five? Were you taking – from number five on, were you still reading the meter, "Is there anything else will modify this?" and see if the meter knocked?

Male voice: Oh, it was from about eighteen on that I was doing that.

Oh, yeah. And you were still getting a meter knock?

Male voice: Oh, yeah, definitely.

Is that right?

Male voice: Very definitely.

All right. And you stripped it down and it got down to thirty-four?

Male voice: Yeah.

Of course, this is brand-new, this type – particular operation. All right. Well, we've got some idea. The meter went null at about thirty-four, huh?

Male voice: No, it went null before that, and the pc originated the others that are written at the tops of the pages.

Oh, I see.

Male voice: From about ...

Oh, it's thirty-eight, thirty-nine.

Male voice: Yeah. That's right. From about eighteen to about thirty on the meter.

Yeah.

Male voice: The others originated.

I see. And the pc originated after the meter went null?

Male voice: Yeah.

All right. Okay. Very good. Well, we find it was modifier number five – which falls within my guess that they give it to you in the first five or ten. And it's, "In spite of other people trying to influence me," which is a perfectly valid modifier. That checked out, did it? Have you checked it out thoroughly?

Male voice: I checked it out, thoroughly. Yeah. It was ...

Doesn't say so here.

Male voice: But the checker who checked it said that it was going in and out.

Female voice: It did not check out; others came alive. Didn't check out.

Didn't check! Didn't think it was. It seemed too reasonable. There's no denyer. One would look at it. I would – don't you dare add this as a modifier, now! [laughter]
"To be myself in spite of not being here" or "to be myself although I am elsewhere." You get the modifier type of the thing. You have to kind of dig for those things. Sometimes they are hard to blow out. That would be a denyer type of modifier, don't you see?

I don't care, even if one of the two I have just said is his, he can't have it. [laughs]

Okay. "Reassess, more modifiers." Yeah, well that was checked out and it was found to be going in and out and some of the others came live. So I would say, offhand, that there is a denyer on this thing that puts it out of view. And this "in spite of" is a kind of a denyer. It is a kind of a denyer, but there might be something else there that has something to do with it.

Now, you realize in checking these things out, something interesting is liable to occur. You're liable to blow the whole goal! Particularly on the second or third goal that you check out with the pc, you repeat the modifier and you repeat the goal. And then you repeat the modifier and you can't find it. And then you repeat the goal and you can't find it. And then you look for the terminal; then you try to get the rudiments in and they're all in. And you try to find the goal and the terminals. It's about time to listen to the pc: He's been saying it's been gone for some time.

So, that is not what occurred here. I'd, tomorrow, check the goal, huh?

Male voice: Yeah.

Check the goal. It's perfectly accurate but check it anyhow. Get how much it's falling and see if you can't get a modifier that falls like the goal is falling. You know, the goal falls like the modifier, falls like the terminal, falls like the level – or pardon me, I should have said "reacts" throughout.

The needle reaction of the goal is the same as the needle reaction for the modifier, and the needle reaction for the terminal is the same as the needle reaction for the goal. The needle reaction for the level will be the same. They all will, more or less, be the same. Sometimes more! You'll find you will sometimes get a greater reaction, but if you have a less reaction be suspicious.

If your reaction decreases and if it's sporadic and goes in and out, we haven't got it. There's something wrong here. Either the rudiments are out or the wording is not quite correct, and so forth.

I appreciate your difficulty in this particular case because you are dealing ... Constantine speaks very excellent English, but his basic tongue is not English. And so when I'm doing one like that I almost always do it in the native tongue of the pc. Even though I couldn't write Greek these days to save my life. Get the idea?

Have him say it in Greek "to be myself," and then try this thing in Greek. Try the same goal, see if it stays in. See, we might be running the English off the top of it. You know something weird might be happening.

All of you, by the way, are language cases. You realize that? You've only been talking English for a very short period of time. Do you realize that? English is sort of a polyglot tongue. There is a civilization – there are two or three civilizations on the track, though, that
do speak the same English that we speak, right now. They're backtrack, way, way backtrack and they talked English. Funny, isn't it?

It's very funny. You get back into that area with sonic, you know, and somebody is saying, "Hey boy, look out," you know? [laughter] Usually it's in lingua spacia or something like that, you know. "Polyga mugal!" "Rrrr."

I like those tongues, though, that are all gutturals. "Ghlk." You know, where that is a consonant – "Glnk."

All right. We got that taped? Yeah, all right.

Never be ashamed to be clever as an auditor. Just remember that, never be ashamed to be clever. Because you're being clever as an auditor, you're not being a squirrel.

A squirrel is doing something entirely different. He doesn't understand any of the principles so he makes up a bunch of them to fulfill his ignorance, foists them off on a pc and gets no place. And you know your fundamentals and you know what you're doing, and so forth, and you don't ever get clever about anything – what a knucklehead of an auditor you will be because you will run into impasses every now and then that – you'll say, "What's the textbook solution?" There was no textbook solution. There are textbook fundamentals but no textbook solution.

They tell an old gag – there's an old song in the Marines about this Marine private who went into the battle with a vim. And his name was McBin, I think, and he went into a battle with a grin because although he got killed, why, he had used the textbook solution. He died with a grin, that was it, because he'd used the textbook solution. Yeah. Well, don't go around dying with a grin just because you used the textbook solution, because that's just an effort to make me wrong.

No, you've got to be clever now and then. You've got to be very clever in checking some goals, some terminals, that sort of thing. You've got to be clever. And this modifier thing requires a certain degree of cleverness. After the pc has said to you, fifteen or twenty times, "Well, you keep asking me but I just can't reach it, you know?"

After the pc has said to you for fifteen or twenty times, ask him – just, you know, go get a big, blue spark and suddenly say, "Well, is the modifier 'that you can't reach it'? Is that it?"

"Well, yes, yes. I want to be a plumber but I can't reach it."

There are all these denyer bits, see. There's another gag you can get the modifier with, is you can run the goal. Run the goal both ways for a moment or two, and the modifier will show up if it's hard to get. You can take the goal and you can say well ... Well, we'll say the goal was "to give myself up," or something like that. All right, the goal is "to give myself up." you run an auditing command something on the basis to "How would you give yourself up?" "How would somebody else give himself up?" Anything like that. Run it two ways just for a little while, and so forth, and then ask for the modifier and you'll come out at the other end with a good – well, a better look at the thing. Remember all – nearly all modifiers are denyers.
There's something else to know about this particular battle front, is – a pc goes into a sort of a numb games condition when he's ARC broke and he won't give up anything but he doesn't have any flexibility or fluidity of mind. In other words, his zones of attention are very short; they're very small. And if you get a pc into a sort of a knuckleheaded, wooden, "Well, I'll go along with it somehow" frame of mind, the amount of success you are going to have in getting that pc to reach anything is going to be very poor.

In other words, the livelier, the happier, the more cheerful, the more fluid or fluent a pc feels, why, the more likely you are to get a goal, get a terminal, get a modifier, you know, and so forth.

Pc is sitting there, glumly, "Well, I'll go ahead and be audited just because you say so," you know? Don't expect him to reach very much because he's sort of not extending himself. And sometimes it's a little bit worth your while to get a pc to extend himself slightly. Instead of just sitting there, a wound-up doll yourself and so forth, why, just have a discussion about all of this, you know.

Of course, in the process of the discussion you can invalidate him, break the Auditor's Code fifteen times and make him worse. If you find you're doing that, it's a better thing not to do anything. A wooden frame of mind is better than a completely gone one.

All right. Here we have Maxine Kozak auditing Jenny Edmunds and I am sure the pc will absolutely die in her tracks at my taking up this particular report because the goal is "not to be found out"; isn't it, Jenny?

Female voice: Yes.
Okay?
Female voice: Yes.

All right. And we don't find anything here. We find the modifier is assessed and we've got several – the modifier: "not to be found out." Well, I don't know how this goes together. What have we got, another goal here? I have been wondering about this. I spent some – I was worried about this, as a matter of fact. How do we take this goal, "not to be found out," because "not to be found out" sounds more like a modifier than it does a goal. Now, did we ask this pc if there was any goal on the front end of it?

Female voice: Today.
Yeah.
Female voice: Yeah.
We did?
Female voice: Yeah.

Was there anything on the front end of this "not to be found out"? You know, "to be a plumber but not to be found out." Any goal on the front end of this? Is there? What is it?

Female voice: "To tell lies."
Yeah. "To tell lies and not be found out."
Female voice: Yes.
So, oh! What you've got written down here is the front end?
Female voice: Yeah!
That's how it makes sense.
Female voice: oh, yes. The whole list is. Yes.
Yeah. All right. You don't say so anyplace, see? [laughter]
Female voice: "Not to be found out!"
No. "Not to be found out" is the modifier. You've got the goal. You did a Goals As-
assessment on top of the modifier.
Female voice: Yes, I realize that.
You see?
Female voice: Yes.
So these actually are goals and we've got the modifier up here: "Not to be found out."
Female voice: Yes.
All right. That's the modifier, and we already had that as a goal.
Female voice: Yes.
See? It wasn't a goal. And now we've got this other goal here. Do you mind if I – .
Female voice: Hm.
All right. She does mind – . [laughter]
Female voice: I tell you, I don't.
Ha?
Female voice: I don't really.
You don't really?
Female voice: No.

All right. It's "To tell lies and not to be found out." And that's your goal-modifier se-
quence. Fascinating. I was concerned with that because I saw that, and I said, "Good heavens!
We've got the modifier end of the line." Now, I held my breath because I didn't know whether
or not we could easily get the goal end of the line. And I'm very, very glad you did. Hm?

Female voice: As soon as you said it last night I knew it was the modifier.
Oh, yeah? All right. Well, I'm very, very glad that we got that pair sorted out. That
was a very good job. A very good job.

Yeah, this'll – there's only two or three here in this particular unit that I was concerned
with and this was one of them. Very much so. And I thought, "What on earth is that one going
to turn out to be?" Well, that was an excellent job.
Now, has it been checked out?

*Female voice: No, it hasn't.*

All right. We'll just say, "Get it checked." [writes] Very nice. Very nice. Well, apparently here, that was — went rather smoothly. Pc tended to have an ARC break here toward the end of session because of the rudiments. Pc was traveling along here all during this assessment at 2.5, 2.25, 2.75, and then all of a sudden on the rudiments went to 3.25, and then went to 3 and then stayed at 3. What was that all about?

*Female voice: It was after the break. When she came back after the break, the tone arm went up.*

She'd been figuring.

*Female voice: Hm. Yes.*

Something on that order. Been figuring or something like that. Do you think that was it?

*Female voice: I asked her what it was.*

Did you get it?

*Female voice: No, I didn't get the tone arm down.*

Yeah, well, I would show that up, wouldn't I, in front of God and everybody.

*Female voice: It's okay.*

When a pc's TA goes up during a break or between sessions, it's a very good thing to investigate it rather thoroughly.

All right. Well, you get it down for the next session. I think that's very nice. Okay. Stop worrying about that one.

Okay. Hm. Yeah. You're having a ball. All right. Now, I'm glad you put this one in my hands because this was the first one that was done and I gave this to Bob to sort out Jenny's goal and modifier.

All right. We had a goal running on this particular case and it was "to be a racetrack driver." And that goal was not — it was doing all right. The case kept hanging fire on the terminal "racetrack driver," and so forth. So I caused an assessment here and this caused an upset to the pc. The pc was quite upset to have another Goals Assessment or something like that done. And while we were scrambling around on it we got in here with this goal-modifier arrangement and the auditor promptly shook it out as a goal-modifier arrangement. May I say what it is?

*Female voice: of course.*

All right?

*Female voice: Sure.*

All right. "To be a racetrack driver, but a racetrack driver couldn't rule." That was what was missing off the end of it. And of course this makes a highly specialized terminal.
Now, what does that terminal turn out to be? The terminal turns out to be – may I say it? – turns out to be Lucifer. Now, just why it does is up to the pc and so on, and we're not interested in whether terminals are logical or illogical or something like that; it's whether or not they run. But the pc couldn't run this – couldn't run a five-way bracket on the assessed Prehav Scale. Couldn't do it, because the pc says, "I'm too much the terminal."

Now, you're going to find that. Now, that you're finding a very finite ... Remember what I told you, I said, "We're heading in for a way of finding the terminal. Well, of course, if you get a very fundamental terminal you get a total association between the pc and the terminal as being almost the order of the day. They don't differentiate between one another at all.

Now, you find terminals on children and you find exactly this condition. You find out they can't differentiate between one thing and the other. So your first auditing commands – this five-way bracket wouldn't run on this pc – and our first auditing commands of a five-way bracket, couldn't be checked out. The auditor very cleverly did not run them. The auditor actually cleared the auditing commands – and possibly the pc's digging in her heels had something to do with it – and found out they couldn't be run and asked me on the report what to do about all this.

Well, what to do about this became very simple. You just treat this as a total closure, that is, the pc thinks of self as the terminal so you limit the bracket.

And I must call to your attention the tremendous importance in the Prelogics of gradient scales. You solve all cases by gradient scales. All things are solved by gradient scales. All auditing is done by gradient scale. And so auditing commands, when they are difficult to do, are done by gradient scale. And you get the simplest auditing command that you can think of and then you go from there on out.

Now, of course, perimeters of attention are so limited when you've got a terminal totally closed with the pc, the perimeter of attention is too tight. They can't get the idea, actually, of another person. You've got the terminal and then you haven't got anything else. You see? You've got the terminal and here's the terminal. Crunch! You see? And you say, "Well, how would you shoot another? How would you communicate to another?" You see? "How would another communicate to you?" This is too steep! This is too much.

But you can ask them something on the order – or should be able to – whether or not the person can communicate with himself or whether the terminal can communicate with itself. Naturally, you could get that. And if you ran those two you'd eventually get a differentiation.

So the auditing commands I recommended were something on the order of (suggested)
"What might you have?" – "disagreed" was the level – "What might you have disagreed with?"
and "What might Lucifer have disagreed with?" See?

Not "What have you disagreed with about Lucifer?" or "What has Lucifer disagreed with about you?" You see? This is just total concentric, singleness. "What have you disagreed with?" "What might you have disagreed with?" and "What might Lucifer have disagreed with?"
We put *might* in there and the person doesn't have to answer very specifically. You see? We aren't asking for the *exact recall*.

You ask a person to recall – all right: "Recall a time when you built your first pyramid. Thank you." [laughter] They can't answer that kind of question. But you can say, "When might you have built a pyramid?" See?

"Oh, well," they think, "Well, then ..." Anytime within that million-year line, see, they might have done it, you see. And they don't even have to say they have done it. And yet it will run very easily and it is quite beneficial. So we put *might* in there; that eases it up. We've got already – it on a gradient.

Now, let's see what we did here. We ran this apparently. Hm. Looks awfully good here. It looks like the tone arm was flying around a bit. Cognition and so forth. Heavy rock slams. Running between 2.6, 2.5. Oh, it took a little while to get going apparently. Yeah, and then it started flying up here to 3.50. This is nice action. And then you got a blowdown, and a blowdown, and the pc made her goals and feels good about the tone arm action, and so do I. A break. Rudiments well in. And then we got – went flying back up to 3.50, down to 2.25. That is very fine action, by the way. That is very good action. 2.25 to 3.5, you would realize, is three-quarters of a division but it's in the Clear range. And that much action in the Clear range is pretty fantastic.

Don't think too much ... You can have a whole tone arm action between 5.0 and 6.0, way over here and it doesn't mean anywhere near as much as a half a tone arm action down around the Clear range. It's interesting.

You get a person up at 5, all he's got to do is withhold the fact that his – the end of his nose twitches and he goes up to 6. You see?

So, anyhow, that was fine. And he got various blowdowns and then some apathy began to come off. I'm glad to see that, actually, because she's been sitting around in it. I've been looking at her now and then saying, "Well, she's swimming through some bit of it." That's right, isn't it? And it was sticking around a little too long, so I was glad we found that.

All right. And she's – auditor's comment is: "Tone arm action fairly active. Pc felt this area was difficult to run because there wasn't much MEST to grapple with. Felt kind of queasy in the stomach since the beginning.

"Says, 'Oh, what's the use,' and sighs frequently. However, she's answered each command without any dispersal. I questioned pc by expanding – about expanding the bracket."

**Male voice: Right.**

"And the pc has certain resistance to running these agreed-upon flows because she claims they don't get at one area and clean it up and she has to hop around too much to do the command in a full bracket." Well, that's perfect. I agree with that a hundred percent. I'll give you the answer to this in a minute. "Which I will have to ferret out and clean up. I suspect it's probably ARC breaks in doing the bracket commands."

No. No, no, no, no, no. No, you're just asking the pcs to fall in over their head a little bit, you know, and they just *zzzttt*. 
And "How do I expand this bracket? Is it Lucifer to others? Pc to others?"

No. The next way you expand the bracket – you can go to a straight five-way bracket. You can, but the theoretical way you expand the bracket is to make an interchange between the pc and Lucifer now.

Male voice: That's what I had across from it.

Yeah. Well, that is the – that would be the next change. It would be the inter- "What have you disagreed with?" "What has Lucifer disagreed with?" You could say something on the order of – you could put the word might in there – "What might you have disagreed with about Lucifer?" or "What might Lucifer have disagreed with about you?" You get the interchange going now. You see, you've got it center-center. All right. Now, let's get an interchange going and don't swing around into "Lucifer to other" or "Other to Lucifer," because that requires a loosening attention. But that's added later. See?

All right. And I think that is going very, very well. But here's – here's some data you're in need of here. The pc's goal. Let's go back and look at this goal, see? "To be a racetrack driver, but a racetrack driver couldn't rule."

Now, this integrates in some fashion with the behavior of the pc. And you'll find out in running a goal-plus-modifier terminal that the pc – this is quite important – may heavily dramatize the goal when they first run the terminal. See? They – that's – well, let's say part of the modifier is "but it is unreachable." And as you run this, they don't tell you directly that it's unreachable; they just feel very dissatisfied about the thing, you see and "There's nothing there," and so on. And they keep feeling like this as you're running it and they're uncomfortable. And don't think anybody is very comfortable running a goal-plus-modifier terminal because this is – we're getting into heavier raw meat with this stuff. And the goal has a tendency to be dramatized slightly by the pc. The goal is not in view and so forth.

Now, I wouldn't expand the auditing command – yet. I would dream up a method of running a two-way flow on the goal-plus-modifier.

Male voice: Hm.

"What racetrack driver couldn't rule?"

Male voice: Hm.

See? Now, how do you get the reversed flow? Well, you just say, "What couldn't you rule?" "What haven't you been able to rule?" "What mightn't you have been able to rule?" Don't you see? "What mightn't a racetrack driver be able to rule?" You know, anything of that character, but slide that in as your three and four. See? You plus self on "rule." Racetrack driver, see, plus self – plus racetrack driver, see, on "rule." Just – that's it. See?

"You, not rule – you couldn't rule." "Racetrack driver couldn't rule." "Disagreed with self." "Lucifer disagreed with." And this thing will suddenly start integrating. You'll see a different scene suddenly. Then you can start expanding it. But I wouldn't necessarily drop the goal out of the line. It all depends on how it runs. You have to kind of run it by ear. We don't have very much experience right here at this moment or much backlog on it. We know we're
dead right and that it is running along fine. But it's just – exactly how you tune up the heterodyne so it will super-receive – we're not quite cognizant of. Okay?

Male voice: Right.

Sounds sensible to you?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. [writes] "Add goal commands to two-way and run." An awfully good job, Bob. Thank you.

All right. This is Marianne Christie auditing Smokey. Smokey? All right if I mention any of this?

Male voice: I don't give a damn.

It's all right? All right.

Now, I suspected that this was going to be a dog's breakfast. Do you know why? Because I think that this was another one of the things where we had the modifier and didn't have the goal, or there was something wrong and I couldn't imagine, myself, easily or readily, what you could add to "Hidden source of action." "To be a hidden source of action." All right, a goal "To be a hidden source of action." How do we modify this? It seems self-modified, doesn't it?

So, I've been kind of – I've been very interested in seeing what came out of this and so forth, and he got a list of modifiers here apparently about – oh, I don't know, maybe thirty, something like that. And all we're getting is restatements of goals.

The goal is "To be a hidden source of action." All right. And all we're getting is "Not unknown," "Could be found," "Somebody could find it." Now, how do we add that in, Marianne? How do these make a goal-plus-modifier – "Not unknown"?

Female voice: It seemed real to Smokey that these would be stopping or make it difficult to get that goal. These were liabilities.

Yeah, but how would we make a statement out of it?

Female voice: Once it got known, it wouldn't be possible to have a goal in it. There'd be no game on it.

No. We want a full goal-plus-modifier. We've got a misapprehension here on what's required. That's what this is all about. I see some sign of it here, "... but to be apathetic," or "To be a hidden source of action would be degraded about not being known. "Well, now, that would make a complete statement – "To be a hidden source of action but to be degraded about not being known." All right. That would make a complete thing. I see here that we have a double check on that. It was still staying in. Did that stay in?

Female voice: Everything has gone ... No, not just now. There are only about four at the bottom there that are in.

These four at the bottom are still in.
Female voice: Yes, but these are relatively new ones added on at the last – at the end of the list – it tended to null the lot, just in the last quarter of an hour.

"To be a hidden source of action with an intention to be found?" That was a more recent one, huh?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Well, you'll just have to carry on with this. You'll have to also make very, very sure that your pc does not feel that his goal is being invalidated, which it isn't. We don't think it's wrong, we only think it's incomplete. See? So, go along and get that. Pc's riding pretty high here on the tone arm which is not extraordinary for this particular pc. Seems to have done all right, though, and seems to be pulling with you very well. And that's very fine. Now, this pc has already run some of his goal.

Female voice: Yes.

And if I had any more trouble with this at all, I would simply go into it on the basis of running this command: "How would you be a hidden source of action?" Something on that order. And "How would another be a hidden source of action?" And I'd just run this back and forth a few times. See? I'd run this for maybe fifteen, twenty minutes, something like that, and then check out the modifier that came with it, or anything that came up as following it.

As a matter of sober fact, you have a very tough one here because I think it is highly probable that it is the goal and modifier all in one package statement, bong, see? You get the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

It just sounds like it. "To be a hidden source of action." It's almost impossible, you know. See? That forms itself enough problems to make a game from here till Halifax. Doesn't it Smoke? Huh? All right.

But don't go torturing the pc about it in some way. If he can't get a modification to it he can't. And if he can, he can. But these sound very, very promising. "Intend to reveal some source later," "intention to be found," "wanting to reveal source later."

Female voice: There were one or two straight in the middle, too, that sounded very promising, but then they went null.

Mm-hm. Well, all right. But he's getting the classification, clarification of it and I am sure that you will get it. Okay? I've told you ways and means of doing so. Okay. [writes]

Female voice: Thank you.

Okay. I've just taken up some sample cases, to show you what we look at, how we go through it. Maybe you've learned something, maybe you haven't. I haven't shown you the one-two-three of how to do it. And I should add the one-two-three.

First, let us find out if the pc was audited that day. Now, you think that is funny, but by George, if you don't check the time audited you may find that the session has been abbreviated or had to be cancelled out or something like that. You're immediately short-circuited, then, into some other interest. In other words, what is wrong here does not become any tech-
technical question, it becomes some personal relationship of some kind or another. Or present time problems of the pc or something of this sort. So you look over the amount of time the pc was audited that day.

Then, the next thing you look at is to look at the pc's goals that were set for the session and find out whether or not – if the auditor has noted it – that the pc felt he made any of his goals for the session. Pc felt he made his goals for the session, in whole or in part, well, that's fine. That's fine.

And then you check tone arm action. You look down the line for tone arm action. If you're not getting any tone arm action of any kind whatsoever, you know doggone well one of two things is true: The rudiments are out a mile – regardless of what's being done, whether it's Sec Check or assessment or anything else – the rudiments are out a mile or the pc is Clear. And that depends in large measure on what the tone arm is reading.

Then you look on the list. If a process is being run, you quickly check twenty minute periods, down the column for the tone arm reads to find out if at any time this process was flat for twenty minutes and the auditor has missed it.

That's to make sure that you're not getting an overrun on a level. It's very easy to do, you don't have to do it with very great care. Thing says, "3, 3, 3, 3," or there's a whole bunch of 3, 3, 3, 3s all together, you say, "Gee, what do you know, dzz-zz-zz. Is there a quarter of tone arm difference here on this 3, 3, 3 column?" And if there isn't, why, then you might find that you've got some trouble towards the end of the session. And this is easily explained to you. Now, anybody can understand how there's trouble at the end – toward the end of the session. All we've done is flatten the process and then we've overrun the process and then the needle was getting sticky, and the pc is getting very restive, and pc can't find any more answers, and it all seems very stupid and masses are being dragged in on the pc and he's being crushed inexorably under the wheels of Juggernaut, and a few minor things like this might account for the fact that there were some ARC breaks at the end of the session.

And they come out of this area: "Was the process flat for any given twenty minutes in the session?" If it was, why, you yelp.

Now, actually auditors going on noting tone arm reads, noting tone arm reads, noting tone arm reads, just going on down the line, down the line, down the line, sometimes, are so interested in auditing they don't realize that they've written down 3.10, 3.20, 3.10, 3.05, 3.10, 3.20, 3. – . It won't go reading like this long. I mean, it'll now start to do something else. It'll start to climb. You can say that if that goes on for a half an hour – you know, the vast difference of read between 3.1 and 3.15 and it went on for an hour – now you can expect the tone arm to go to 3.5, 3.75, 4.2, 4 – we're getting lots of tone arm motion here, you see? – 4.2, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25, 4.25. They never mention what the needle characteristic is but of course it is rigid as a girder in the Eiffel Tower. Thuuuurh! Chance of reassessing gone! That is exactly what happens along these lines.

You check for that, and then you check the auditor's comments. The next thing you check is the auditor's comments. What's the auditor think about this and find out if the auditor wants any advice. It's whether or not you're going to give him advice gratuitously, whether he asks for it or not, or you found something that you should comment on, or whether or not he
wants advice on the thing, or what progress he's making, and you put down whatever the ad-
judication you have of it.

Now, you can do an awful lot with an auditor's report. It depends to some degree upon
the legibility of the report. Cryptography shouldn't be part of an auditor's report study line. I'm
not good at cryptography. It is much easier for me to come around and read your mind than to
bother with your writing sometimes. But I know that auditor's reports are written hurriedly
and I would rather have an auditor's report which is the original report written at the time of
the session, written during the session. And I don't like copied reports. I don't like a report to
be copied after the session or written after the session. I actually like all the gimmicks and
stuff written during the session. I don't care how many sheets of paper it took, how much
scribble there is to it. Somehow or other it can be made out, because that is a better report
than what you remember after the session. And when it comes to tone arm numbers – copying
tone arm numbers – when you transcribe from a scribbled sheet of note paper over here to a
column, you're liable to make some kind of a mistake.

I like to see the report, as it was written during the auditing session. If it's legible, fine.
But certainly the report that was written during the session, not a copy of the report after-
wards. You'll find out it's much more beneficial.

That is about all you look for.

Now, knowing Scientology as a background of all of this and the various things that
you see that are taking place during that particular session, it doesn't take much of a crystal
ball to find out that this or that or the other thing is taking place during the session. It isn't
very hard to adjudicate that the rudiments are out. Why, I just gave you an example of what I
mean. Karl set no goals at the beginning of the session. Well, he must have felt kind of mug,
you know. I can sympathize with him because I felt that way myself occasionally at the be-
ginning of a session. But usually I didn't think the auditor could audit. I didn't think he was
going to do anything. Why set any goal? You know?

So that's an easy one to adjudicate. You get the idea? You just say, "Well, he's – didn't
set a goal? Poom."

A tone arm – tone arm no action – well, there's something flat.

Tone arm extraordinarily high and stays there and never fluctuates – well, we don't
know. He might be running through a phase of the process; he might be in an awful ARC
break; he might have withholds; he might have a lot of things. But now you get to a point of
adjudication; we don't know what that high tone arm means. There's nothing wrong with hav-
ing a high tone arm. Nothing wrong at all with having a high tone arm. But it can stem from
several things. If a person's tone arm doesn't ever go high, they'd never make any progress.

Remember, that a case that is reading constantly at 3 with a sticky needle, forever at 3
with a sticky needle, will go through 7 before they come down to 3 again, and will spend the
greater part of their auditing career after they get launched in the vicinity of 4 or 5.

You realize that? It's not a matter of trying to keep the pc's tone arm at 2.0 or 3.0. Be-
cause you take someone who's below death and work like mad to keep his tone arm between
2.0 or 3.0, you're going to be spooked all the time, because every time you make a gain he reads 6.5. You make a gain, he reads 1.2.

The other thing is, as you see tone arm reads drop below 2.0, you realize that sooner or later they're going to go all the way around. And as you're following the reports down the line and you see the tone arm has – registers 1.2, it's sort of – somebody has dropped a shoe and you're waiting for them to drop the other shoe. Because that is going to follow sooner or later. If it doesn't follow, the case is not progressing.

I gave Mary Sue one, one night. She was auditing me and she got me to recall something or other, and turned the tone arm all the way from something on the order of 3 through 7, through 6.5 and down to 3 again on the other side. It went on a complete revolution. It just sat there – it went about that fast, see?

Staggered her. She was no good for the remainder of the session. I hardly ... [laughter] The end of the session she told me about this. See, she was stoned. Recall one thing and you get a revolution of the tone arm. All right. This was as fast as she had seen it. But you shouldn't operate on a huge – this is no criticism of what she was doing – but you shouldn't operate on a big withhold from your pc on what the meter is doing. If the pc wants to know what the meter is doing, you let the pc know what the meter is doing.

He asks you what the meter is doing, why, you say, "That's all right," and show him what the meter is doing.

He says, "Well, is that goal still in?" or "Is that modifier still in?" Well, tip the meter over and repeat the modifier and let him see it knock, just once. Don't let him sit there and make a life study of it. But don't deny him information through the session. You see? And sometimes you have to read between the lines because you haven't got all the steps of the auditing session, you don't quite know what's happening in the auditing session, but you sometimes have to look it over from the basis, well, maybe Code breaks and that sort of thing are occurring, or maybe the pc is just being denied lots of information, and so on.

And you only get curious about these things when a pc is doing poorly. Go by this rule: Don't go charging around on a case and throwing smoke into the air ... Well, I can do this once in a while; I think the case could be moved a little faster or something like that. But don't go throwing your weight around on a case that is moving.

If the case is moving it's moving. What means moving? Tone arm action, pcs making their goals, everything seems to be going along and they are making progress.

All right. It's a relatively uneventful picture. It merely means you're getting tone arm action, pcs apparently making their goals, auditor doesn't have any vast questions about it, apparently doing all right. Leave it alone. Leave it alone. Just say, "Fine. Okay. Good. Continue." That's it. You know? Leave it alone.

Tone arm – no action; pc sets ninety-five goals, makes none; we see that the end rudiments took three-quarters of the session, something, you know. Well, actually the thing to do is to get ahold of the auditor or pass him a word or write the report out in such a way that you want information. That's basically what you want. You shouldn't be telling him things to do without some information about it. You want some personal information. The best kind of
information is personal information. You're directing a lot of auditors and you see a report like that and – what the hell, you know? Three-quarters of the session was devoted to the end rudiments. Three-quarters of the session devoted to the end rudiments.

Well, the thing to do is get ahold of the auditor and the pc. It's better to get ahold of the auditor and the pc than just the auditor. Always better, because you can always cross-check the pc. That is to say, you can always put the pc on the meter and you can find out how the pc is going, find out what the pc is reacting to, and so forth.

But this all comes under the heading of checking cases and keeping them running, and I've tried to give you an example here of this – of some of the things I do and look for and think about. I do this every night with your cases, and sometimes I actually miss your presence on deck and I have to sometimes make a wild guess about it. And there you're lying there in bed innocently asleep and so forth. And it's very hard to pick your brains. Very, very hard to do so. And the aura that comes off the auditor's report is usually a bit mucky.

So, the essence of the thing is that cases making smooth progress are the cases that you pay the least attention to. Except to make sure that they go on making smooth progress. What you pay attention to are the hang-ups. And if a case is running well leave it alone. Case is running well, don't change it. If an auditor is auditing a case very well, don't rouse him around. Don't rack him up one side and down the other. See? Lay off.

But if this thing is going by fits and starts, and falling on its face and that sort of thing, well, give them a note on the report but always try to follow it through with some personal information along any communication line which you have about that particular case.

In this particular case, why, most of you whose cases are going badly – auditing somebody whose case is going badly, that is to say – you generally will stop somebody on staff and you will generally tell them all about it. You didn't know that you put a communication line almost directly, straight, dead to Ron whenever you did this. Because that's, of course, what we pay attention to. Want to keep them rolling.

Well, cases can be an awful worry to you. They can be an awful worry. And you get this many cases running all together, it's a case of sometimes holding your breath just a little bit, you know. "Well, is that one coming back on the line or not, you know?" It's like keeping twenty-six plates spinning simultaneously on the end of sticks. Something like this. And they're all different and they all have their peculiarities of operation, but they all follow the same rules.

So I hope what I have given you here might have helped you out at some time. Okay?
All right.
EFFECTIVE AUDITING

A lecture given on 9 November 1961

Thank you. Thank you. This is 9 Nov. – Russian year, 9 Nov. Kapluskov.

I invite your curiosity to the behavior of a needle on the E-Meter. There is only one thing that can make an E-Meter lie, and that is a bad auditor. A bad auditor can make an E-Meter lie.

We had some character running around the States about a year ago and he couldn't read an E-Meter and he was asking everybody if they'd ever been pain-drug-hypnotized. And, of course, each one of these words fell on the meter, he never bothered to compartment the question and it wasn't till I started proving to people conclusively that they had been pain-drug-hypnotized by cats, dogs, mice and so forth, that somebody woke up and said, "What do you know. The auditor has something to do with making an E-Meter read right."

Yeah, he does. And similarly, you cannot get a false goal or a false terminal or a false modifier or anything else on an E-Meter if you know how to run an E-Meter. You just can't get one. You can't push one off on an auditor. You can't receive one. The E-Meter tells you the truth in the matter.

For a number of years we have had difficulty in auditing because auditors were very leery of actually believing an E-Meter. That's because the auditor in practicing his skill uniformly had withholds. And having withholds, of course, he didn't want any withholds off anybody else.

We got a Central Organization right this minute – it's getting all nicely straightened out – but we had somebody in the Central Organization as a – actually, it was an auditor that was auditing staff. Fortunately, it wasn't anybody important. (That's a joke.) And this auditor just kept sitting there and kept sitting there and you know, the needle would knock on a withhold and the auditor wouldn't get the withhold. And finally, why, the staff member was just getting worse and worse and feeling badder and badder about it all.

And so HCO Secretary took a lance out of the umbrella stand, couched it properly, and went at solid charge in the direction of the Association Secretary and said, "What is this?" And the Association Secretary spoke to the Director of Processing, and the Director of Processing mentioned it casually to the auditor. And the next day it went right on happening Why?

Well, that particular auditor and that particular Director of Processing had some mutual withholds from the organization. Not only would the auditor not get a withhold off somebody else, but of course, with her partner in crime involved, the partner in crime would not even force her to get a withhold off somebody else.
So it's, "Let's all be down here in the mud with these nice withholds." That is the motto of all of that. Interesting, isn't it? Whenever you see somebody – I just take this as a forthright thing.

A person refuses a Security Check, they've got withholds, see. A person that won't get withholds off another case has withholds that they have never divulged. This is about the way it looks. I mean, it's quite a technical fact.

This particular HCO Secretary, by the way, had just written me a letter which I received this afternoon begging me to come over here and let somebody give her a one hundred percent run on a Joburg and get all of her withholds off completely so that she would have no diffidence on this particular line and then let her go back and saw into the staff. So that if it started out with just one person with no withholds, you see, this would then get contagious, which was an interesting suggestion. I didn't take her up on it. Because a class member here, very shortly, will be going back to that organization. And they better have all their withholds off by the time they leave and everything will be fine.

You see how this goes, though? You see how this goes? A diffidence is based also on this fact. It is accompanied by withholds because a person wouldn't be this way unless they had withholds. But they are very afraid of what they might hear from the pc.

And when they get very afraid of what they might hear from the pc, they won't ask for withholds. They might hear some gossip about themselves, you see. Well, pcs are always willing to oblige, particularly on an auditor that can't security check well.

You say to the pc, "Well, all right. Now, are you withholding anything?"

"Oh, yes. Yes. I'm withholding the fact that yesterday in a coffee shop, why, I heard three people talking about you, huu-huu-huu-huu. And these people said... and I'm withholding it from you."

The hell he is. He hasn't withheld it yet. There's been a lapse of time of about six hours between the incident and the session. When did he have any time to withhold it? Oh, no. When I hear somebody start that one, I always can get pay dirt. I can always get pay dirt. Because he's about to say, "I heard..."

And I say, "Good. Fine. Thank you very much. Now, let's find out what you have been up to lately."

"Oh, well, that's something else. Ha-ha. Well, no. But I heard. And actually, I won't be able to get in-session, you see, unless I get the..."

"Well, fine. You're in-session. Now, what's the withhold?" [laughter]

Now, you would be utterly amazed how far you can go and what you can get away with in auditing. You invalidate somebody's goal, you invalidate somebody's terminal, you upset somebody on the subject of his auditing progress in some way or another and you deserve to be shot. That's for sure. But – you fail to accept the pc's answers. You do these various things and it's very upsetting to the pc. He feels he can't talk to the auditor and so forth.

But how far can you go within the framework of these rules? Actually, I don't invite you to do such a tactic. But we have been boxing around with a withhold that keeps falling on
an instant read and we can't get it – do you know the pc feels better if the auditor even went as far as, "God damn it, what is it?" [bangs on the table] Do you know that?

The pc says, "Uuuuh! It was a so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

You say, "Thank you. Now, good."

You see? It's the same thing as you would lay hands on a pc if he tried to blow the room. See, the pc feels under control.

Now, you can ask. You can persuade. You can be quite forceful. You don't have to be angry or upset. I'm just giving you an extreme, extreme, extreme example. But you can be very pressing on these things, you know.

"Yes, yes, yes. I know. I know. That's all very interesting, but what did you do?" [bangs on the table with every word]

And the pc says there, "You know, there's some session control around here. By George, you know, I'd better not look up too much because there's liable to be a controlled session going on here."

You have asked a question. You want to know what that fall is, and the pc doesn't give it to you. Now, the pc may not know. May not know. That is the time to be very helpful. Get your help valence on. And you say, "All right. Now, let's just sort this out. You say you don't know what it is. All right. Let's just sort this out." And now you ask a great variety of questions. A great variety of questions.

"Have you stolen anything from the firm?" And we've gotten a knock and the pc says, "I don't know."

All right. Well, let's just try like mad to help this pc sort it out. Let's don't immediately assume the pc is holding out on us and does know, you see. Pc says he doesn't know. He looks puzzled. He looks a little bit upset. He's actually sitting there trying to figure it out.

Now, you're an auditor, and you can tell when somebody's sitting there trying to figure it out. So you help him out. "Stolen something. Well, could it have been property? Could it have been some item? Could it have been some perfectly worthless item? Could it have been some very valuable item? What could it have been?" You see, "How about paper, stationery, stuff like that." You're watching the meter all the time, you see, "Paper, stat.." Pong! Pong! Pong! You say, "What the heck is that?"

"Oh!" the person says. "Oh, yes. I've – I've been customarily taking sheets of paper home and I never realized it was stealing." They could – must have realized they were stealing, you see, or they wouldn't get a knock on the E-Meter. But there it is. And there it is and you say, "Well, what was it?"

"Well, about – it seems like for a long time now I've been taking sheets of paper home. And yes, the first time I did it was a long time ago. I remember I did have a twinge of conscience the first time I did it." You know?

"Yeah. All right," you say, "Good. All right. Now, have you stolen anything from the firm?" Dead. That's it.
Now, that's one proceeding. You see, you're being very helpful, and you compartmentalized the question. You see – you know, you've moved the question around. That is to say, "Have you stolen anything from the firm?" you know? And we find out that it is just "firm" that is falling. "What's this about firm?" You know? "Have you stolen anything?" is null. "What's this about 'firm'? Firm? What is this? Firm? What else about this firm?" You see?

The pc says, "I don't know." You help him out.

All right. There's another point of view about all this. See, there's another point of view.

You say, "Have you been cheating on your girlfriend?" you know.

And pc says, "No."

And well good, and you say, "There's a fall here on the meter. What could that be?"

And he says, "Well, no. Must be false. Must be on something else." Instant read.

And you say, "Well, have you been cheating on your girlfriend?" Bang! Instant read, see.

And he says, "No. Nope."

And you say, "Well, come on. Tell me about it."

And he says, "No, no. There's nothing there. There is nothing there. No, I have not! As a matter of fact I resent your inquiries into it because it's accusative. And you realize the Auditor's Code doesn't permit you to be accusative."

I say, "Well, the Auditor's Code isn't covered by – for the E-Meter. E-Meter isn't bound by it." I say, "All right. Now, tell me all about it now."

"No, I haven't been and so on. And I think it's very mean of you to ask me and actually you're trying to destroy my reputation. And it's probably something I heard about you and ..."

"Now, all right. That's fine. What is this withhold right here about your girlfriend? With whom have you been cheating on your girlfriend? Tell me!"

"Oh, that – it's just nothing. It's no fair. I mean, you're picking on me. Just taking advantage of your position as an auditor."

"All right. Tell me now. I want to know. Who is it?"

"Oh, [sniffs] Isabel." [laughter]

And you say, "Good. Now, do you feel better?"

"Uh, yes. Well, I am. But you really shouldn't be so accusative."

"What else? What other one?" [laughter]

You see, you're justified there at that particular type of withhold because the fellow has gone into a games condition with you. And he doesn't think that you can do anything about it, and that you won't do anything about it. And he knows you're all bound down, and you mustn't dare talk turkey to him, but it requires some sense. You know, it takes some sense...
on your part. It takes an ability to look at the pc and to estimate the situation. And when you estimate the situation, you have to make up your mind, is this just willful heels? Or is this actual confusion or upset or what is this? Or is it the question which is almost on or it's some part of the question that's reacting? Or is this pc just in a fog from something else that has been going on in the session? What is this all about? The rudiments have just gone out crazily or something has happened here. That's for sure. We know something has happened. And as an auditor we go ahead and take care of what happened.

But we cannot say the blanket solution to every time you get a fall on the meter is to ask the question this way, this way, this way and you do it every time and so forth and it's all here in the rule book and so forth. No, no. It requires you. It requires your participation in the session as the auditor. It takes you.

Now, if you developed a nice, calloused dead mask in lieu of TR 0; if you think that a tremendous deadness, a tremendous woodenness, a tremendous, [in a robotic voice] "I will now repeat the auditing question. One, two, three, four. Thank you. Good. Thank you. The next auditing question is –." See. I sneer.

That is taking a refuge back of a ritual. The ritual is for your use, not for your protection. If you need a ritual, why, go to a session with a bulletproof vest on. You'll feel better.

But it's all under the heading of all you've got to do is audit the pc you are auditing and the technology you have is to assist you to do that. The rituals you have is to assist you to do that. Everything in Scientology is to assist you to process the pc.

Now, for you to just throw your bare chest out against the howling north wind and say, "Here I stand all alone, naked and scathed. Me, personally, processing this preclear. Oooooh, that's pretty adventurous. No bulletproof vest, no protective screens, no pat textbook answer to fit every single turn of the road. No." Well, just get brave. That's all. Just get brave.

And sometime, if you ever have a tendency [in a very monotonous voice:] to just follow the ritual and be very wooden about the whole thing and never do anything off-line, and just go on down the line, down the line, down the line and never get curious about what the pc is doing and just sit there and reel it all out and give them the auditing questions and so forth and the needle knocks and you say, "I'll repeat the auditing question," and the needle knocks and "I'll repeat the auditing question," the needle knocks and "I'll repeat the auditing question," the needle knocks and "I'll repeat the auditing question," and the needle knocks. Do you know after a while somebody, including the pc, will begin to believe that time is stuck at that point. You see how that could be? Well, if you find yourself doing that sometime or another, get a brilliant idea: You audit the pc for a moment.

Maybe your rudiments as an auditor are out. But the way to get them in is just audit the pc. Audit that pc in that instant of time that you are covering right that moment. The pc is going "Boo-hoo-hoo, wow-wow-wow. I don't want any more of this. This is too much, and so forth. I can't face it. Now, I just don't remember anything. And it's horrible. And you're just torturing me," and so forth and so on. And there doesn't seem to be a textbook answer to all of this, you know.
All of a sudden sort of relax and look at the pc and look the situation over. Even if it takes a little time. Pc won't forgive it, but that's all right. He won't give anything right now anyway.

And look it over and say, "What is going on?"

And you know, he's liable to tell you. Because you asked him. You see, you asked him. That's different than a ritual question. Just try it sometime. The pc will all of a sudden wake up and sort of come out of it and think it over and then tell you what's wrong. And you go on and you clear the thing and you'll find your session swings right on in.

Do you know that with one single question which is heartfelt and meant by you, you can put all rudiments in just like that? It's an interesting thing, but there is no substitute for a live auditor. There's just no substitute for one. And this is particularly true in Security Checking.

Now, when I say this to you, it opens you up on – perhaps some of you might get the idea that what I mean is that you should be sweet or you should be kind or you should be inviting or something of the sort. No. No, no. There are times for the mailed fist in the auditor's glove, believe me. It might be a time for you to get human as an auditor and express exactly what you're feeling about the thing. And it might put the reality right back into the session.

You maybe have gone as far as this: "Look, Joe, you've been sitting here now for a half an hour giving me motivators. Don't you think it's time you gave me just one little, teensy overt, huh? You know? Don't you think that'd be a better proportion?"

And you know, the pc is liable to think it over and decide you're right and give you one. And it starts the ball rolling.

Now, the odd part of it is, is you can do any of that within the framework of modern auditing. You don't have to throw all the rules away to suddenly become an auditor. Because actually, if you are really auditing, do you know the rules all go into place click, click-click-click-click-click-click-click-click? That's what's interesting about it. The more and better you know your business, the easier it is to apply your trade and the more human you can be.

For instance, I talk to pcs. Oh, there's no doubt about it: occasionally I go too far. They always come up shining at the other end of the session. Sometimes I go too far, that's for sure. "Look, I've only got another half an hour to get this. I'm trying to get your rudiments in. Now, are you going to help me or aren't you?" That's going a little bit too far. See? A guy could be bowled over by that, you think.

"Well, let's just shortcut this whole thing, and you tell me exactly what you think is going wrong right here, right now. Now, what is going wrong right here, right now? What do you think is upset?"

Pc just, "Oh, uh – well, there isn't anything right now. It's what was going wrong."

"All right. All right. Fine. Well, is there anything going wrong now?"

"Well, no. Well, there was something going wrong."
"All right. Let's just lay that aside for the moment and carry on with this Sec Check."

In go the rudiments.

End of session, of course, you have to go back and clean it all up.

You know, the more you sin, the longer it takes you to end the session. You realize that. An auditor always pays for his sins in terms of end rudiments. But do you know that there are times when you pay for your omissions? You didn't commit any sins. You weren't direct enough. You weren't real enough. You were just kind of wobbling around. "Well, have you ever raped anybody? All right. Thank you. All right. I got a fall there. Have you ever raped anybody? It says here. Uh – you – uh – thank you. All right. Have you ever sung in church? Yeah, have you ever sung – have you ever sung in church? All right. Well, we can skip that." [laughter, laughs]

And you know the pc gets the idea that you're not doing anything? He does. Pc does get that idea. He gets the idea that you're not doing a thing. Which I consider quite remarkable in view of the fact that, of course, you're in there industriously!

You know, you're right in there pulling those withholds. You know exactly what's in the bank. You know exactly what the E-Meter's saying, and you know where these questions are going, and you know what you're trying to do with the pc.

Of course, out of such a session, he gets that idea, doesn't he? Never. He says, "Well," he says, "the mice could accumulate in the belfry, and the cobwebs stretch across the door, and not a breath of air would ever stir the dust in this Stygian gloom." [laughter]

He doesn't even restimulate his withholds. [laughs]

Now, of course, you can be far too overwhumping with withholds. I'll show you how you really overwhump a pc. You say, "Well, have you ever sung in church?" No reaction on the meter at all.

And he says, "No."

You say, "Well, have you ever sung in church?" No reaction on the meter.

He says, "No. No, no. I never have. As a matter of fact, I never go to church," and so on.

"Well, have you ever sung in church?"

"Well, no, I ...

And do you know you can have a pc crying and sobbing in no time if you keep that up? Do you know that? You can get the pc actually sitting there shattered. You can make people stammer. You make people so they can't talk. Just with that kind of idiocy.

All right. You say – here's another way to do it:

"Have you ever sung in church?"

Pc says, "Well, yes, I did once." You're adjusting the meter, you see.

"Have you ever sung in church?"
Pc says, "Yes, I did once."

You say, "Good, well, have you ever sung in church?"

"Um ..."

"What is this reading here? Yeah... All right. We're ready to begin now."

Pc says, "Begin? How about this me singing in church?"

"Oh, well, that was just a test question. It didn't have too much to do with it."

You've set up a withhold situation. You have forced the pc to withhold. See, you can Q-and-A with it so you force the pc to withhold. Well, how? By not accepting any of his answers, so of course it's all unintentional withholds.

Now, I wouldn't break out laughing or something when the pc gives you a thing. As a matter of fact, startled once by an auditor who looked all of a sudden – it had all been going – you know – it was the change of pace that did it, you know. All had been going about "Have you ever poured water down a drainpipe? Thank you. Good. All right. Now, have you ever poured water up a drainpipe? Thank you. You know? And have you ever washed any horses? Thank you," and so forth. And "Have you ever stolen any horses?" and so on.

And I said, "Yes, as a matter of fact, I have. Stole a horse, and ..."

The auditor said, "You did ??"

You know, there was this tremendous gleam of interest, you know. It was all going along – knocked me about five feet out of the session. Last thing in the world I ever expected to happen though. Gradient scales are of use. So if you're going to be interested in the pc, be interested in the pc. Don't fade from complete interest to total disinterest to mild interest to vivid, enthusiastic interest to no interest and so forth. If you're auditing a pc, just audit the pc. Because they recognize these things as quite false.

But you, the auditor, have rights too. The pc suddenly comes up with one that is an incredible type of withhold that you've never heard of before. Nobody asked you to put on a death mask at this point, so it startles you. But don't just leave the pc in the dark about this and then try to put on a death mask afterwards, you see.

The pc says, "Yes. Well, as a matter of fact, I rowed a boat up a drainpipe one time." [laughter] You know?

And you say, "You did? Oh, really?"

And the pc says, "Well, yes. What's so unusual about that?"

And you say, "Well, I was just startled. Did you row a boat up a drain pipe? How did you do that?"

"Well, I did this so-and-so and so-and-so and such-and-such and so-and-so and so-and-so."

And you say, "Okay. All right." And he gets the illusion that he has satisfied this startled curiosity. See, because you've got to be satisfied to the degree that you were curious. You
see that those things are direct in their relationship. I mean, if you're going to say, "Nooooo!" you know – well, at least, get your acknowledgment up to that level of enthusiasm, see.

"Well, all right. Hey, what do you know. All right. Okay. I really got that," you know? Pitch your acknowledgment up to match the other, you know.

You say, [in a loud, excited tone of voice:] "You did?? No kidding!" And then say, [in a disinterested tone of voice:] "All right."

Now, the funny part of it is it takes some auditor to make an auditing session. Some auditors have too much auditor there. Now, the way you have too much auditor there, however, is simply distracting the pc's attention, giving him change of pace, startling things, dropping the E-Meter, fixing the cans while you're in session. You know, if an E-Meter goes out on you, just for heaven's sakes, leave it alone. Don't even move it. Don't bother to look at it anymore, but just leave it alone. Do you realize that?

Your E-Meter all of a sudden is out and your E-Meter isn't registering anymore and by the usual movements by which you regulate an E-Meter – usual movements by which you regulate one – you all of a sudden see that is a very, very deadly meter. Don't even move your hand on it. Don't take the electrodes out of the pc's hands. Go on with the session as best you can. That is it. Not another quiver out of you. Do you hear me? That's very important. Much more important than it would appear to be because E-Meters do go out.

Pcs start gesticulating with electrodes. They can pull the plug out. And they can rip the connections up. They can actually break a wire. They can do something of this sort. And if you pay any attention to it ...

Well, let's say the pc just tears up the E-Meter cans, you know. Just rips them up, rips them right out of the sockets and that sort of thing. And he's sitting there with the E-Meter cans and he all of a sudden notices the E-Meter cans are broken and he says, "What's this?" he says, and so on.

Why, just say, "Well, that's all right." And ask him the next question.

"Yeah, but what's this? The E-Meter's busted."

Just take them out of his hand and put them on the floor and go on with the session, you see.

Don't ever fix a meter. Don't fiddle in a session. Don't fiddle with ashtrays, electric fans, windows, doors, that sort of thing. Leave it alone. If you're going to do something about something, end the session. Just go right on into end rudiments, end the session – even though you do it rapidly – and declare a break. And then go ahead and do what you please and adjust the doors and adjust the people rushing up and down the hall and adjust anything you've got to adjust, you see, and come back into session and open up a brand-new session. You'll find that the break, however, is probably more upsetting than the disturbance.

And your fiddling with the E-Meter can cause that tone arm to go up as much as two divisions. All of a sudden you see the meter isn't working, you see, and you get over here and you start cranking it, you know, and you start balancing it and you [fumbles around with meter noisily] [laughter] – it's just about the worst thing you can do to a pc.
Now, how do you run – how do you run a Sec Check? How do you run a Sec Check – if – with a busted meter on a very tough pc who's got lots of withholds and your meter busts and you're busy sec checking like crazy? How do you do this? Well, you don't. That's easy. And you say, "Well, do you think you have any more withholds on that?"

And he says, "Well, so on and so on and so on."

And you say, "Well, we'll look into that. Right now I'd like to run some of your Havingness and Confront. And here we go." And we run some Havingness and Confront and so forth and finish off the session. Or if there's a lot of session to go, we simply end the session, repair or get another meter and complete the Sec Check. But we don't do it in the full flight of a session. We never distract the pc's attention out of the session, see? Just don't do that. Now, you can put the pc's attention on the auditor with an auditor's interest because he realizes this is with him.

The way you knock the pc out is by irrelevancy. You can be as interesting and as interested and so forth as you please, as long as you are relevant to the session and what the pc is doing. Your interest, your pressure, your that, your what, anything of the sort – as long as it's relevant to what the pc's doing, that is fine; you can do almost anything you please. You can actually get up to a shout, you can get down to a whisper, you can be terribly active, you can be very histrionic without really upsetting the pc because it's all relevant to his case. Now, you'll see this I'm sure. What upsets the pc – what upsets the pc – is an irrelevancy to his case. That's all that upsets a pc.

It is not what you do. It is how relevant your actions are. Now, you start doing things which are not relevant to his case – your watch is run down, so you sit there fixing your watch while you audit him, see, and he'll go blooey. He lights a cigarette in spite; you start to light one. Irrelevant. He'll go blooey. Your attention is patently on the E-Meter, not on him. He'll go blooey.

Something wrong with the E-Meter – you see, it's irrelevant. It's on the E-Meter, not his case via the E-Meter. You can inspect an E-Meter all you want to, you see. "Yes, yes. Huh-huh. Yes? Oh, yeah. All right. Uh-huh. Okay. Let's see here. Now, you say so. Are you sure that that is all there is on that question? I'm looking at the meter here. Beware. Now, I'm looking at the meter when you answer that. All right. Have you ever swum up a waterspout? Ha-ha. There it is. Ha-ha-ha. Yeah, ha-ha. There it is. Ha-ha-ha-ha. All right. All right. All right. Now, you tell me about that. You tell me. It was an instant read, too. Come on, come on, come on. Come on." Never affect a pc. Never in a million years. He'd say, "Ooooh, you know. Waterspout. I did. I did. I did swim up a waterspout and so forth. I did, oh gosh."

"Hoo? When was that? When was that? It's right here. Come on. Come on. Come on. Come on." "Oh. If it says there – it must be there. I wonder what it is and so forth."

"Now, come on. Don't kid me about it. Now, don't monkey with it because I want to know right now. Right now. Come on. Give me it. Now, what is that?"
I'm not giving you this as a model. I'm giving you this as rather corny auditing. It won't upset him – do all of that.

You say, "Well, let's see. What's the meter reading here? I mean, what's the matter with the tone arm? Uh-oh, uh-oh, uh-oh." Next thing you know the tone arm is reading at 5. And you say, "How did it get there?" Well, it got there because your attention was on something else rather than the pc. His terminal demands attention and the only thing a pc will not forgive is not getting any attention from the auditor. And the auditor could practically dance a jig as long as it was relevant to the pc's case.

The pc said, "Well, we used to have these dances, you know. We used to go up and down the temple floor," (this would be horribly corny auditing) and the auditor can get up and say, "Like this? Or like this?" And sit down in the chair again, and the pc would be quite fascinated and say, "Well, it was actually like that. It was actually like that first one you did."

Yeah, and he'd go right on talking and telling you about it and so forth.

But the auditor has danced a jig. See? It isn't what you do in a session. It is how relevant it is to his case. As soon as you learn that, you can shed a few shackles in auditing. You can feel a little less braced, a little less plaster of Paris auditing, you see. "If I twitch my left cheek a little bit, the plaster of Paris will crack. I mustn't permit my eyeballs to dilate more than an eighth of an inch because that's proper TR 0."

I'm sure you could do all that like an Indian. Some of the schools in India practicing hypnosis can stop or start blood from flowing from a cut vein. You know, I heard about that in America one time and I was absolutely fascinated. Absolutely fascinated. In Chicago, they rounded up every doctor in Chicago who even – was inspecting an Indian who could make blood start and stop flowing from his veins. It's marvelous. He could make the blood do this.

But what was fascinating is that America didn't know it could be done. I didn't ever know it couldn't be done. You see, you can get several sides to every opinion. See, I was real startled because I didn't know it couldn't be done.

Now, you're similarly going to get startled someday at the fact that you ever had any trouble with auditing. You know? "What? You know, I had some – I was nervous about it or I was upset about it or I was diffident about it and so on. It's rather nonsensical." And you feel quite natural while you're auditing.

Drink a cup of coffee; audit. I mean, no more effort either way, because you gradually learned what you can get away with and what you can't get away with and you feel perfectly comfortable because that's it. And you say to the pc, "What you think?" As long as it's relevant to his case and isn't a challenge to him. You know, an invalidation.

It's pretty rough on a pc when an auditor starts in on him on the basis, "Well, you've been a creep all of your life. How can you expect to level with me now?"

That sounds awful rough, you know. "Have you ever done one decent action in your whole life? Now, tell me. Have you? Have you? Have you ever? Just one. Tell me one, one, one decent action you've done in your whole life. So you see, you can't." [laughter] "All right. Now, let's get the withholds off." That'd be awful rough on a pc, wouldn't it?
Well, get your order of magnitude. Do you know that it's ten times as rough on the pc for you to get rattled about your E-Meter and start fiddling with your meter as for you to do that? Get your perspectives in. Why? Because any crack you make at the pc, believe it, is attention. That is attention for the pc. You're interested in him.

And do you know that some pcs won't believe you and -- well, Susan Hayward, for instance, hated me like poison for a long while, years, until one night I was in a particularly vicious mood. And she brought up some picture. Her husband was sitting there and her husband looked at me. And he'd warned me never to flatter this girl about her acting or anything. She was very upset about it. And I was feeling in a very vicious mood and said it stunk. The last one I'd seen -- you know, almost that bluntly, you know. It stunk.

And she said, "What did you think was wrong with it particularly?"

And I said, "You were false."

You know, she was my friend forever afterwards? She knew I was sincere. She knew I was sincere. That was her whole measure of whether or not somebody was her friend. An enemy is somebody who flatters you. A friend is somebody who criticizes the living daylights out of you.

We've had people around occasionally -- one or two guys around -- and all I would do would just give them a studied insult. I'd never say hello to them. I would say, "Well, I see somebody has left a door open again." And they'd get this immediate sensation: "He understands me." [laughter]

This sounds mad, doesn't it? But these are acceptance level. Remember the old acceptance level? And a person who's in grief will accept a sad remark. And a person who is in degradation will accept the degrading remark. The only reality is the reality of the Tone Scale on which they're sitting.

Well, nobody asked you to compromise your reality. I'm just calling to your attention that it isn't so much what the auditor does, it is whether or not the auditor is being effective with his attention relevant to the pc. Is he being effective with his attention relevant to the pc's case? And that is all a pc ever demands of an auditor -- that he's effective and that his attention is relevant to the pc's case. And that's what, basically, an auditor violates when he gets in trouble with the pc.

He's sitting there woodenly. He's asking questions disinterestedly. His attention is on something else. The pc is aware of the fact that the auditor has an appointment at three o'clock. And that it's getting toward three o'clock. And that the auditor has a present time problem. And the auditor keeps glancing toward the door and looking at his watch.

Oh, man, if you want to form some ARC breaks, the whole pattern of ARC breaks is actually totally on the basis of the pc ceases to believe that the auditor's attention is relevant to his case. And that is the whole background of ARC breaks. There is no other background.

Now, we're up there. If you remember the Philadelphia lectures, the highest level is conviction. All right. Well, right up there, that is above agreement. That is above communication and mechanics, and so forth. That is a belief. The pc must stay convinced that the auditor
is interested in auditing him and interested in auditing his case, and auditing his case. Not necessarily interested – at that point of the Prehav Scale – but just auditing him effectively. And the auditor's attention is on the pc. And as soon as that has been achieved by the auditor, he gets no more trouble with rudiments. But it's something to achieve. And it is not anything very arduous to accomplish. I assure you it's not arduous to accomplish. It's very easy to accomplish. The first requisite is if you know enough about the mind and if you yourself have enough reality on its mechanics, then you are never debarred by the mystery of it all.

The pc doesn't look to you like a big mystery. He only looks to you like something that can be resolved. You want to know the ramifications of the thing so that you can do something about it.

But if you yourself know the basics of how his mind operates, you aren't backed off to a point where it's all just a total mystery and you go into a disinterest. If you know the actual mechanics of how he operates, you know that he has engrams, you know he's got a time track and you know he's got circuits and he's got valences and you know these various mechanics, you know how he responds to these, you know the overt act-motivator phenomena, you know about goals terminals, you know about these various things; you can look at somebody, they're doing something, well, you can understand what they're doing. It must have something to do with some of these. Well, this brings you immediately close enough to an understanding of the pc to form an ARC with the pc. It's an ARC that's formed. But it's formed by your understanding of the generalities of his difficulty. He has a generality of difficulty.

Now, your attention and interest is on the particularity of his difficulty. The specific parts that refer to him out of your knowledge of the general picture the pc presents. If you were comfortable and ... If you can go down the street and you see somebody gimping along and you know he's gimping along and he's having an awful time there, and he seems to have a great big bandage on his right foot, you know; an uninformed person looks at him and says, "Somebody has injured his foot." You look at him – and don't tell me you don't because I know that you do – you look at him and you know that he's kicked somebody or he's stamped on somebody's toes at some time or another, you see.

You know the basic mechanic – the overt-motivator sequence – and he couldn't possibly have a bunged up foot unless he was a specialist in bunging up feet. See? Therefore, you aren't invited into a supersaccharine sympathy about it at all, but if the fellow were to say to you, "You know, I got an awfully bad foot," you would be very happy to do something about his foot, you know. Even if it was just, "Look at my fingers," you know, and throw some somatics around for him. Why go through the histrionics of, "All right. How did you hurt your foot?"

"Well, foot was run over by an automobile wheel, and it's been very bad, and so forth."

You say, "All right. Stand there and kick an automobile wheel. Thank you. Kick an automobile wheel. Thank you. Kick an automobile wheel. Thank you."

You got some twenty-five percent chance of just knocking it out. Just like that, see? Twenty-five percent. You know, it's a small percentage, but you'll get your percentage. That's for sure.
Give him a Touch Assist. Do this and that. You can do lots of things about this foot. All right. If you can do things about the foot, then you aren't in awe of this foot and you also can be interested in the foot without getting totally interiorized into the horrible mysteries of the foot and how horrible it was that he got this terribly bad foot. And how could he possibly have gotten this foot? Isn't it terrible of the police department to drive the police van right straight across this man's foot. And we ought to change the government, shouldn't we. See, you're not off to the races here; you know exactly what's wrong with the man's foot.

You say, "What's it feel like?"

And he says, "Well, it just – it feels like it's in a boot, you know. It just feels like it's in a great big boot, and it's not, you know, but it feels like it's in a great big lead boot." [laughs] Well, that communicates to a Scientologist. It doesn't communicate to him. You're in the favored position of knowing far more about it than he does.

Now, knowing that, actually, that alone – just without your saying anything or doing anything – that you know about that reflects immediately. It forms a superiority on your part where he is concerned.

You don't have to do anything from that point there on. Somebody who understands life can talk about life, and other people know that he understands life even though they don't know what he's saying, which is a great oddity. Very possibly, some of you at one time or another have been overheard in a discussion with somebody or other and had somebody sort of looking at you kind of... [laughter]

Well, they don't really know what you're saying, and they don't really understand you maybe, but they certainly know that you know what you're talking about.

I had a fellow on an airplane one time, some big company executive, and somebody was chattering to me, some four-striper in the navy. And I was giving him very banal replies. I was not trying to impress him even vaguely. And this fellow sitting across from us, he all of a sudden – it was in the bar – and he was getting very interested and so on. The guy next to him started to get very interested and they said something to each other. And there were three or four people there, four or five people there on the other side. And they'd get talking to him and they'd look over. They were listening to this conversation. They were absolutely fascinated. We weren't talking about anything that had anything to do with the price of fish as far as I was concerned. But this four-striper had problems and all I was doing was giving some offhand advice. You know, hardly anything to bother with. I was trying to explain to him a few little minor things, you know.

And these guys were looking at this, you know. They didn't understand what that was all about, but they knew somebody knew something about a life over there. And finally, one of them, as he left, "Say," he says, "who are you?"

And I laughed at him and went on back to my seat. Left him in a total mystery. [laughter]

But this sort of thing communicates to the pc. Because you're outside the pc's bank and are not being influenced directly by the pc's aberrations, he of course recognizes – even
though you're equally trained – he recognizes that you *could* know more about what he's doing than he does. See, he recognizes this instinctively. It's true, you see.

Now, when you – equally trained or better trained or worse trained or anything else – are there and you are not looking and you are not interested in doing something about it in a session, that itself is an ARC break. Just like that, see. He's been cut. He realizes that you with your skill could get right on down there to the bottom of the pile and pull that bottom overt and there'd be a clinkety-clank of breaking glass all over the place. And you don't do it.

Well, actually it wouldn't matter how you did it as long as you did it. And it's quite interesting. As long as you did it – that's the only thing which he doesn't forgive is not doing it. That he won't forgive. People do not forgive no auditing. People do not forgive being ineffective. They just don't forgive these things.

The best answer for it is to audit the pc yourself and always to some slight degree be effective. Now, you've got enough tools and weapons now to be effective to the end of your days. I mean, you never catch up with the human race with how much you know now. I mean, the human race would never catch up with you. I mean, God 'elp us. There's two billion five hundred million pcs out there right this minute.

There are wise men all over India. There are hakims and sad apples and Sufis and bug-jumps and jujus and AMA doctors, and bums and tramps amongst the witchcraft and so on, medicine men amongst the Indians, all this sort of thing. And not one of these experts knows as much as you do about mind or about life. Not one of them. You give them cards and spades and still whip them every time. Medical doctor says, "Well, there's something wrong. Every time this fellow – every time we examine him, he sits there and he starts to tremble and so forth. And he starts to tremble every time they examine him. And I wonder what this is. Is this a locomotor nerves in the *pocomocus* and so forth? And shouldn't we operate and snap a couple of tendons or something here in order to keep him from going this way, and so on." You listen to some of the wildest balderdash.

Well, he's being the expert. It's quite remarkable. You are diffident about it because you're so schooled to believe that he's the expert, so schooled to believe that the man is interfering.

If you'd have walked over to him, slightly in his lingo and said, "The man's suffering from a psychic trauma. He probably has some reaction to an examination. Ask him if he's ever been an examiner."

And the medico says, "What?"

Oh, but he says "What" very interestingly. You must have said something there. He's liable to be kind of nervous about you, too. You know? But a different – entirely different – atmosphere than what you would expect would arise from the situation, because he knows he is talking to somebody who knows. And that can't be missed. It isn't how you hold your pinky. It isn't how you balance the saucer on the end of your nose. It's just whether or not you know.
And your confidence and skill, of course, is in direct ratio to your certainty of knowledge. You know these things are true. You know they are true, and that's it. You've had it. You sit down in an auditing chair. You look at the pc. He feels this.

And the only other thing the pc demands is attention on his case, not on something else. You start telling that pc sitting in the auditing chair about your case, you're going to form one of the wildest ARC breaks you ever heard of. Try it sometime. Pc sits there in an auditing session and you say, "Well, that reminds me of an auditing session I had once." And you talk about a totally dissimilar action to anything you're undertaking, see – and anything – has nothing to do with his case whatsoever. And carry on for about twenty or thirty minutes in that wise.

Man, if you can get the rudiments back in, in end of session, I'll tell you I'll give you a medal. It's – it's marvelous. And yet you actually have been very polite. You've been very kind. You're trying to reassure the pc. Anything you could put it down to, you see. It still wouldn't make any difference because it violates this little rule.

You've got to be effective, and your attention has got to be on the pc's case. That's all he demands. He'll even forgive tremendous numbers of things if you do those things. He'll forgive things all over the place. He'll forgive dropping the ashtray and everything else. He'll forgive running the wrong process 895 hours even, if you all of a sudden start running the right one on him.

Aw, you haven't seen anybody particularly ARC broke about suddenly bringing up modifiers. I don't think anybody's been cursing about it. I felt a tiny bit chagrined about it that it's taken me some months to find out that there were tails and middles and beginnings on some of these goals, you see, that was holding them up. I know right now why Clears go unclear so suddenly. Just a modifier clicks, just like that. They're all cleared up, but there's that little tag end of disappeared modifier and it has enough charge on it to make the case charge up again.

Well, how do you patch up a Clear who has been Clear and then who has this charge. All you've got to do is go back and clip out the modifier that has been hung up there. This has been quite a mystery because a certain percentage of Clears lapse.

One down in Durban the other day, perfectly Clear, checked out Clear, everything was beautiful, and so forth. Went outside and BOW! You see, the bank falls in. She reads stiff on the meter. The meter up to 5. You know, all just blwaaaaah! Everybody down in Durban being terribly reasonable about it, see.

They're saying, "Well, all right. Let's see, the – the pc couldn't confront the environment, cleared on the first dynamic, ability to postulate, caved themselves in and so forth. And maybe after this, why, the pc was feeling bad about being a Clear and was self-conscious about it and so on. And that caused the environment to do so." See, all the figure-figure going on, see. Some auditor has just been handed a lose. Fortunately, why, the Marines were landing right at that moment. Halfway between here and South Africa at that moment was 7 November 61 bulletin. See, all they got to do is get hold of this girl and say, "All right now. Let's see. First goal you were audited on was to sew socks. Fine. Let's find the rest of it. To sew
socks and... What's the rest of it? Go ahead and complete the sentence. Go ahead. To sew socks and... Good. Complete the sentence now."

"And fill them full of holes. Oho. Yeah."

You know, your needle goes bang, you know.

Now, you say, "What was the goal to sew socks?"

Bang! Big surge.

"All right. Full of holes." Tick.

"All right. To sew socks." Tick.

"All right. Full of holes." Gone. Gone. Gone. And just take each goal they've had right on up the line, bring those tails and middles off of the thing and so forth and they'd settle out straight. Interesting, huh? Might take a little more patch-up work or something like that because it was such a shock to them to go Clear and then un-Clear so fast with the missing link. We've really found the missing link now, haven't we? Yeah.

Anyway, I don't know. Maybe somebody around here said, "Gee whiz. Well, I audited on the wrong goal all of these hours."

No, you didn't. You were on the same goals chain and so forth. But I'm much more interested in your case than I am in my face. And you know that. So you've taken much worse than that from me. But people get upset about my building fireplaces and buying ships. Why? [laughter] You see? It adds up.

Makes a little ARC break. They don't know that I do that on my time. They don't think I have any time. And it's true. I don't. All I have to do is tell them, however, all the time I'm fixing up ships, I'm thinking about cases. [laughs]

And only if that were true, however, only if it were true, would that wipe even that away, you see. You see why this is?

All right. A pc can form a considerable amount of ARC with an auditor. And the ARC, according to some schools of thought, even in Scientology, is only formed by sweetness, kindness and nice, humoresque on the Stradivarius. You can make a pc hate you with that. You're always sweet and kind and understanding and never effective. The pc is going out of control. The pc knows he's going out of control. And you're sweet and kind. I never had a pc in-session so much – or actually ever had any ARC with one pc so much – as I did after I had practically picked her up by the nape of the neck and carried her across the room and set her down in a chair with a terrible thud. With a real thud.

I said, "Let's not have anymore of that right now. Now, pick up the cans." You know, the pc tried to blow. The pc was not ARC broke. This all registered on the basis of: "Hey, you know, he really means to audit me. He really means what he is doing. He's not kidding. What do you know! Hey! What do you know!"

Now, the reason student auditing is often slow is because everybody is studying auditing at the same time they're doing auditing. So all of the auditors could come into the category of "just auditing me in order to learn and practice." So that would modify the definition "ef-
effective and interested in my case," see. They could be effective and not interested in the case and have a hard time keeping rudiments in. You see how that would modify it?

"Well, whatever we've been learning lately has nothing to do with it. What do you think has happened here that you have a tone arm up at 6? Well, just what do you think happened? Well, how come your tone arm went up to 6. It's been stuck here for about two weeks."

He says, "Well, I don't know. I don't know. Taken off the process suddenly, and – and I guess – or something – I don't know. Really. It's true though. I felt different for the last two weeks."

"Now, how have you felt different? And what have you been doing now that's different?"

"Well, I've just felt different and so forth."

"All right. Well, anything went on two weeks ago that you were in violent disagreement with in some kind or another? Were you in a fight with somebody around or something happening and so forth?"

Well, we all of a sudden find a postulate that they're going to keep the rudiments in now, and they're not going to let the rudiments go out so that they can be properly assessed and so that they can go Clear and get out of here. And nothing is going to affect them in any way whatsoever.

Ah, but they give this up to somebody, you see. They give this up to an auditor who is asking about them. Asking about them individually. Not as an example to something else. You know, the fellow wants to know, and he asks them.

I am actually maybe opening the doors on the hordes of hell because an auditor can use this as an excuse just to do anything in a session. You can practically do anything in a session as long as you're effective and interested in the pc's case and your attention is on his case and what you do is relevant to the solution of his case.

Now, that tells you that if you really want to chop up a pc and get the pc overwhelmed, use an auditing session to secure an advantage over the pc. Ah, that's not being effective, is it? And it's not really being interested in the pc's case but interested in using the pc's case. And even though the pc'll go into a kind of a thralldom thereafter, and so forth, man, they're really never quite on your side. You have a hell of a time with them.

So some auditor carelessly goes and sleeps with his pc. "Aw," he says, "well, this will make good ARC." [laughter] Great day in the morning. It'll make good ARC all right. Why didn't he cut his throat. I mean, as far as the auditing session is, it's finished. He's not going to get any auditing done. Not after that. It's quite interesting, isn't it? Because it violates this idea. He's not interested in the pc's case. He's interested in the pc's body. Well, that's not being much interested in the pc.

Women can actually figure it out so that if you're interested in their body, why, you're interested in them. They actually will put this together and make a mishmash out of it. But it
won't work with them in an auditing session. You can always tell a girl going along, "You look very pretty today."

That's fine, she may accept this, she may not. But she thinks of that as complimentary. And of course it is. But in an auditing session, if you sat there and described to them what a pretty body they had and how nice they were to look at, and how well dressed they were, they'd go some little distance with this. Then all of a sudden, it'd suddenly go bzzzzzzzt. And you couldn't quite figure out why it went bzzzzzt. Of course, a body isn't a case.

You're an auditor. Therefore, what you're doing isn't effective. All things just boil down to that. Every skill that you have in an auditing routine – Sec Checking, your elements of Model Session, Problems Intensive, it doesn't matter which or what of these you're practicing, has of course a certain form. This form rather guarantees interest in the person's case. It rather guarantees that. Don't let it ride on automatic because now it sort of compounds the felony.

The ritual is interested in the pc's case, but the auditor isn't. And I think you've seen that, haven't you. The ritual is interested in the pc's case. Well, then, the auditor looks kind of funny, you know.

The auditor asking if it's really all right if he does so-and-so, and the auditor doesn't care whether it's all right if he does so-and-so. And it makes a kind of a lie. And the pc gets weird unreality about the whole thing. No, what you have to do is be interested in the pc's case and determine to do something effective about it. And then, through the media of the ritual and E-Meter, you give him the auditing commands. That's all.

That's – those things serve – they are secondary. They're a very vital secondary. You shouldn't come off of them and so forth. But unless they're backed up, they're as empty as sounding brass in the tinkle of the temple bell. They are nothing.

And in Sec Checking, if you don't get to the pc as an auditor, if the auditor does not become visible or real to the pc, no withholds knock. How do you like that? A little voice in the far distance is saying, "Well, have you ever swum up a waterspout?" Doesn't mean anything to the pc. Nobody there. "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" the little voice says in the far distance. Hasn't anything to do with him. It's not restimulative.

All right. But the auditor is real to him. He knows the auditor is there. He has an idea that there is somebody auditing him and that this person is going to be effective and is interested in his case. Now, it doesn't much matter what the fellow does – what the auditor does at that juncture – as long as it satisfies those points.

He can say, "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" And he can get some knock on the E-Meter. But if he's got good presence, he says, "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" And the – you get a pretty good fall on the meter. You don't get a fall on the meter in direct ratio to the volume of your voice. You get a fall on the meter in direct ratio to your reality to the pc.

So I look at a pc sometimes and I ask him very softly and quietly and so forth, if they have ever swum up a waterspout or sung in church or some other crime. And the needle falls off the pin. I turn it over to somebody; they don't even get a knock. And this is true of assess-
ment. I assess somebody, the needle falls off the pin. Turn it over to somebody to check out. It's gone. It's nulled. But that's because nobody is asking him. It's no more mystery than that.

Now, your presence is as poor in the pc's opinion as you have to keep the rudiments in. An auditor has a direct self-criticism mechanism. Your presence is as poor – not as much as the pc objects to you. That's all balderdash.

The auditor is as real and has as much presence to the pc as the rudiments stay in and has as little presence as the rudiments go out. Because you're using terribly powerful forms. Terribly powerful commands. Very challenging questions, all said from a nobody there. See, there's nobody saying these things. There is no presence delivering these things. And these tremendously overwhelming forms are being thrown at the pc from a nowhere. He hears the words, you know, but there's no music. It's the auditor that's the music that goes along with it. He hears it, but it doesn't mean anything to him. Actually, it can be disturbing to him.

He has just gotten through robbing a whole peach orchard. He knows it was a crime. He not only robbed the orchard, but as he went through the thing he broke off all branches. And then he didn't want the peaches for anything; he fed them to the pigs and the whole herd of pigs died. You know, I mean, this is quite an overt, as we stack it up. And it's all very complicated and intricate of some kind or another. And from a nowhere, he hears, [in a bored voice:] "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard?" See? "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard? Have you ever robbed – ?" It's hard to get that disinterested, you see. "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard?"

Yes, he's robbed a peach orchard and he's scared about it, too. Nothing matches here. There's nobody really interested and you don't get much of a knock on the needle. It doesn't restimulate it at all.

But when you, a living being, a living presence, look at him right in the thetan and you say to him, "Have you ever robbed a peach orchard?" Oh, oh, somebody is knocking on the door. He has a suspicion that he should answer that one. He just better answer it. He just better answer it. And your Sec Checking, goals finding, levels finding, speed of delivery, all become very easy on these bases.

Problems Intensive – you say, [in a faint, bored voice:] "Well, have there been any self-determined changes in your life? All right. That's fine. All right. List the self-determined changes in 1956 and so on, so on, so on. All right. Now, we're going to assess these changes. All right. 1952 change, well, bought a new hat, in 1952 you bought a new hat. And 55 you bought a new hat and 61 you bought a new hat and so forth. And you're going to buy a new hat. And that's the changes in your life."

And you come around and you say, "You know, there's no changes in this person's life?" No? You got the volume of change to the direct volume of auditor. They're "matchly" tuned. The quality of your auditing was buying a new hat, see. Get the idea? You mean, your presence was so faint on the line.

All right. Now, you're interested in it. You're being effective. You're right in there pitching. You want to know about this thing and you say to the pc, "All right. What self-determined changes have you had in your life?"
And the pc says, "Well, what do you mean as self-determined change?"

"You know. You make up your mind to change. Now, how many times has that happened to you in your life, do you suppose?"

"Well, quite a few."

"All right. Now, tell me one of them. A self-determined change in your life. Self-determined. That you decided to change. Now, tell me one. All right. Tell me one now. All right."

"Oh, and it's – yeah, yeah. Well, there's so-and-so, and I decided I couldn't stand my mother-in-law anymore and shot her. Yes. That's a change. And other changes, and I decided this, and I decided to bathe only in borscht." [laughter] "Yes, I've always been mystified about that one."

And you get a wild list. And you get it rapidly. Now, of course, the bank, the pc's bank, is quite responsive to your auditing and is responsive to your presence. And you can handle it, of course, to the degree that you are handling it. You're real to the pc, you can handle his bank. It's odd that you can handle his bank better than he can. And this is what he means by being effective.

So when you never order his bank around, you're sunk. He doesn't think you're auditing him. Nothing happens. You sit there, irresponsible about the whole thing, bang! Nothing happens.

But you say to him, "All right. Now, are there any more self-determined changes in your life?" You're looking at the E-Meter. It doesn't knock. "All right. That's fine. That's the end of the list." It's that easy.

All right. "Are there any more self-determined changes in your life?" is asked.

"Well, are there any more self-determined changes in your life?" It doesn't fall. Couldn't be any more.

And with just a little more presence, just a little more interest, "Are there any more?" And it restimulates and you've got another one. You get the idea?

The more presence you have, the more you get out of the pc. It's quite interesting as a mechanism.

Now, your deadpan auditing asking a pc – or accepting withholds that don't fall, by the way, is one of the wildest things you can ever do. The pc tells you the withhold. And you see this, and nothing happened. Nothing happened to the needle. Nothing happened to the tone arm. This must be about the flattest question there is. You ask him again. Ask him the question again just for form's sake to get off the question. "Have you ever swum up a waterspout?" No. It's null. Off of it. On to the next one.

But you sit there and use auditing form to demand answers to your auditing questions and you'll get all sorts of created universes. Now, the trick is be effective, you see. Only ask for withholds when you see that they are there. Only start pressing when they're obviously there. Only start getting frantic and histrionic when you just can't get them off and it's quite...
obvious that the pc is sitting there with a clenched jaw with his hands locked behind him, won't touch the E-Meter cans and says, "Don't you dare ask me that question again."

Well, what would you do at that point? Well, whatever you do. Do it effectively. If that's your signal for throwing your auditor's pad down on the floor and say, "God damn! I've had just about enough. Are you going to answer it or aren't you?"

If that's what you think you should do at that point and that's the only way you can possibly conceive that you would get an answer to it, why, by all means do it. Because you've come to that impasse situation, don't you see?

Or if it's down to this basis, "Oh, come on, George, come on, come on, George. You can answer it. Come on. Come on. You can tell me. You can tell me. Come on. Come on. It's all right. It's okay. You can tell me."

[through the teeth:] "I don't know if I can tell you or not."

"Aw, come on. Come on. It's all right. Just tell me, and we'll get onto the next question. Huh? Just tell me and we'll get right on to the next question."

"Well, all right. But something tells me I shouldn't." He gives you the withhold. Clean it up the rest of the way, he's back in-session again. But the way to get a pc in-session is to audit him. And that sounds like one of these horrible truisms. There is no way of talking a pc into session. There is no way of wheedling him into session. There is no way of pleading him into session. The way to put a pc into session is audit him. Audit him. Be effective. Put your attention on what he's doing, what he's thinking about and so forth.

You know, a pc would even forgive something as corny as this: "Now, just sit there and shut up for a minute and let me think. Let me think. You presented me here with a rough one and I'm not quite sure which way I'm going on the thing. So just be quiet for a moment and let me figure this out. Shut up now!" [laughter] "Hm. Well, Jesus, you got a rough case." [laughter, laughs] "All right. This is what I'm gonna do, see." And lay something down. I mean, that's awful corny. But a pc would accept it because you were trying to do something about this situation. Pc would sit there for an hour waiting – you figure out something about his case. [laughter] It's actually true.

But beware of mechanical distractions of all kinds. And it's by definition. What is a distraction? Well, a distraction is something that is not relevant to the pc's case and is ineffective. And that serves as a distraction. If you want to knock a pc into a cocked hat in a minor sort of a way, all you have to do is find a very effective process on him, ask him about three questions of that effective process and then change the process.

You're obviously being ineffective. Because he knows the process is effective. He can feel this thing bite. He can feel the fangs go straight in, see. And you've asked him three questions, and you say, "Well, what is not known about a ruddy rod?" And the meter goes bong! and the tone arm swings.

And, "Ooooooh, I don't know if I could ask that. I don't know if I could answer that. I wouldn't ever ask anybody that. What is unknown about a ruddy... Oh, boy! Ooooh. Ooooo. Uh-uhuhuhuhuhuhuh mmmmmmmmmmmmmmm. Got a somatic."
"All right. All right. Okay. I'll repeat the auditing question. Now, what is unknown about a ruddy rod?"

"Well, it's a uhhhh. Uhhh, its length." See?

"All right. What is unknown about a ruddy rod?"

"Mmm. Mmuuuuuuh-kroooow!"

And you ask three questions with that response, and then you say, "Well, I think we'd better get on to auditing your terminal now."

See, it violates that part of the definition of what is auditing in being totally ineffective. This thing is biting like crazy, you see. He's getting action, action, action. And all of a sudden, here you go.

Now, unless you could demonstrate to him that the next process was about three times as effective as the one he was just running, you're sunk. You know, pcs will sit around and mourn about having been audited in 1954 by something or other, and they were run on a process of "Jump over the moon. Thank you. Jump over the moon. Thank you. Jump over the moon." And they really knew that one. It was never flattened, and it really bit. And nobody has ever flattened the process.

And it'll come up session after session after session. You ask for ARC breaks. "When was the first time you had an ARC break?" And they go back to this unflattened process. It isn't the process was unflat. It was that the auditor was being ineffective.

The auditor shifted off an effective process to an ineffective process, and the pc practically never forgives it.

Now, if you think of auditing as an activity concerned with deportment, well, you'd have something vaguely true. It's vaguely true. Yes, it has something to do with deportment. Ladies shouldn't put their heels on mantles while they're being auditors in the auditing chair. There's various things you shouldn't do. You should wash your teeth before you process a pc. At least, wash your teeth once in a while and so forth. And if you don't change your socks often, why, don't take off your shoes and put them in the pc's lap. [laughter]

There's various little courtesies of this character that one should follow. But you notice that they're all irrelevancies to the pc's case and your being effective. That's what makes them irrelevancies, and that's what makes them bad. It's not codes of deportment that makes them bad. It's whether or not they're relevant to the pc's case.

Now, you lay it down to the pc that you're going to audit the pc, he expects some auditing. The pc can be absolutely screaming in a session, just practically screaming, and wind up at the end without hardly any ARC break at all, as long as the auditor was totally effective all the way through the thing. And as long as it just wasn't ARC breaks and irrelevancy that were causing the screams, you know.

Pc says, "Uuuuuh. These bullets are going by and -- oh, wait a minute, wait a minute. You shouldn't be running this process at all. You shouldn't be running this process because you've got bullets going by! Bullets! They're real live bullets in this thing!"
AND YOU SAY, "GOOD. FINE. ALL RIGHT. LET'S HAVE ANOTHER BASKETFUL OF THEM."

[LAUGHTER]

He can think of you as being the most cruel, heartless person he ever heard of and say so, but if you want an ARC break, turn kind at that moment. Become ineffective at that moment and you have a honey. That ARC break will be catastrophic and it'll be hard to find, too, because it's obvious that you did the right thing. You didn't. You became ineffective.

The way out is the way through. The pc was walking in the shadow of death and you, by golly, didn't keep shoving him along. And you said, "Okay. There you are. We will all gather round, brethren, and will sing this hymn." [laughs] It had nothing whatsoever to do with his case, you see. Buuuuuuh!

So you're damned if you continue and you might try to figure your way out of it this way: "Let's see, I'm damned if I go on and so forth. And he'll just get worse and worse and so forth. Maybe I ought to stop because it's too painful." Well, of course, that's just totally ineffective. The only way out is the way through.

No, regardless of how rough it gets, you've got to ride it on through to the other end. There's where your judgment comes in. Run a process that is the proper process that is the right process and runs the pc through as smoothly as possible and you don't get to these points of judgment where you say, "Well, oooooooo, is it better to kill him or cure him at this point?" You really don't come across those things if you're auditing straight and your processes are all right and you're auditing goals terminals and Problems Intensive and doing what you should. It's easy.

Now, in your auditing, then, the one sin which I adjure is not auditing. It all boils down to that. That's the only sin that you can pull.

Now, if a pc is demanding that you audit the pc, you can say no unless you start, see. You can say, "No, no, I'm not going to audit you. I don't want to give you any more auditing I'm – very full schedule, and I can't do anything about it." Well, you'll get some ARC break. That's right. You'll get a mess, a bit. But if you start auditing him and stop, then that becomes absolutely fantastic because you've got the pc in-session and what you're doing now is irrelevant to his case. So you're sunk.

No, deportment begins and ends on the one question of: is there auditing taking place. If auditing is taking place, gains are being made and so forth, then the deportment must, by definition, be perfect.

Thank you.
Thank you.

Aw, I didn't think you'd be glad to see me today after this bulletin change and so forth. Maybe it was Mary Sue you were glad to see. Is that right? [laughs]

Okay. Now, the first talk on Routine 3D, and I'm going to go over the Information Letter with you which is undated because I typed it.

This is now complete except for commands.

Now, let's take up the history of clearing. A tremendously smooth, interested job of auditing in the days when we didn't have rudiments could make a Clear. A tremendously smooth job of auditing, that took up a person's engrams that were quite visible, that brought him into a condition where he could see his pictures and where he could confront his track. And that was a long time ago. A very long time ago. And only me could do this.

Now, the world of psychiatry has never at any time, or psychology, believed otherwise than that I was quite a practitioner. What they don't like is that I wanted somebody else to be able to do it. That was the unforgivable sin.

Well, it was not only an unforgivable sin, it is almost an insurmountable problem. It was, actually, something on the order of except for here and there, here and there – I suppose you could have counted them on the fingers of one hand – an auditor isolatedly would make a Clear. That was somewhere from 1940 – well, others auditing them – from somewhere around 1950 to about 1958. Wasn't that ACC '58?

All right. Now, on that ACC, I did assessments based on a Dynamic Assessment, went down the line and, working directly at circuits and machinery and so forth, assessed that whole class. We got something – I don't remember how many were on that class – I think there were about fifty-five or something like that – it was quite a large size class in Washington and we got fifteen people who went Clear. I didn't do any of the auditing. All I did was some assessment on the thing.

Now, that was a rather fabulous average, but for the first time somebody else auditing had made a Clear. That was the milestone there. But remember I had done the assessments.

Well, time went on and trying to teach somebody how to assess, trying to put into communication, frankly, the various factors, trying to make them relatable, had to bring any knowledge connected with this out of the realm of the intuitive where I was concerned into the realm of the cold, mechanical part well expressed, so that it would communicate. Now, that's been the roughest part of this. And trying to bring about a condition in an auditor where, through training and so forth, his auditing was sufficiently smooth to keep the pc from balling
up on ARC breaks and other rudiments and so forth; trying to develop a technology which would teach and a technology which would apply auditing has been a very tough run.

But if you look at the actual number of years involved, it's not very long. The first auditors I tried to teach was in 1949. That was before there was any Foundation. And they made a dog's breakfast out of it, you know. I mean, they really did. And it began to dawn on me that they weren't doing something I was doing. Only, this really didn't dawn on me at all until 1955 when a chap in the organization in Phoenix had been watching me audit on television and he made a very interesting observation. He says, "You know, you acknowledge everything a pc says." And by George, you know, I'd never thought to remark it. Now, it was that kind of differences.

So we had to get together and assemble all these parts. What did constitute an auditing session, see, what did put this together?

Now, it wasn't that I was so wonderful. It was the fact that I could do it. This was something I could do and trying to find ways and means of getting somebody else to do it was quite interesting because I myself down through the years have enormously improved my own auditing. I am not doing something and then teaching you to do what I am doing. That is not what's been happening.

I've had to find the actual parts necessary to make auditing occur. And then I've used them all myself. As a matter of fact, my auditing right here at this instant is sort of shot. It's in very bad shape because I've been rewriting the end rudiments. And when I do Model Session now, I don't use the old Model Session, I really haven't learned the new Model Session and you haven't even got it yet. [laughs] So that's sort of the way it's been going.

I started this originally on the CCHs. I sat down and tried to do a perfect Tone 40 job to find out whether or not this could be done, if it was doable and so forth and had to retrain myself to this new skill – a Tone 40 job of auditing as done on the CCHs.

And that was quite revelatory to me, because I found out with great personal reality for the first time that I could myself do these things with a definite improvement of my own auditing. In other words, by knowing how to do these things, my own auditing got better.

So as time went on, we developed the Model Session. Of course, the TRs were developed, the Model Session, the other parts of auditing. And frankly, we were learning things about the E-Meter as a short time ago as three months ago, we were learning things about the E-Meter. For instance, the last thing which turned up about the E-Meter was instant read. There's some possibility that something else could be learned about an E-Meter, but I decided about June that we knew practically everything there was to know about an E-Meter, and I wrote a textbook which you have as *E-Meter Essentials* and there's only one real datum in that missing. And that datum is simply instant read versus latent read. And that's all that's missing in that textbook.

Now, I learned a lot about this meter in experimental runs and so forth but, basically, trying to teach people how to use the meter. And it was unbelievably tough. And to this day Instructors do not believe what they see in people learning how to use an E-Meter. And on the US courses, Instructors have developed a mechanism of using – of how to use the E-Meter
which is kind of a drill. And they have an auditor and a pc mock-up session, with the auditor actually asking the pc questions on the cans. And then they have a third student who stands back of the auditor and studies the reaction of the meter. And an Instructor is there and says, "What reaction was that?" And this is a drill which is actually teaching people to use an E-Meter.

They – apparently an enormous percentage of people in reading a meter just don't ever see the needle move. This is sort of buggy. But it is a fact and something that you should remember in teaching people to use the E-Meter.

Now, where you have an instrument of as precise a character as the E-Meter and where you have a thing as intricate as the human mind, you have to have a very skilled operator in order to carry something through, as far as the meter is concerned. The person really has to know what he's doing. And although you could probably get away innocently in earlier years with sitting there watching the E-Meter wobble and being learned about it and not really knowing what it was saying or doing, you had this as a protective factor, if you please: there were no technologies of sufficient bulldozer quality to actually plow somebody up. The technology itself was not up to a total massed battery sort of an action. But today that is different. Now, the technology which I'm about to go over with you here and which you as a class are already using, this technology – this is wild stuff. I mean, it is definitely of a high bulldozer quality.

You realize that if you miss in running Routine 3 – if you miss in running Routine 3 – you could practically bury the pc. What you are using, in essence, is so strong and so heavy, is so powerful that if you choose the wrong items on any one of this sequence of items and then audit the final result on the pc, and then if you don't check the number of levels coming alive and don't find out you're wrong, you can practically plow him under, almost as surely as Roosevelt plowed under pigs. Can practically wipe him out.

The bank becomes more solid. Any tone level the pc is in will get more and more so. It won't relieve. It just gets more so. The pc feels a little bit sad and the next thing you know the pc feels sadder. Not downscale sadder, but more volume at that tone level. And if you keep it up, the pc feels much sadder and much, much, much, much, much sadder. Get the idea?

The whole case is becoming stronger on the aberrated manifestations of the case.

All right. There are techniques, now, which we sought to classify as the relatively unskilled technique. But what do you know? Routine 1, similarly, can cause a mess. How?

The Security Checking. If a person does a bad metering job and misses one Security Check question or one rudiment, he's had it. He's had it. I mean, that becomes a dog's breakfast at once. So Routine 3 itself provided means by which you could quickly spot whether or not the pc was running right because if you got the goal and you got the terminal, assessed it on the Prehav Scale and ran it for a while and then went back to the Prehav Scale, don't you see, and checked it again, well, more levels were alive so you'd better do something and it was wrong.
Well, that was all right as a remedy, but the truth is that the errors being made with it were far more gross than that. One error: run a level only so long as the tone arm is moving well. And as soon as you get the tone arm moving well, you assess for a new level and run that.

And let me tell you. If you do that to a pc, he feels like he's going crazy. He's got two levels live simultaneously, which is quite remarkable as a mental sensation. If you yourself have had that as a mental sensation, you know what I'm talking about. And of course, here you've been rounced off one process onto another and so forth, and sometimes the other process wasn't flat. And for a day or so you feel zzzzzzz. Well, it's much worse than that if you grossly mishandle these things.

There is a whole body of technology, now, lost in the yesterdays which could be applied by an auditor, and we put that under Class I-type auditing. And, actually, a lot of that auditing is relegated to co-audit. And some of you will – as soon as you get the new co-audit processes on which I am working at this particular moment – as soon as you get these new co-audit processes, you'll see what I'm talking about.

But old Rising Scale Processing, if you please, is going to be run in co-audits by the veriest amateurs. They just come in. They sit down. What is a pc? A pc is a policeman. You know? They don't know a thing about it. And here you have it that they can actually get away with Rising Scale Processing. It's quite remarkable what they can get away with.

We will have a whole body of skills there which are still meter proof, pc proof and that won't overwhelm a pc. But what we're dealing with right now, when we moved into the zone and realm of clearing a small percentage of people – that is to say the technique was adequate for clearing a small percentage of people – we were on the edge of things which required only the greatest technical accuracy. And when we have moved into Routine 3D, let me assure you that you are not just on the edge of technical accuracy, you had certainly better know your parts of auditing, your E-Meter and the whole ruddy lot.

And anybody fool enough to permit himself to be audited on Routine 3D by somebody who has to continually fumble with the directions and "Let's see. What do I do now?" and so forth, out in the public, of course he's just trying to commit suicide. I mean, it's at that level of magnitude, because you have here a body of technology which is actually stronger than the human mind.

The pc has no chance of resisting the error. That's something for you to think about. In earlier days, yes you could say, "Well, go ahead and audit anybody on anything you want to. It'll settle out in three to ten days," see.

Well, we've moved into a body at the same time that we start clearing broadly, clearing any large percentage of the pcs who sit down in the pc chair – as soon as we move into that, we have, of course, moved into technology which in itself looks like massed bazookas and atomic rockets, and so forth. That's the way it looks to the fellow in the human mind.

In the first place, he's sitting there in-session. The technology you have just about sessions and that sort of thing puts him in-session willy-nilly. He can't do anything else but to go
into session if the auditor knows his business. And then you go and run this. There isn't any way he can say no.

So the responsibility an auditor takes for the use of this particular routine is very great. His responsibility, however, should not be on the basis of being cautious and trembling and chewing his fingernails and all that sort of thing His responsibility factor should be simply on the side of knowing his business, feeling comfortable in a session, being able to conduct a session in a very efficient and effective way. It's relatively easy to do that today, but it is something to do.

And therefore, I adjure you – when people ask you about Routine 3 or Clearing or shouldn't they use Clearing, you know, and shouldn't they do this and shouldn't they do that – I ask you for your support in telling them quite firmly, quite firmly, "Well, when you are a perfect Class II Auditor – when you're perfect as a Class II Auditor – and when you have studied assessing very hard, why, yes. But right now we're thinking about you being a perfect Class II Auditor. That's what we're thinking about. And if you can reach that classification, you're fine."

Practically any technology that existed from 1949 straight through to, let us say, 1955, 1956 is total bait for a Class I Auditor. Now, if a fellow wants to audit with no training and sloppy and just do it any old way and so forth, remember those techniques were designed in a large degree to be mishandled.

But I want to impress upon you the fact that the techniques which we're talking about at this moment... Even a Security Check can go wrong, you understand. You can upset the living daylights out of a pc by just misreading one question on a Security Check. From that point forward, particularly through the Clearing routines now, we have passed into another world. We have passed into a world of high effectiveness. And your auditing must be as effective as the techniques which you are administering. And the techniques which you are administering are fantastically effective.

All right. The birth of Routine 3D came about on a pressure basis because I could see very clearly that on a lot of cases it was going to require another two months on what we were doing to round them up. And I had to cut that down. And I've been doing nothing since February of 1961 but cut down the amount of time necessary to audit a case and increase the percentage of wins. That's all I've been interested in.

And I had a lot of this data in the background. And when it became obvious to me that having released the modifier and seeing what the modifier had been doing, and how that had actually buried goals out of the way and made the student upset in, you know, in a session. You know it's a hidden thing that tells him to be upset. So he goes on and he's upset. And every time you audit the terminal, why, it kicks a little bit harder and so on. It takes a long time to wear this thing out.

Well, I decided we didn't have time to wear it out and released the techniques about the modifier. All right. The discovery of the modifier was handed on to you very rapidly and you promptly took 12 ½ hours to find a modifier. I never dreamed it. I considered that a modifier would require thirty minutes. You see, there's this slight difference of estimate here.
Almost everything that you complain about in Scientology is based on that same error, however. You should understand it. I'm not trying to hide the error. My optimism is based entirely upon what I can do or what auditors can do who are auditing exactly what I tell them. You know, right under the gun.

And these are out as soon as that technique drifts out beyond this perimeter that I just named, you see, something else happens to it. So we must take very good precautions that that doesn't happen to Routine 3D. You've got to be able to do Routine 3D here, and you've got to be able to do Routine 3D anyplace you go and be able to do it well and with confidence. So there's pressure on the training line.

You're feeling that pressure. You're getting ARC broke by being posted, and if you study twice as hard as the highest student and get five times as many passes as you did last week, if you get the fire company to lift you up on one of their ladders, you will get into the failed category. You know, I mean, this kind of super pressure. That's why you're getting this pressure.

But a lot of you are leaving here in the middle of December. All right. That gives me something on the order of five auditing weeks. I'm going to make the grade in five auditing weeks over my dead body or your dead body. Just so we don't make it over the top of any dead thetans. [laughter]

So therefore, I went to work on this promptly. I studied all the folders involved and found out that here was twelve hours to find a modifier, and some of the modifiers weren't even found, and everybody was busy stumbling around about this. Well, I first thought the best thing to do was just turn around and educate you thoroughly on the subject of Dianetic bouncers, callbacks, denyers, all that old technology, haul it out of the grab bag and reeducate you into the thing, and teach you how to use repeater technique on the pc to wear out phrases and all this sort of thing. But that's not very advantageous, is it?

So all of a sudden I realized that the only reason a modifier was there was because the goal was opposed. Ah, well, let's get a modifier in an entirely different way.

Let's take all of the parts that oppose the individual and get them first and then come back to the modifier and the thing'll fall into your lap. And at the same time you've got the opposition and you've got opposition goals, and you have finally achieved the anatomy of the problem, which is the goal of the pc. He thinks of it as a goal. Actually, it is not. It is a problem.

It is his effort to do something opposed, and those two have hung in balance, one against the other, for eons. We're not dealing, now, with a problem that lasted since last Tuesday. We're dealing with a problem which has lasted, probably, the last hundred trillion years. We've got the goal locked up against all accumulated opposition and they're equally opposed, one to the other. And having that, we then have the whole thing laid out before us as to why a pc is hung up as he is hung up.

The data on prior confusion has unlocked a number of doors on this. That is why you don't have any commands yet laid out for this, because there are some versions of command,
which I am checking out while you find these parts. I know we can do it. It's just how fast can we do it that counts.

All right. So I went ahead and worked out and tested this entire routine over one short weekend. That's fantastic, but it was tested, straightened out, taped, and everything. And at once, into my lap fell the answers as to why only a small percentage of people go Clear. And why in finding a goal you have such difficulty keeping the rudiments in; because, of course, the goal is opposed by an opposing idea and is susceptible to instant invalidation and so disappears like that.

And therefore, we have the hardest part of Routine 3 being the first part of Routine – 3D rather, being the first part of Routine 3D. And it's the same old part of Routine 3, and they have missed, missed, missed, missed, missed throughout this year on doing a Goals Assessment. I have seen some of them just become endless. I've seen people get up to a thousand goals.

I'll give you some idea of how much improvement has been along this line. Right here a very well known Instructor, auditing a pc I am looking at went through weeks and weeks of a Goals Assessment and ran up to some astronomic number of goals and so forth, just this last summer. And with a lot of experience under his belt, that same Instructor got the goal and terminal Routine 3 style on a pc in, I think – from what I've seen on the cable – must have been a weekend. Oh, that's an improvement someplace.

It looks like we've found some of the missing parts already before we moved into 3D. It looks like we found how we actually can do a Goals Assessment. We can do a Goals Assessment by doing perfect Model Session, perfect E-Metering, and keeping the rudiments in, in, in, in, in. If it gets as bad as doing five minutes worth of assessing and fifteen minutes worth of rudiments in, that's the way you'd have to do it. But you can do it now. It is a doable action. So in go the rudiments, and there goes the goal and we've got it.

Now, the first part, then, of Routine 3D is as difficult today as it ever was in Routine 3. But the technology today of exactly how you find them – although it hasn't changed – we know exactly why they can't be found, is the rudiments go out. And it's just that simple. The rudiments go out so the goal can't be found, and a lot of you right here were into that rat race, utterly unbelievable.

The South African ACC, I don't think it took us – I don't – I was around there scolding one day because we had several students – I mean, I think we were almost a week deep in the course or something like that – we had several students who didn't have terminals yet. Didn't seem to me to be reasonable. And poor Peter and Mary Sue said, "Well, we apologized and got to work." And they themselves, then, shoved the E-Meter down the pc's throat practically and straightened him up and got the goal and terminal on a high duress basis.

Poor Peter goes back to Australia from South Africa, and he sits down with a great big class of people and nobody could find any goals. And what had happened? And right here this was happening. We just weren't able to find goals.

And then finally I sorted this whole thing out and came down to just one conclusion: Auditors were in a sort of a games condition with one another, and it was all a matter of ru-
dimensions. If you kept the rudiment in, there'd be the goal, and the goal usually appeared in the first 150 goals that the pc had given you. And the terminal usually appeared in some similar number.

Now, you don't have to find the terminal now that way. But that goal, finding that first goal, requires just that same amount of technology. It requires that accuracy. It requires the effectiveness and efficiency necessary to make the pc just sit there and deliver. And you get the pc's goal. Now, that is the toughest hump of Routine 3D, is finding the pc's goal.

And when you're over that hump, you are on easy street because your next foremost action... It's unfortunate, you see, that we couldn't have it first. You see, why can't we have the opposition before we get the goal? Well, maybe it'd work out, but I haven't done any research in that particular line. And I think all we'd do is key the person in with a thousand motivators is my first idea of it.

I know we can do this other and we've got this thing taped and that that goal is accurate.

Our next immediate step is to find the opposition terminal. Now, this explains a great deal. Auditors floundering around here and there, auditors looking for somebody's terminal have here and there assessed the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal. Very interesting. And there was no preventive for knowing that we really did have the pc's goal and not an opposition goal of some kind or another. That has come up, too.

The auditor has failed to say, "Is that something you, you know, you, y-o-u – sitting there in that head – is that something that you ever wanted to do?" – has just neglected that little tiny part in doing the Goals Assessment. Assessing things the pc really wanted to do and not having met that part, they put down just things that appear to the pc. And the pc can have these implant goals and things like that appear to him, you know, and they just sort of appear out of the blue sky, you know, in front of their face. They suddenly see this.

They get out of bed in the morning – this actually happened – get out of bed in the morning and they sort of see it printed on the ceiling so they know what it is.

Not anything they really wanted to do; it's just something that occurred to them. And, of course, somebody – they come back, and that naturally assesses as a goal. It assesses as a goal because it simply assesses. It's all choked in there one way or the other as part of some implant.

Now, you remember that in Problems Intensive, which you all went through and I appreciate your cooperation on that because we really got that one whipped out. And you know that Central Orgs are getting marvelous results with this thing right now. They're doing marvelously with it.

We were just looking over stacks of stuff upstairs up there. And I'd say, for something new – brassy new in their hands, to do this well with it was marvelous. We notice you aren't doing these. That's because it's merely a key-out. It's a short look. It makes a person happier. It changes their profile. It just does better than anything we've ever had, but it doesn't clear them.
Now, if you noticed there, "a self-determined change" and "don't run the problem" were the two things that we learned at once when you started doing Problems Intensives. Self-determined change. That's all you must list. You mustn't ever list anything but a self-determined change.

The person decided to change and that's all we want because if we take "what changed your life," the person gives us his appendectomy, his tonsillectomy and so forth, and of course they assess his engrams because they are engrams.

We want the highest powered change, not the highest powered engram the person has. And they're making that mistake right out there in various parts of the world right this minute. They're assessing anything but the selfdetermined change. So that mistake can be made on a 3D, too. You can get a list of things that the pc had never wanted to do but that the pc is simply upset about. And then, of course, you don't get the pc's goal because it isn't on the list.

But this will occur to you as you go along – and you will be fascinated with this in running 3D – that the pc's goal, the opposition terminal, the opposition goal, the pc's modifier, the goal's terminal which is the terminal for G plus M and the Prehav level will all read exactly alike on their needle action. They will all read exactly alike. That's not necessarily true in patching up a case. He's got his goal almost gone on Routine 3. We've got that almost out. And all we need are the other parts, you see, to blow the thing completely.

Well, you'll have the goal, see, going kind of tick, you know – a very sick sort of tick. You know? And the original needle action of that particular goal was a rock slam a half a dial wide, you see.

So you get this little tiny tick on the goal "I want to grow apple trees," you see, and you get this "tick." And then you find the opposition terminal to it, which is "termites" or something. And you get "termites," and you get a half dial wide rock slam, see. It's never been touched. It's sitting there virgin. Pong!

And you get this bluthu-bong-bong-bong-bong-bong! And you get down and you get the opposition goal: "termites, to gnaw; to gnaw everyone." [laughter] Something like that. And you get this opposition goal. And it's going bang, half a dial wide. You see crash, crash, crash! It's all registering like the original goal, you see.

You get back in there, you find the modifier, and there that goal goes with a very sick little tick, see? And we find the modifier: "and to never be audited right" – "to grow apple trees and never be audited right." And we get a half dial wide rock slam on "never to be audited right." And for a moment the goal just reads gorgeously; it's just the most gorgeous reads you ever saw. And you say with a huge sigh of relief, you say, "Well, we finally got the goal back in." And then we read the modifier and then we look back at the goal and it's going with a very sick tick.

Then we go and try to find the rest of the parts and we try to assess something and we can't find a rock slam anymore. And we go back and there's no sick tick left. That's it. We just blew the rest of the goal. But there was that part of the goal lasting.
Now, this is why, you heard me a few – not too many – days ago making a crack – I should never make a crack at Clears, but I made a crack – I'd said, "Well, a Clear is a First Dynamic Clear. And you want to know why they act a little bit self-centeredly? That's why."

Do you realize that sitting on every one of those cases to clear up the rest of the dynamic, although the needle is floating, although the person's in perfect good shape and still stable, is all the rest of these parts? They're still there on that case. We're pretty damn clever to get around them that far and have the person walking straight up.

But where the Clear got cleared, got a perfectly free needle, everything was gorgeous, they were in wonderful shape and walked outside and the bank caved in on them – what was it? It was just the modifier or some other undisclosed part, and then they didn't quite know what had happened. Well, what does it take to straighten them out? Well, just run them through 3D on each one of their goals and these things will go boom! boom! blow! blow! blow! boom! boom! out, out, out, out, out and they'll come up to Dynamic Clear. But you got to go through all the steps of 3D with them.

Whether you ever get a chance to audit anything on them or not – like on the Prehav Scale – that's beside the point. Because there are just these little tag ends still hidden in the bank. When you get those things out, then they go up there.

Now, the reason I've used the word Dynamic Clear is simply to bring up that point, not to make Clears feel that they're dynamic people. Just to bring up that one point: Yes, a Clear will be Clear on the first dynamic and can be cleared on the first dynamic, and he'll stay with a free floating needle and be in a bit of a games condition on the remaining dynamics; and that this is a hardship on one and all. The guy is now much more able to shoot you in the eye with skyrockets, you see.

Supposing the first goal that the Clear had was to climb the Eiffel Tower. And somebody ran that and they got a mountaineer or something, you see, and they ran that and the rest of it and it cleared all the way through it and everything else. Still sitting there is the modifier at least, you see, which is "to fire off skyrockets down at them and kill them all." Interesting thing to omit on a case, isn't it? [laughs]

So you see where this is now. You see about where we're sitting. But this is a different type of Clear that we're making here because we're trying to clear this person up on all dynamics. And you'll find as you go through that they will clear up on all dynamics. That works out as an automaticity. Because you go back and start reaching for earlier, earlier goals and all that sort of thing and you'll start picking up the aberrations on the other dynamics and you'll get them worked out. These things will show up more rapidly.

All right. So much for the background music on the thing. Your hardest point is finding the pc's goal. And that must be done with very perfect auditing, and it must be done with all rudiments in and the various laws of finding goals completely unchanged. And oddly enough, those same laws that govern the finding of goals govern the finding of every one of these parts. So actually you're not doing anything new at all. You're just using the same technology to find a different part. You learn the technology of finding a goal, of course, you can always find the technology of finding an opposition terminal and so on.
There's two exceptions to that in here. There's two exceptions: is (1) the modifier doesn't come down to just one phrase. You'll find that two or three phrases may stay in the list and you do a jigsaw puzzle with them and all of a sudden they're the modifier. Makes sense to the pc and clang, you've got the modifier.

The next point that isn't quite exactly the same as your other assessment actions is that the pc – the more you find, the less the pc ARC breaks. So progressive discoveries on the assessment make an easier assessment, each one.

In other words, you're assessing more easily. Once you've got the center pin, the goal, to assess from there on, you'll find much more – much simpler.

Now, but you just go on hammering and pounding these things out and you just do an assessment. Now, all of you are getting some security on the subject of assessing I found out that you can assess, that you do a good job of assessment, that you're occasionally knuckle-headed as hell but you can all overcome it. And then you smarten up and everything straightens out and so forth.

But you aren't having, really, a hard job doing an assessment. So I feel very secure in being able to teach that particular process and people to do it well. You have some command of your TRs and Model Session and reading the meter and know how to keep your rudiments in and know the activities connected with doing an exact assessment, and you won't have any trouble with it. Those things, known, are resulting in a rather easy discovery of goals.

Now, to get an opposition assessment is done the same way. And to get your opposition goal; well, that's done the same way. And to get your modifiers; done the same way. And to get a terminal from the pc's goal terminal plus modifier is done the same way. And your Prehav Scale is a specialized type of assessment, but it's done just as it always has been done.

So although you may look at this as a formidable new package of stuff. "Oh, my God, what has he done to us now?" Oh, pages of it, you know. I've just shown you how you can cut about 80 percent of the charge – about 80 percent of the charge – off a goal before you ever run it.

So the time invested on assessment is enormously beneficial because it subtracts something on the order of four or five to one off of the final runs. In other words, one hour spent on this 3D assessment is worth maybe five and may be worth much more in terms of hours on the final run, so it's all – it all cuts your time back.

Now, assessment can be done rapidly. Assessment should not be done slowly and pokily and sticking your feet in the mud, and so forth. Assessment is something could be done [snaps fingers several times] – one right after the other. Bang! If you just really know that a pc will read ... If a pc's rudiments are in and you say it, your instant read occurs after you've said whatever the items is that you're checking The instant read occurs, bang! right there. And you don't have to sit around and wait for it. And the pc doesn't have to say anything.

And your rudiments stay in – you know, you can just do an assessment on almost a machine gun basis. It's the fastest thing you ever cared to look at – doing an assessment.
So these assessments are backed up by the fact that at first it may look to you, because it takes so long – it takes maybe twelve, twenty-five hours to find a pc's goal. Then the remainder of this may look to you as being equally lengthy. But it isn't equally lengthy. And the more assessments you do, the shorter length of time it does. So, now the assessment becomes this important and so forth – well, we can analyze and break it down and teach you to do assessments on a brrrrrrt basis, you see.

As a matter of fact, I wrote most of you notes in your pc's folders on how to do a rapid assessment. Aw, I can just state those very briefly right now. Just bang!

(1) Get your rudiments in.

(2) I don't care if you have a list already in existence before the session began or you have no list at all. Whatever list you were working with or obtain, you then ... Of course, you don't have to attain a list on an E-Meter. You're just saying, "Well, what would...?" and so forth. Well, don't bother. Don't necessarily make him lay down the cans, but you're not paying any attention to the E-Meter. You just write the list down, you know. Cats, kings, coal heavers, you know. Just bang, bang, bang, bang, write it down, number them. Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. You don't have to read anything.

And you can note tone arm occasionally and find out if tone arm is wobbling. But that's just a cross-check. If you're on the right track, you got to get a little tone arm motion while the person's assessing. All right. And you bleed that list down, with the meter sensitivity cranked all the way up to the top. And you ask some very pertinent question like, "Are there any more terminals that you feel would oppose growing apple trees?" And remember that growing apple trees is going to react on the meter, so you've got to be smart enough to get your reading off "Are there any more terminals?" No instant read after this – there aren't any more. And that is it. You see? You bleed that meter down.

And you add without argument anything the pc wants to put on the cotton-picking list. No chin-chin about it. Halfway through the assessment and read off, the pc all of a sudden says, "Ooooh. Ooooh. A coal heaver. Oh, yes, yes. We were looking for heavy men, who handle shovels. A coal heaver. I just had this terrific cognition. Yes, a coal heaver."

Well, don't shut him up. It's just – you're halfway through the assessment ... There are two schools of thought on this. Either one is right. Add it to the bottom of the list to be checked later or add it right under what you were just adding. But of course, it goes out of number if you add it right on after what you're just assessing. But the more stylized one and the more perfect one is to write it down at the bottom of the list and give it a number. That's all. As much as that. It's those he adds on. Anything he wants to add on any time, let him add it to anything. We don't care what it is and we don't care when he wants us to add it in.

We're halfway through rudiments and he thinks of another goal. Well, write the goal down and go on with what you're doing there, you see. Never argue with a pc as to what's going to be written down. There's another preventer in here about this, by the way. If the pc in giving you (quote) goals (unquote) is only giving you difficulties, "to get rid of my lumbago," "to get rid of my skull," "to get rid of my stomach," "to get over this terrible feeling that every time I see a cat it's going to jump through my right ear and out through my left ear," and so forth.
All right. Write them down. By all means, write them down, but write them down on a processing goal list. The pc won't object to this. You say, "Well, all right, that's ..." You write it down, processing goal. You say, "We're interested in goals in life and livingness, you know. Look at all these difficulties. There we are in processing, see, and so on. We write that down – when we come to audit, we'll take that up."

The pc is perfectly happy about it – as long as you write it down! The only thing a pc blows up about is you just won't accept his goal. So if you have to split it out here with five lists finally because amongst the opposition terminals he's given you is all the friends he has and all the enemies he has, and it's just a total confused mishmash and so forth, well, write it all down, but not necessarily on the opposition terminal list. That's a good rule, see, because it keeps the pc from getting busted up, ARC broke, see. All right.

The next thing you do is you get that list complete so that there's no additional falls on it. Now, one of the ways of completing a goals list, of course, and a standard way – the standard way of completing a goals list – is to add secret goals, withheld goals, antisocial goals, unworthy goals, discreditable goals, that sort of thing. You know, you're used to asking for all those things.

Well, now remember that on these other parts we also have unworthy things and discreditable things that the pc doesn't want to have there. A person says, "Well, here's this list and there's five – yeah, there's five opposition terminals." Five opposition terminals, huh? Early in the case? Five opposition terminals? Oh, no!

You ask him, "Any more terminals that would oppose this goal?" and so on.

No, no. Actually you don't get much of a fall on the meter either. You have to ask for unworthy opponents or opponents it would be unworthy to oppose. And opponents that would be discreditable to fight. Hu-hu-hu-hu. You find this hulking brute of a man has as his opposition terminal, a baby. He very possibly will never come up with it and tell it to you because it's just not worthwhile. You get some fellow who's very upset on the subject of wives because he kept burying them and shoving them in to vaults where other people were already buried. And that sort of thing. Well, a wife isn't a proper opposition terminal, see? But it is. And you've got to point it out by asking unworthy, discreditable, so forth, goals.

So you shake all these things down on that type of nomenclature. In other words, you don't only get your antisocial goals, you see, sort of thing as the additional type, you see. You get the unworthy or discreditable opposition terminal.

You don't get an antisocial opposition terminal because the pc will tell you they're all antisocial. Ministers? Everybody knows that they're the most antisocial people alive, and so forth. They're all antisocial terminals to the pc, you see. So that you're wasting your time asking for an antisocial opposition terminal. That's silly. They're all antisocial. To some degree or another, they're destructive. Let me put it that way.

Now, we come down the line here and we find the opposition terminals the pc lists, or goal or any other type of assessment. We've got to get the list complete. We've got to make sure that there's nothing he's dodging. We've got to use any kind of wording necessary to
make sure that he has understood exactly what we are doing and what we exactly want and we watch the meter, and we make sure that that whole list is bled.

That meter is just bled of any reaction on the subject of another terminal. We want the instant read on another terminal, not on a repetition of the goal. That's about the only thing that's going to get in the road of somebody. Of course, every time you say the pc's goal, you get a reaction on the needle. Every time you say the pc's modifier, you're going to get a reaction on the needle. Well, don't get it all mixed up with what you're asking for.

Learn to ask for what you want. You say, "Now, on this goal to grow apple trees ..." Of course, you're going to get a reaction. It's perfectly all right for you to say that, don't you see.

"Now, on this goal to grow apple trees, is there anybody else who would oppose it?" Bang! Well, who was that? See.

Well, of course, that "oppose apple trees," let us say, had a little rock slam. And when you say, "Now, on this goal to oppose apple trees," and you're liable to get a little rock slam there, you see. Because every time you repeat the goal, you get a reaction on the needle. You know that, so you don't pay any attention to that. And you just say, "Are there any more terminals that would oppose it?" Oh, pang, see. You get your instant read on the question you want.

Learn to read a meter instantly on the basis of what you want to know. And you learn to stress the word that you want to know and get your reading only on those words. If you're very clever, you can actually read a meter this way. "Now, what would oppose wanting to grow apple trees?" Well, you know darn well you're going to get a rock slam on wanting to grow apple trees – but right there. "What would oppose..." you get your instant read right there. See? Actually, take an interim, middle of the sentence read.

"What would oppose wanting to grow apple trees?" Of course, you're going to get a rock slam over here as soon as you say, "want to get apple trees," see. Naturally. But you just take your read right out of the middle of the sentence. You see how clever you can get on that?

All right. Now, having completed your list utterly, you get the rudiments in. And while completing the list if the pc is upset, you get your rudiments in. But you certainly get your rudiments in at sensitivity 16. Cranked way up. And you really get those rudiments in. Bang! And then you take the thing down to a one dial drop, because that's all you'd want for an assessment. It's too crazy trying to assess with your sensitivity knob too high. Oh, man, it's just all over the place, particularly if some guy's had a lot of auditing, you know. His needle's very loose anyhow. At zero it's a one dial drop. What do you think it will read like? What do you think mine reads like every now and then?

I mean, somebody'll turn it up here to sensitivity 16 and I breathe, you know. Breaks the pin on both sides. You can't read it, see. So you want a one dial drop if you can possibly manage to get that. And then with a one dial drop, you take your long feathered plumed pen in hand – nib already sharpened; you'll – no more delays there, see – and you go straight
down the list. You say, "Now we're going to assess this list ..." or you can say, "Is it all right with you if we assess this list?" And you go right down the list.

And you read three times. Bang! Bang! Bang! Now, I found out that it doesn't much matter whether you read and acknowledge and read and acknowledge and read and acknowledge, or read, read, read and acknowledge. It doesn't much matter which one you do. But in view of the fact that, with technical perfection, each one is a theoretical question, see. Even though you have just said the terminal, you have theoretically asked the pc a question like "Is this it?" See? Only you haven't said, "Is this it?" You've just said the item. But theoretically that registers as, "Is this it?" see. "Is apple tree it?" You know?

And I suppose with total perfection you could lay it down as a bit of a rule that every time you said one you acknowledged the pc and then nobody's going to get mixed up.

All right. And you just say it and acknowledge, say it and acknowledge, say it and acknowledge. Just about that fast.

"Soldier. Soldier. Soldier," [leaves a little less than a second of a pause between each] see, would be the spacings necessary to read it.

So, if you fill the interim in with the acknowledgment it sounds like one straight line. You say, "Soldier. Thank you. Soldier. Thank you. Soldier. Thank you." It doesn't sound like there's any pause there, but of course "Thank you" is not going to get a reaction, but "soldier" is. So the instant read is going into your acknowledgment.

Now, you read all of these things off while looking at the meter. Now, total perfection requires that you lift your eyes from the meter to the pc when you give the acknowledgment. But factually speaking, to the pc to really know whether or not he's being acknowledged, you would have to be in the action of lifting your eyes while you were saying "ank" in order to have caught the instant read before you did so.

In other words, don't go so goofy on this one that you miss your instant reads just to be looking at the pc. You got it?

When you get this real down pat, you'll flick your eyes at the pc or lift your head and say, "Thank you" to the pc directly every time, see. Even though you're picking it up on the meter, you're saying it to the pc.

Now, the funny part of it is, is the pc – your eyes aren't necessarily necessary in order to convey the "thank you" to the pc. And it's not really necessary to go through a lot of gymnastics on this sort of thing. I'm just trying to lay it down so you get a picture of how it looks.

If you can get three repeats of the item in, a thorough acknowledgment to the pc and tell the pc whether it is still in or is now out, and go on to the next one and do the same thing without entering into chitchat, oddities, or anything else or discussion with the pc, and with no time being lost in the middle, I will be very happy with you. If you can get that far, I'll be very happy with you.


Now, I can assess faster than that. If you run it that fast, you've got it made in the shade.

Now, you tell the pc at the beginning, "You don't have to say anything." The pc can just sit there in the most gorgeous state of irresponsibility, as Mary Sue raised it less elegantly once. And the whole assessment's perfectly accurate. Pc doesn't have to say anything.

Pc in the middle of your saying "Soldier. Soldier" ... pc says, "I just thought of another one. 'Gargantua'."

Well, that's all right. That's fine. Good. You got another one. Write it down here on the end of the list, and go back and say, "All right. Thank you. Soldier. Soldier. Soldier. Thank you. Still in." Got the idea?

Now, you get assessing down to this type of a basis, and you're not doing twenty questions a session. You're doing something on the order of a hundred an hour. That sounds a little bit different in the same lick of speed.

Well, all right. As long as we're going to do this much assessing, we might as well learn the most optimum, swift, accurate method of assessment.

Now, why only three times? Well, frankly, if you go over the list more often, you will find out that the number of times you've had to repeat is lessened. Going over the whole list and coming back to the beginning again scrubs more terminals than going – or goals or items – than trying to scrub one out eight or nine times apiece.

We had a slightly different system we used earlier. If after three times it seemed like it was staying in, we went ahead and scrubbed it out. For an actual test, this isn't necessarily useful. You just give it three times, it's still in, and go on to the next one – yes, it'll leave an awful lot of marks down the line that apparently are still in and still live, but you'd be surprised how many of those will disappear on the next pass over. Because in going over the list, you haven't permitted then the pc to sink back on the track.

The pc is still with you, and the pc is still – is as-is-ing more rapidly because the pc hasn't been driven into a point of the track. And restimulating chronic somatics and that sort of thing – which was a liability to the other type of assessing – is avoided. You never repeat him back into the middle of the operation and then try to go on to the next level. Hu-hu-hu. Try that sometime.


So once – thrice over lightly you'll find holds good.
Now, there's something else that I'd call your attention thereto: that it's an equality. I don't care if you speak these things forcefully, lightly or otherwise, as long as they reach the pc with clarity.

If you vary from terminal to terminal or item to item, your volume and expression, you'll throw the assessment somewhat. You have decided, for instance, it's "Gargantua," you see.


And on an exaggerated basis, you can throw an assessment by doing just that.

Now, you're – as you tear down the line, you get this item – this is your next step in assessing – you get the item, whatever it is, isolated. It's the only one left in that's reacting. Now get your rudiments in at sensitivity 16 and check it against the dead items that you've already killed. You just read three or four at random off the list and read this item, and three or four at random off the list and read this item you found, you see. The found item. And read three or four more nulls off the list and you'll find this found item.

Don't be too surprised if there's a slight kick still left in some of the things that you thought were null. Because the funny thing is, as you balance the whole terminal line out, some things will fall out and then momentarily fall back in. Don't worry about that if it does that. Just start worrying about it if what you found falls out. It's somewhere else; it's something else if something starts going in and out on you that way, because they hold it.

All right. Now, having found the thing and checked the thing, you now check another point. Let us say it's the third item you've found here. You realize now you've got to say the goal and note its reaction, the opposition terminal and note its reaction. And let's say you were working on the modifier – or the opposition goal – and say the opposition goal. And now you'll find out that if one did a kind of a Stage Four piece of nonsense, then the next one'll do the same piece of nonsense, and the next one will do the same piece of nonsense. And the whole assessment will fall exactly alike. It's quite interesting. But the whole assessment – every item on the assessment will fall alike.

Now, that is not a final test. You should not throw everything away just because this doesn't happen. Because it is not a final test. You get your ARC up and get the roughness off the session and they will all fall alike, but sometimes a roughness at some part of a session will cause one to go a little bit zzzzz.

And you'll notice this. What you want to worry about is that the opposition terminal is different than the goal and all the rest of the list.

Well, but the goal – you're getting the Prehav that falls the same as the goal, and you're getting the goal plus modifier terminal, that falls the same as the goal. And everything falls the same as the goal, but the opposition terminal. If you check it over, you find out that the pc himself got an ARC break along about that time, and he's kind of hung up, and it's half
pushed out. The second you straighten out, this could come back right in and read the same as everything else, you see, without changing it.

So you see, other things than wrong assessment can make these things go a little bit haywire. But when you've got everything straightened out and all rudiments completely in and all roughness off assessment and any upsets and so forth off, they all actually ought to read alike. It's just a complete parade. That's a perfect textbook solution is the goal and the opposition terminal and the opposition goal and the pc's goal modifier and the pc's goal terminal, and the first level of the Prehav assessed – it's just a bunch of little martinet soldiers. They all read ee-bong, ping-pong. They all do exactly the same read on the meter. They all make the needle do exactly the same thing. Why? They're all part of the same package. They're all locked up together. If one of them is terribly different, it's not part of the same package.

Now, what you want to be aware of in that last checkout is that your goal assesses fine, and then your opposition terminal assesses the same as the goal. And then the opposition goal doesn't assess the same. And the modifier doesn't assess the same. And the goals plus modifier terminal doesn't assess the same. The Prehav level assesses so ... What's this?

Well, it means that where they started assessing differently, you got the wrong one. It's the first one that has the different reaction. And the safest thing to do is to go back and do the whole thing from the point where it doesn't get the same reaction. Because they will go further and further out from the wrong one, see. You wind up nowhere. And that is one of the preventions. This checkout is one of the preventions from running a wrong goal or something like that. It's a prevention. It doesn't so much prevent running the wrong goal, but it certainly prevents running the rest of it.

If you can't get anything to agree with anything on the whole case, you'd better do another Goals Assessment and make sure you had the right goal in the first place because that's the one that'll be out. Nothing falls with it.

Now, when you're doing this cross-checking, invalidation is one of the grimmest things that you can do. But next to that is suggesting. And just never suggest anything to a pc, please. Don't, don't. It's gotten more and more important that we didn't ever suggest anything to the pc. We can have all our own opinions we want to. We can talk these things over with the pc. But we must never suggest anything to the pc. Just nothing. Never suggest a thing The pc says, 'Well, don't you think maybe that to ... Don't you think maybe uh ... ducklings would be a very good opposition on this? Duckling. Can you think of something like ducklings?'

And you say, 'You're getting there. What is it?' Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Give him encouragement. Always give him encouragement. Never give him any suggestions. Because you could do yourself more throat cutting and you could mess yourself up more by suggesting an item or two or even seeming to for the pc than any other single way you can do it.

Unless, of course, it's permitting the pc to sell you an item the pc is fond of. If you don't think people learn to do this early, a nine-year-old the other day was able to sell a wrong goal and wrong terminal to an experienced auditor. Isn't that fascinating? A nine-year-old pc sold a wrong goal and a wrong terminal to an experienced auditor. Sold them.
They were just wildly out. But the nine-year-old decided that would be a nice goal to have and that would be a nice terminal to have so, every time came past it, had a little tiny physical convulsion that threw the meter.

So next... First, there's invalidation. That's just out. We don't even pay... This couldn't happen. And then there's suggesting things to the pc. That's a nice big crime. And then there's this next crime, is buying things the pc is selling. We're using sell in the category of having a body convulsion, twitching the little finger. Suddenly finding out that they can get a registry if they suddenly pull their skin tight across their face, suddenly.

"Well, every time you hit that terminal, it makes me pull this surface across my face!" you see. And of course, the E-Meter will get a reaction.

You say, "Well, we're going to check that out without you doing that."

"Oh, but it's impossible. It always does that."

You say, "Well, it may be impossible, but just look around the room for a moment. Now, look at the ceiling. Now, look at the floor. Now, look at this. Now, look at that."

"Bingo!" That was the terminal, see – "bingo." The person will say – belatedly, you know – Ah, he missed. [laughter] Wasn't able to make it that time. A little bit late.

It's a real stupid auditor that will buy a "sell" of this character. That's real stupid because everything then will go out and nothing will check. Now, it's an awfully good thing that when you've found a part to get it checked by somebody. As you get more experienced, find a package and get it checked by somebody.

All right. Now, I should tell you perhaps a few words on what all these things are, but you will find them defined in this unnumbered bulletin. You'll find them all defined at the back of the stuff of what all these things are and so forth. And I don't think I would do you any too much good giving you any more data than you have right in this first page 4, Routine 3D. I think that's quite adequate to the definitions which are on that.

But let me tell you something. The whole theory of it is simply this. It's very easy to sum up its theory.

Observation: The pc's goals are so easily invalidated, they disappear and can't be assessed.

All right. Now, that's an observation. Now, you've got good reality on that one.

All right. What's making this happen? It isn't because the auditor's mean. Because I know you; you're not mean. A few trillennia ago when you were making a specialty out of burning young girls, you had some aberrations alive then, but you've recovered from it. You're not that mean anymore.

How come? How come this is so uniform? Well, it obviously must be that the thing has an opposition built into it that is easily triggered.
Well, what is it? There must be a part in there someplace. And then how come this goal – now that we've learned problems will last forever on the track because they're postulate-counter-postulate and therefore become timeless – what is this goal (if it is timeless, which it obviously is), what is it but a postulate-counter-postulate, terminal-counter-terminal situation. That must be what a goal is. And the goal is the little tag that is visible, but there must be some other parts of it which are missing, which is what opposes the goal, how come it's hung up in the mind.

You see, if you know the anatomy of problems, you know the fellow has a goal, he wants to get something done. And it's right there as one little package and so forth.

Well, you're crediting this fellow with the extraordinary ability to hold onto this determinism without some mechanical assistance for the last sixteen trillennia. You know? I mean, there it is.

What's it up against? Anything? Nothing There's nothing out in front of it at all. There's nothing out in front of this goal to hold it there. Does that seem reasonable? No, it isn't reasonable at all. And by George, there is something out in front of the goal.

All right. So it's a package which composed of... The pc's goal is quite visible because that's usually – even though it's "to be a first-class prostitute" or something – it's quite socially acceptable. Human beings would recognize this as a goal.

See, it's something that can be remarked on. You could mention that. And that's all that's in view. Well, that's all that's available, really. "Oh, yes, well, I wanted to be a – wanted to be a big boy when I was young."

Quite socially acceptable, isn't it?

Of course, when we get the parts, we find it wasn't quite so socially acceptable, but so far so good. We've got to be a big boy.

All right. What's this opposed against? Well, it's opposed against an idea. But let me tell you that the idea is, I think, more difficult to find than the terminal. It's easier to find the terminal and then find the idea than it is to find the idea and then the terminal. The most available thing there is the terminal, so we find the opposition terminal to the goal. Ah, but it's an opposition terminal to the goal, see, we're finding it criss-crossed, see.

So here's this thing: "To be a big boy." "Well, who would oppose your being a big boy?" Not necessarily – this is kind of poor nomenclature. Poor to keep using "your goal" and phrases of this kind where you're asking the person. Why not just ask the person. Well, you found his goal. It's not going to wear out. So you repeat it five thousand more times, and it does wear out. Well, that just clears him that much faster. So go ahead and use these parts. Go ahead and use them in your phraseology after you've found them.

And you say, "Who would oppose your being a big boy?"

"Bigger boys. Uh – cats. Um – fathers. Mothers."

Here we go on down the list, you see. "Who would oppose your being a big boy?" you know. And we get something pretty wild that fits exactly what the case is. And what would oppose his being a big boy, naturally, is machinery. That's what he says, and that's what it
assesses out and it rocks the same as "to be a big boy" and here's "machinery." Ha-ha! Good. We've got the opposition terminal.

Now, let's find the opposition goal. All right. "What would be the idea of machinery?" Now, we get a lot of things.

"Well, the idea of machinery is to run wild and to make dog biscuits, and it's ideas and so forth."

And "Well, what would a – what idea would it have there of opposing your goal to be a big boy? I mean, what idea would it have that would oppose your being a big boy and so forth?"

"Well, huh – well as a matter of fact, that's cutting people to pieces."

Yeah, well, there's that one. And then there's "running wild," and there's doing this and there's doing that. We assess it out, and it's "to cut people to pieces." Ah, well, we're getting very interested here.

All right. Now, we've got machine, and we've got its goal. We've got the goal of the machine. That isn't really the goal of the machinery at all. It's the goal that the pc thinks the machinery must have that directly opposes him.

So, so far we've got the pc's goal, we've got the opposition terminal, and now we got the opposition goal is "to cut people to pieces."

All right. Dandy.

Now, we've got to find the pc's goal modifier. And this was completely out of sight up to this time. But we've done all this assessment work, so actually we've eased up the weight of the invalidation just by bringing it to view, see. So now the modifier should show up far more easily because before we were going through a tough route to find it.

All right. Well, we've taken some weight off of this thing now. So the pc's goal modifier is "to be a big boy or go up in smoke trying and never come down again." Well, that's great. That's great. That's just fine.

Now, let's find what is the pc's goal plus modifier. Now, we want to know: "Who or what would want to be a big boy who would go up in smoke trying and never come down again?"

"Go up in smoke trying and never come down again. Would be a rocket operator. Yeah, and it'd be a horse jockey and a cat whisker and a lion tamer," see. And we get down the line. But all of a sudden we come back and it's "a rocket operator." It's "a rocket operator," all right; that's what we've got. And there it is. "Rocket operator." We've got it right there. And that's our goals terminal.

You'll find out the further you go on the assessment, the plainer the part gets. But out of this "to be a big boy," it sort of looked like we had school days, charm, everything was wonderful, going to be sweetness and light, isn't it cute, you see. And we get machinery and the machinery's going to cut you to pieces and so forth. And it starts looking peculiar, doesn't it? And naturally, all of this is directing us straight in toward the Goals Assessment. And
frankly, if you can do an expert job of assessment, _drdrrrrrr, ta-tat-ta-tat ta-tat-ta-ta_, just sit there, get the rudiments in, get the thing, get the list written, get the rudiments in, assess the list, _brerrrrrrrrrr_ and on down the line; you're going to find out that after you've got the first goal, that finding the rest of the thing is just a lead-pipe cinch.

It all depends on how many times you say, "Ah," how many times you say "Er," how many times you sigh and how much space you leave between items. And that's all it amounts to because nobody's going to say that you must put the rudiments in rapidly. Don't think that is necessary.

I say put the rudiments in effectively. If it takes you a while to get in rudiments, all right, so it takes you a while to get in rudiments. Nobody's going to argue with you about putting in rudiments or time consumed thereon. But I _am_ going to argue with you about "soldier" or "rocket operator." "Mmmmm. How do you feel about that? Hm-mm... Meter's a little bit out of adjustment here. Yeah... All right... Well, here we go. Here it is again. Rocket operator. Hm... Yeah... _Mm-hm_... Rocket operator... Well, okay. That still seems to be in." Of course, it's not doing anything in the world but falling on an ARC break by this time.


Then your assessment is simply boiled down to the speed you can write because that's the lengthiest activity – would just be the activity necessary in simply writing down the terminals which are given. Nobody's going to say that this is a school in penmanship, and we teach you how to write fast. Just get over all those times you wrote the billet-doux to the wrong man's wife and get over those times when you signed those warrants for execution and you'll find out your _ss_ – goes up terrifically – speed just goes right up. [laughs]

All right. Now, I'm going to have to give you more talks on this because we have the whole subject of commands and so forth to go into. But so far as you're concerned, the reason you find all these parts is to make it easier to find in each case the next part with greater accuracy.

Now, that's reason enough for you to find all of the parts, strangely enough.

And later on, after you've run the first terminal or so, you know, off the Prehav Scale, and you're on to your next Goals Assessment, you're going to find you're going to have to get to the Prehav Scale and run that one probably. And then your next one. And all of a sudden, just the finding of these parts goes in a sort of an endless circle. You find the parts, you find a goal and you get it down the line as far as you can get it. And go back and check it and it all fits. And what this basically is best at, this particular thing, besides making things easier, is that it gives you the consecutive release of goals – occurs much more rapidly. So there's, of course, enormous amounts of time saved toward the end of clearing. This hasn't either that – too much to do with it; you're going to clear a lot more people in this particular way.

Now, how are you going to miss clearing people? You're going to miss clearing people by doing a bad technical job or by not auditing them or by not taking enough time with
somebody to find all the parts correctly and so forth and putting it all together and hanging
the thing right. That's about what the thing amounts to.

And we already know that if you find the goal and if you find the terminal that
matches that goal and it doesn't beef up the Prehav Scale and you run that on many levels of
the Prehav Scale and it goes down, down and disappears out of sight – and that a lot of people
go Clear on this if it's done enough and if it was accurately enough done in the first place.

But there's nothing that guarantees the accuracy of the first job. There is nothing that
takes care of a lot of little missing odds and ends of parts. The pc stays very – remains very
hard to keep in-session to a marked degree. And so you get a small percentage of people go-
ing Clear on that particular procedure. Now, this one, you've got all the parts that could make
any difference to the thing. Exactly how you speed it up from there depends entirely on the
form of the command and if anything can be done with speeding up the actual commands. We
could just go on and run these terminals as found on the Prehav Scale, and all would be
lovely. We could go ahead and clear that way. And I'm trying to find out right now if there
isn't a faster way to beef up that particular formation of commands than we've had to speed it
up even more. Because it now lies in the lap of effective commands. The more effective the
command is, well, the faster clearing will occur. Okay?

All right. Well, you've got the package there. I'm sorry to dump it on your lap so un-
announcedly but I would say, after looking it over last night, that most of you had weathered
the storm very, very well, and you are to be congratulated on it. You recognize that some of
the goals are quite null and it's going to take a little while to finish off that particular goal, but
it'll finish off more or less by assessment. And then you'll be out in the clear and onto a new
level.

Actually, some of you don't realize it, but you're very, very close to the point of having
the first goal-terminal combination flat right this moment. So you're starting in with Routine
3D the hard way. Very short way; but it's the hard way because you'll be puzzled why things
are disappearing and appearing and so forth.

And later on when a good, solidly aberrated case comes along, why, you will see it
work much more smoothly than it's working right at this moment. So I don't think there's any
lack of supply of that type of case just at the moment, so that's fine.

All right. Thank you very much. And I wish you lots of luck with it.

Audience: Thank you, Ron.
Well, as you can see, I walk in here, your case is in my hands. [laughter] That's a joke. But not quite so much of a one as you might think.

All right. I suppose you are still in a gentlemanly and a ladylike frame of mind about 3D, and you are wrestling with it. A little later you'll be rassling with it. A little less ladylike perhaps.

The truths of the case is that there are some possible randomities in Routine 3D which could get you into various upsets. But what is this now? This is the 15th of November 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill, and we have under discussion Routine 3D.

Now, we still have some people around who want to know why are we finding an opposition terminal and all that sort of thing. We ll, what broke down the whole thing was that a majority of people were not going Clear on Routine 3. Now, why weren't they? So I got a small pick and a shovel and began to go into skulls and then I got one of these widow-maker pavement breakers and started going in a little bit deep. And then got an oil well rig and really started going down two or three miles. And I finally found out that the length of time of clearing – clearing would eventually happen – but the length of time of clearing is in direct ratio to the dramatization of the modifier. I found a new piece here, the modifier.

Now, on people who clear fast, it accidentally runs out fast. And on people who are clearing very, very slowly at Lord knows how many hours, it was running out very slowly.

Now, what is this modifier? It is the threat the pc makes if he cannot obtain his goal. Covert character, this thetan, huh? He says, "Well," he said, "I'm going to build buildings." Isn't that sweet? That's nice, isn't it? That's real nice. You know, that's good. That's good. That's socially acceptable. Everything's fine.

And he says, "To build buildings." And everybody says, "Cheers, he's going to be a great engineer," you know. "A great construction man," and so on. And his tutors pat him on the head, and everything goes along swimmingly, and everything is marvelous. And you try to clear the fellow on this goal "to be a great engineer."

Well, what's your – what – this question should be asked. Why do we have to clear him on being a great engineer? This is obviously the sole virtue this character has. Yeah, let's ask that burning question. Why do we have to clear him on "to be a great engineer," huh? Aha. Aha. We twist the moustache at its long waxed ends and look down his throat, and what do we find? Well, I've said, "Well, it must be a problem because it's hanging up on the track. To be suspended on the track, this goal must then be suspended against something which is other-determined to it."
Ah, all right. I didn't look very far. But the first thing I found was this modifier. And that's the pc's, is "to be a great engineer, and if they don't applaud sufficiently when I put up buildings, to have them fall down and crush them into da street." [laughter]

Now, for some weeks, I went around doing a background music study on this thing, and I was quite interested to find in all the works of man, every one of them has got a booby trap built into it.

You tell Homo sap to mow a lawn and it's all fine, but there's just something there, you see? It's not me being critical. It's the fact the lawn is too short or it's too long, or it isn't mowed around the fringes, or they stop the mower in the middle of the lawn and fill it with a gas can and spill some.

We say, well, it's just carelessness, you know. So you say to the fellow, "Well, now, the next time you mow the lawn, why, pull the lawn mower off to the side onto a path, and there fill it with the gas can. You see, and then you spill all you want to, see." And you come back next time, and the wheels of the mower have been spinning in some fashion to cut large ruts across the best place. But he did do this other, you see, but there are these ruts in the lawn now.

Well, I've had a lot of experience with Homo sap. And of course, I've had to live with myself, too. That's taken some doing, believe me. It isn't everybody could have done that. [laughter, laughs] But here we had this marvelous thing going on whereby if you don't quite watch it, why, there's going to be something built there, so the fifteenth step up the tower is not welded.

What are these things? And what are these things? And I asked myself that for a number of weeks. I went around and observed all these things, and so forth. I don't get up in some ivory tower because they're drafty, these ivory towers. It's much better to be out amongst the warmth of humanity if you're studying it. And it's a new thought, you know, in the whole field of philosophy, is go and look at what you're studying. A brand-new thought. Actually newer than you think.

So I couldn't find anything man was doing that he wasn't building a little problem into. And the worse he was off, the more problems he was building into what he was making or what he was doing. And this seemed to me to be very interesting. Well, now, this wasn't, to be very honest with you, bluntly and directly solved by the modifier. It wasn't just one, two, these two studies, one study resulted – of man's errors – resulted in the other studies. It just happens I had been studying this for some weeks, which probably catalyzed my observation of these other things. What I found out was that pcs went downhill as they were clearing and then went uphill. And sometimes they went downhill for a long time, and then went uphill. But they always went downhill before they went uphill. Isn't that interesting?

Well, it violates the rules of early auditing. You give somebody some auditing and he gets better, see? He doesn't get worse and then gets better. So we must have – must be a bug in here someplace. What is this that has gotten around, and we find out on further observation that there was a reservation on the goal. In other words, whatever the person set out to do, he had a little bit of a reservation kicking around. Let's just put it that way. That's the mildest, most acceptable form of it. But it's worse than that.
You ask this person, "Now, you want to be a great engineer. All right. Very good. Now, what would be your answer to constant failure at this goal. What would you add to the goal if you continued to fail in it?" and so forth.

And the fellow will dream up some various odds and ends, and all of a sudden you'll get some that register on the meter.

Well, it's very interesting but it's almost unreachable, almost unreachable. You tried for a week. I could reach these things, but I reached them as a Dianetic auditor. Get the meter, repeater technique. Take the various words. Take the whole list. Take all the bouncers, denyers, call backs, and so forth, out of the entire list that they had already given you. Very interesting. This is quite a technique. Fortunately, I don't think you have to learn it. But it's quite a technique.

You ask them to list all of the things he would use to modify his goal if he continued to fail. He keeps giving you phrases and phrases and phrases and phrases. You finally got pages of phrases now. Then you just go through those. And one or two of you had red marks on the list. I gave you red checkmarks on the list and told you run these by repeater technique on the person, see, because they're in there someplace. He gave you someplace the modifier. But every time he gave you one of these bouncers or denyers or something like that, if it was even close to the modifier, he bounced out of the vicinity of the goal. And the goal read sporadically. Just that. He bounced on the track. He moved in relationship to the thing. And you had to repeat him back into it. And if you were to directly find a modifier, you would have to master these old Dianetic techniques of getting, actually, [snaps fingers] the flash answer to the question. And you get the bouncers and make down lists of these things. Get the list off the pc. Bounce these things back in. Finally sort the thing out. And it actually was already taking you hours and hours and hours and hours and hours to do this. Why?

Well, you're doing it uphill. And if you did it badly, you would invalidate the pc's goal, and then of course the whole thing would go up in smoke.

All right. So I sought a better method of doing this, and ran into the rest of the picket fence. There it was. You see, the goal and the modifier are the pc's half of the idea. What's the other half of the idea and who had it?

Now we had to – have to have two halves to make a problem. And the goal plus modifier is only one half. Now, that must be confronted by something of equal magnitude from an other-determinism to be a complete whole. Otherwise, it wouldn't hang on the track. You've got to have two forces in balance – one against the other – before you get something moving in time in the mind. That's one of the basic rules of it. As you learn problems, you see more and more problems, you'll find out that his problem is to have a happy home. It's not a goal now. It's just a problem. Problem: To have a happy home. And why can't he have a happy home? Well, there must be some other idea confronting it. Now the pc may give you that idea himself, and it may be apparently resident with the pc. But as we chase it back to try to find out where this problem is, he had somebody who was determined not to have a happy home. Let's be as elementary as possible on this thing. This fellow had an idea that he ought to have a happy home. Not a goal to have one, just had the idea he ought to have one.
And he had this opposed idea of somebody shouldn't have one, shouldn't have one. We should have a dog's breakfast on Dog's Breakfast Street. There's two ideas, isn't it?

All right. Now, that is an anatomy of a problem, see? You've got one idea and the other fellow's got another idea, and the two ideas combined run head-on into each other in balance. And if they do that, they'll then drift through time.

Now, there must have been a confusion before that. When you get the confusion out from underneath this, you will find then that – there's something else occurs that one or the other of these ideas unbalances, and this thing sort of misses each other. If you can get the idea of two sticks pushed against each other, they'll stay pushed against each other until you get below them and tap them with your thumbnail or something like that. And one stick will miss, and then these two things won't lock up anymore. And you don't have this same structure anymore.

Well, it takes these two sticks, one punched against the other to get a problem riding through time. That is why the problem rides through time. It's two ideas. It's an unresolvable situation of two ideas.

Now, a problem has this additional thing. The person says, "I want to be a successful wife," and at the same time has the other idea, "I want to go to lots of nightclubs and parties with other men."

And you'll find this in pcs all the time, and they'll come up with it, and that's what makes problems so weird. They come up with this idea, "Well, it's unsolvable, you see. It's unsolvable. My problem is unsolvable, you see."

And you get to drumming it up, and you finally find out that it gets stated on this basis that they want to be a wife and do that sort of thing "And why can't George," you see, "accept me as a successful wife," and all that sort of thing, you know.

And then you get to searching for it. They say, well, they also ought to be going out to nightclubs all the time with other men. And this is in the same pc, you see. And they've accepted one of these as their idea and then they accepted the other one as their idea.

But originally these were two ideas counter-opposed.

If you start plumbing up this problem on a Problems Intensive, you'll find out that there was somebody else around – if you wanted to go this far – insisting they go to nightclubs with other men while they were trying to be a successful wife.

Then these two ideas lock up, and they own both of them simultaneously, and you get a (quote) "unresolvable" problem. One of those ideas was the pc's and then one of them was a later valence.

The situation, then, is you get a lockup in time. And it appears to be what... How you miss it, you see, it appears to be simply the individual himself with two ideas, see? Isn't that what it looks like? He's got two ideas.

Now, if you separate these two ideas apart, you'll find one of these ideas belongs to the pc and the other idea belonged to somebody else. But actually, how did the pc own this first idea? It's usually through a valence mechanism. And the valence mechanism is a simple
mechanism. He adopts the valence, and the valence has the idea. Now, the valence confronts another being, and that being has a different idea. And then the pc gets this valence locked on the first valence, and they're actually in apparent double valence situation. It's like concentric walnut shells, one right after the other.

You've got a walnut, and then you've got a shell outside the walnut. Now, if you can think of the thing of having a shell outside the walnut shell, and then a shell outside that walnut shell, and then a shell outside that ...

You ever peel an onion? [laughter] Well, that is actually the way a pc's bank or being-ness looks. That is the way it looks. And that's why you cry when you – when you ...

Now, frankly, if we were to take this apart in an ordinary and routine fashion, it would be sort of like this. Your ordinary take apart would simply to be to peel the onion skin by skin, and boy, if you haven't got a gas mask, you can't do it. But it does take a long, long time, and it is very tough on the pc, and he gets gains, and he gets loses. And let's say he had a valence as a woman, and that the outer skin to the valence of the woman was the valence of a man. And you process off the valence of a man, and now your pc's acting like a woman. You peel off the next valence, the pc's acting like a child. You peel off the next valence, the pc's acting like a dog. [laughter] What is this all about, don't you see?

Well, there are literally, literally – well, it's some unimaginable figure. It's some astromomic-type mathematics would it take to get the figure, of how many valences are accumulated by the pc in actuality. And it's probably something on the order of – oh, I don't know – binary digits of some kind or another. It's way, way, way up there.

They accumulate as many as half a hundred in one lifetime. And times being tougher in some areas than the others, you say, well, the pc lives ... Let's be very conservative; let's say he lived two lifetimes a century, and half a hundred for each lifetime is a hundred, and that's one per year. And that's for a calm, ordinary existence, you see.

And now we go back two hundred trillion years, and we'd have two hundred trillion valences. Of course, that's a crude way of arriving at it, but that gives you some idea of the magnitude. I'm just trying to tell you it's big magnitude. You ever run into anybody that just after they talked to you they had your mannerisms? Well, they've just accumulated another valence.

Now, it isn't every time they have talked to somebody... because they talk to you once, from there on out they don't just have your valence. They get a new valence from you every-time they talk to you.

Now, have you sneaked up on what the order of magnitude is, see? Well, it's big.

All right. Now, what we're doing is absolutely magical. It's fantastic, and your appreciation of its fantasticity will rise when you realize that we are removing whole onions. Whole onions. It's what's holding the onion together. That's what we're after. We're not interested in peeling this thing endlessly, crying over the dishpan, see?
As a tip to housewives, you peel onions underwater, you cry less. You fill a bowl full of water and peel them underwater. But your hands don't smell any better. Anyhow... [laughs]

But I know of no such ready solution. If it was just a forever situation, forever valences, what would you finally wind up with, you see? You'd wind up with a forever auditing. So lighter techniques tend to do a forever job.

Now, we were accidentally taking this thing apart when we get the engram necessary to resolve the case – we would probably pluck one of these valences when we were being successful. The engram ran easily, and we didn't go back earlier than it or anything, and we didn't have to do anything funny about it. We've accidentally arrived in it.

It's quite interesting that a lot of people who have been running Dianetics go down the track on these new routines and they find the holes in the track that they've already erased by Dianetic procedures. They've contacted that old engram before, or they hardly even noticed that it's been contacted. It makes their case much easier to run because they've already had it desensitized.

You get out here – some member of the public – and you'll get back to the age of fifteen, see? Well, a person who's had a lot of auditing of course goes back earlier much faster. You'd be surprised how explosive this can be.

Now, Routine 3D isn't designed for your case. It is not designed for your case. Your case does not require this much. You could undoubtedly, with me running the tiller on the thing, one way or the other go Clear on Routine 3. With this modifier gimmick, we would have gotten the modifier out. You did it. Most of you are after modifiers. In that one week, you got the modifiers. And you got those things brought out. Well, that was just speeding it up a little bit. But you could have gone Clear eventually on earlier routines.

But this isn't true of the general public. The reason why you're having difficulty auditing the general public is this is so beefed up, it's so highly charged. This is a case that has never had any charge taken off of any kind whatsoever. They don't even know that they remember and have an engram connected with their puppy's death at the age of five, see? They don't realize that's got a big secondary, you see? These cases are highly charged up cases.

Well, now, let's get back to what we were talking about, about these modifiers. Without relieving any more than just the casual, run-of-the-mill problems of his life that you would run into and relieve with a Problems Intensive – that's quite vital – that will keep the fellow in-session. Without doing any more than that, you're actually going to launch this fellow onto the whole track. And now you're going to pick up a modifier. And you're going to pick up the various parts you need, you see, just like the modifier, out of thin air. And you're going to have a hell of a time, that's all. You're going to hold him in-session by strapping him down in the chair. And you can't do that to the general public. And we had to have another method.

So, I could see that it wouldn't be too difficult for us to go ahead and teach this method and find it on Scientologists, but I could foresee that there was great – would be great difficulty in your trying to find this thing on casual public – people who hadn't been audited very much. Why? The modifier will be in there with sledgehammers. You're not going to get near
it. The more charged up the case is, the less secondaries they've had off, the less this and the less that, well, the harder such a thing is to reach.

Now, I anticipated as far as I could into the difficult case. All right. But at the same time I did say that you were having difficulty and there was no particular reason for you to master a relatively difficult, sporadic, artistic technique like blowing phrases out of a bank. That is quite a technique, you know? And trying to hold somebody still while you do it is quite arduous and too arduous for it to be used much on the public.

I saw from time to time one of these things being blown in old Dianetic processing. I remember this airline pilot who came in, sent by American Airlines, I think it was, to the 42 Aberdeen Road, Elizabeth, New Jersey. And the airline company wanted to know what was this Dianetics, sent this guy over and we tried to find out something about him. And actually one of the students at that time, with the idea of phrases and the key phrase on which the fellow's life was pinned – we already had that idea, you see – blowing it just like that with repeater technique and without a meter. Pretty good, huh?

Student took him upstairs and he found the guy's line, phrase, everything else. What was the trouble with the guy – he had failed every time he had had a job out in civil life, you know. Soon as he got in aviation, why, he was more or less all right. And that's because of a continuous phrase his mother used to feed him all the time. And it could only have been effective if it had been the modifier. He had a part of a modifier, and that's what we took off the case. "He was no earthly good." So he could be an airline pilot but he couldn't run a garage.

And this absolutely made the fellow feel marvelous. They just repeater-techniqued the thing into view and out of existence, and that was it. That was it. That changed his whole life.

Another one, a child dying of leukemia, and we shot a phrase out of the bank, "make your blood turn to water." What's leukemia? The blood turns to water.

Shooting phrases out of a case can produce a considerable change in the case, but it's not uniform. It is not something that you sit down with any confidence and do. Because you may do it today, and you may do it in two weeks, and in two weeks, why, you may have the case so steamed up that you can get nowhere near anything. You know, you get the idea. I mean, it's a rough go. You pays your money, and you takes your chance. It's that kind of a thing.

Well, we don't want anything to do with that type of technique if we can possibly manage it. Let's get something which is ascertainable and which runs smoothly. So the answer to getting the modifier was to take the pressure off the other side of the problem. Now, some of you right this minute have been sitting there, while assessing as a pc, and have all of a sudden felt sort of weight lift off of you, particularly on an opposition terminal or an opposition goal. And suddenly the auditor reads two, three, four in a row or something like this, and you – all of a sudden you feel light. You feel strangely different somehow. Something odd has happened to you. And actually they haven't even found anything, you know. They're just assessing the list. And all of a sudden, why, you feel something passing off somewhere or another. Have any of you felt that?
All right. As an auditor in auditing somebody, you don't pay too much attention to a tone arm during an assessment. But you might have noticed a sudden ‘craboom!’ of a tone arm on a pc during a reading. Well now, that is simply the person is losing some weight. What you watch there is a few billion valences going. They're just piling right on off the top of the modifier, you know? They go pfffft.

You're actually not really running anything out on the reverse side. What you're doing is just taking tension off the pc's side. You see, the opposition goal, the opposition terminal – the opposition terminal comes first, of course. And this opposition terminal – "Oh, is that what I've been fighting," see?

And this recognition, "Oh, yes, is that what he's been fighting," you see? This recognition of this, and its ideas is... and he doesn't even have to come close to that one. Just that he's in the vicinity of it starts doing things, see? Similarly with the terminal. I mean, just that he's in the vicinity of what he's been opposing. He feels like somebody's been playing at swords blindfolded in a dark cellar with an Ethiopian for an opponent, you know.

Then here he is; all of a sudden some of this stuff starts coming to view. And it lightens up. The reverse side over here lightens up. You see, his idea therefore doesn't have to be so tightly fixed in because it's not opposed by so much charge. You got the idea?

Now, let's get back to this stick. There's five foot-pounds of energy pushing from right to left and five foot-pounds of energy pushing – foot-pounds pushing from left to right. At the impact point you get a continuous balance because it's five foot-pounds and five foot-pounds. See? There it hangs.

Now, you've got to have at least five foot-pounds, or something like that, of energy to disturb this thing. You could probably disturb it with some other foot-poundage from some other quarter, but it'll be some order of magnitude of five foot-pounds. In other words, you've got to come over here and you've got to push with an additional poundage, or over here and push with an additional poundage. Well, that's all right because you're still – it's not going to unbalance. It's just going to kind of wobble as you put it in on both sides, if you can get the idea. Got it?

And if you push it down this way, well, it might take just a fraction of an ounce to deflect it down slightly. That's why, you see, perhaps that compares to your prior confusion. You find a prior confusion to a problem and nothing much came off, but the problem disappears. It's quite mysterious. Maybe it even follows the laws of mechanics. Who knows?

But anyhow, here are these two five foot-pound forces. Now, your auditing would have to be five foot-pounds – something in the order of five foot-pounds, in other words, to move this thing to left or right or do something about it. You got the order of magnitude here? It's very hard to put this into mechanical terms. I'm just trying to give you some kind of an idea.

All right. Supposing we had some method, you see, not of increasing the force from the left to the right or the force from the right to the left, see? Not of increasing this. Supposing we had the idea of simply, out of thin air, deleting some of the five foot-pounds. And let's
have five foot-pounds pushing in from left to right. And let's reduce this right to left force to three foot-pounds.

Well, something's going to start going, see? Now we've got an unbalanced situation. Do you see how you could do that? Now, you can unbalance this hung in time rather easily by the deletion of force. All other systems, even though they were a millionth of an ounce, would be the addition of force. You would add force.

Well, if you're auditing added force – or had to add force – let's look at this order of magnitude. The balance in this fellow's mind might measure well on an E-Meter, but its original force might have been a space ship colliding with a planet. I mean of that magnitude, which is eight billion foot-pounds versus eight billion foot-pounds at the point of impact.

Now, that means your auditing would have to be of the order of magnitude of eight billion foot-pounds. And do you feel that energetic? [laughter]

Now, if you can take the impact apart, it will simply be on the basis of reducing it down to five billion foot-pounds on one side of it, see? Now, oh, well, let's reduce it down now to three billion foot-pounds on one side only. Oh, well, now let's reduce it down to a hundred foot-pounds on one side only. Something is going to blow up someplace, isn't it? You still couldn't possibly have trapped eight billion foot-pounds versus one hundred foot-pounds. See what would happen? Everything would just go boom, boom, zoom. A lot of energy would be released in various directions. But you have not, then, had to get in there and push harder against this thing, one way or the other, to unsettle it. I can give you a mechanical, as I just have, understanding of the thing. It comes close to that type of thing. It's a study in forces. It's really a study in forces because a thetan's ideas add up to energy which adds up to force.

You ever been in a glare fight? And did you ever have the idea that you might possibly push over that wall if you looked at it too hard. Have you ever had this idea? Or that you might pull it in on you or something like this? Have you ever had the idea that you might move something with an idea? Well, you're pretty careful not to because it can lead to a lot of difficulty, you think.

But in the mind the idea consists of the force. See, you don't have eight billion foot-pounds still residual in the mind. It isn't actually that much force. But it's an idea equivalent to eight billion foot-pounds. It's the idea of eight billion foot-pounds. And there still is some energy, and there still is some force. And there still is some thrust in the mind. And the pc feels this shift, he knows what's going to happen. He knows what's going to happen. Everything is going to blow up. Huh. Did you ever suddenly, accidentally move a mass on a pc? Pc almost goes that way. Did you ever do it? Did you ever have a pc feel he was suddenly splitting in half and part of him flying off into space?

One of these goofball things – it doesn't happen very often – but an auditor gives an auditing command, particularly with a pc who is not prepared for it, the pc's taken unawares. He's a little bit surprised. It's bad auditing. If you've done it, recognize it for what it was. There was no smooth approach to it. It's just after you've had an ARC break. It was just after you changed the process too rapidly. It was just after something. And you got this pc suddenly felt something go, and boy, did he object to it. And after that, he's just holding on, just
like this, you know, ahaa-ahaa-ahaa. You know, just scared stiff something was going to slip now, you know? And sometimes they feel the bank go a billionth of an inch, you know? And they say, "Uh-uh. That's it. I've had it."

You know these guys that only one tech – one technique will work on them, but next time you audit them you have to have another technique? Did you run into that case? It's quite ordinary. The Black Five case is very often this way. Boy, if you were auditing him well on Tuesday and you were just getting along fine on this "get the idea of" sort of process, or whatever it was, and you just didn't have enough hours in Tuesday to make the session totally consecutive to it being flattened – on Wednesday he comes into session and he is not about to get any results from that process. And no further results are going to come from that process.

Every process works once. This is not an unusual case. It's usually the Black Five. You don't notice it because the processes you're running are repetitive in spite of what he's trying to do. He can't stop them. But if he had his way he would, because he gets a little change and the change itself makes him nervous. So he's got the brakes on that process.

Now, you've got to run another process, and you've got to run that. And that will only run as long as he doesn't put the brakes on. So very light processes run on cases of that type give you this aspect if you have to have a process a session. Next session you've got to have a new process. Next session you've got to have a new process. Next session you've got to... You've run into them. I see people from Central Orgs nodding. Yes, they've seen a lot of these guys. It drives a D of P crazy. They're just running wonderfully on Tuesday. We were getting the idea of winning, you know. "Get the idea of winning. Fine. Get the idea of losing. Fine." Those were wonderful. There's nothing wrong with this. It was just gorgeous. But Wednesday he comes back in. Absolutely nothing happens on the same exact process. And on Tuesday it wasn't flat.

Well, this case is so much in balance – it's the high tone arm case – the case is so much in balance that if he feels anything start to shift his idea of the amount of mass that is going to shift and the things that are going to happen are so catastrophic, you see, that he just goes oo,oo,oo,oo,no,no,ho-hoho. Oh! Now what makes him do that? That's because it's his ideas versus the other determined ideas of his life. Ah, well, the idea he's directly opposing is the first idea that you will find. And you find that idea with his goal.

You'll find that idea, and you'll find the first idea he's opposing. You find the goal, and then you can find the goal opposition terminal – the opposition terminal to his goal. And then you can find the opposition idea to his goal. And all of a sudden that stands there all revealed. You got what this is. You know who or what it was and what its ideas were. You know that now.

All right. You had just gotten rid of all but the last hundred pounds of force on the opposition side. And it can't stay stable anymore. Actually, it'll never be stable again – that particular problem. It can't be hung up in time that way ever again because you've taken the thing out on the thing he would pay the least attention to going away.

He doesn't care what you do to the other side. He's agin 'em. He'd kill 'em, man. Most of these opposition terminals you run into, the pc sits there and he isn't saying very much about it. But if you got him to chattering about what should really happen or what he might
possibly have done at one time or another to such people, he's liable to demonstrate a slight amount of misemotion. Have you noticed that, you know?

In other words, he doesn't like that terminal over there. So what you do to the terminal is all right with him. Now, what you do to him isn't all right with him. If he's in a terrific games condition, as your people off the street – your raw meat cases – would be, in terrific games conditions, you know. They're splintered down to about one-sixteenth of an inverted dynamic, see? And the rest of it is totally "them and me", somewhere down the line, you know?

Give a panhandler a sixpence sometime, and if you had him on the meter at that moment of what he thought of you, the amount of gratitude which he actually displayed and so forth, you'd be quite shocked. He's down to a "me" that is against all of "them," ha-ha, rrghhh. So if you want to put him in jail, he's going to object. Or if you're going to take anything away from him, he's going to object. Or if you're actually going to do anything with him, he's going to object. If you just asked him to move over to the side of the sidewalk for a moment, he's going to object. That's all there is to it.

Ahhhhh, but wouldn't he take a great deal of joy as just as he is standing there arguing with the cop, why, you came along and distracted the attention of the cop and gave the cop a bad time. You can just see that panhandler, you know, sort of dust himself off, and, "Haaaa. Haaaa. Serves him right," you know. In fact, you could do almost anything to the cop, and the panhandler would applaud you. Now, the police might not. But the panhandler will. Do you see?

So a pc will sit there and let you gun down his worst enemy with the greatest of pleasure and be very pleased with you as an auditor. And I don't know if you've noticed how pleased the pc is when you're finding opposition goals and terminals. They're sometimes very sour but it's at the terminal, not at the auditor so much.

They feel upset, but that's their areas of least blame of the auditor. You start finding opposition terminals, you won't get many ARC breaks from a pc. You can do anything you want to, to that goal and terminal over there – ha-ha-hahhh. Of course, to this panhandler, the total goal – the total goal for every terminal would be "to do me in," see? It'd be some version of that, see – "to do me in." You know, here's people painting buildings, and they don't even look at him, you know. They'd never even seen him. He could stand in front of them, and they hardly notice him. And they're busy slopping paint on the building, and so forth. But he knows what their goal is – "to do him in," you see?

The pc is backed up against the wall, he's not a panhandler, but he's backed up against the wall as far as the rest of this particular area or session is concerned. You could go over a list here. And you could go over an opposition goal or an opposition terminal list.

Now, here's an opposition list: "A policeman, a father, a meter, a teacher, a tutor, a governess." Got the idea? You could go over this opposition list and you could say to this pc, "Now, would it make any difference to you if I shot a policeman?"

"That'd be pretty good, you know."
And you go down the rest of the way and this is what you would get, you see? They'd applaud on this. It's perfectly fine with them. And of course their ideas are braced into this structure of hostility. Now, you actually aren't tricking the pc. The pc actually can recognize exactly what you're doing. And it's perfectly all right. Because what you're doing is unbalancing the resistance toward his own goal and survival line as he sees them. And you're unbalancing the resistance. So he's winning, see? What is a battle but the person who is winning is winning, you see? And the object of the battle is to win.

Of course, you get a pc "and not to win" as part of his goal, he might be a little bit upset with you if you set him in the direction of winning. But the odd part of it is the technology even overcomes that. That's just another piece of the parts.

All right. So as the individual goes along – as the individual goes along through Routine 3D, you have your best opportunity of finding what the pc has by finding out the things about the opposition.

Now, you can always lighten up the opposition without any resistance from the pc. That's dead easy. And also you can always find the pc thinks the opposition pressure is taken off. You get the rationale? And you'll find out it'll work just exactly on that one, two, three, four from now on, providing you don't go squareheaded on me and start doing your assessments upside down by turning the pages randomly at the last Book of Job or something.

You see, it'll go on just – just – just happening easily because what you do is take the weight off the pc at the point where he couldn't care less what you do to that particular zone.

All right. Now I'll show you a reverse way to do this. This is not the way to do this. This is exactly reverse wrong way to do this. We assess a person very carefully to find out exactly what they're fondest of in life. And we make a list of "Of whom was you fond, Mack ..." Because we couldn't call it auditing, so we wouldn't follow Model Session to do this sort of thing.

All right. And he says, "My grandmother, my youngest daughter, my old dog, and my car." You assess this very, very carefully and we find out that "youngest daughter" wins on the assessment.

Now, you say, "Now we're going to erase all the memories connected with your youngest daughter."

Well, do you think you'd stick to this pc in the session very long if you did this?

All right. The pc sees his goal is a good thing, and he sees his game as a good thing. This is what's idiotic about it all, that it's been getting him into trouble now for the last hundred trillennia is totally overlooked by him. So this would be the wrong way to clear somebody on a Routine 3 type process. Let's get the goal. Let's get the goal. All right, now let's erase it.

Look, isn't that what he's objecting to? Isn't that what he sits there in an assessment and objects to? That you're invalidating him, you're invalidating his goals. That you're doing this. That you're doing that. Well, the rudiments wouldn't go out if you weren't. So when I say faster clearing... There are many other reasons here, but this one should not be overlooked.
Ha-ha. You get this goal, and then you get his terminal, and then you run it on the Prehav Scale to erase it. Oh, yeah? Don't you think you're going to have a little trouble in a session? And you do. You do. You get so many hours deep into clearing and all of a sudden the pc kind of decides he doesn't want to be Clear and he doesn't want to do this and he doesn't want to do that.

And of course the enemy is still on his front doorstep and he knows he's feeling better, but he just doesn't want to go on with this. Well, now, what was this brake? Why did he put on the brakes? That's because you were attacking an ally to the exclusion of the enemy. Now, he wouldn't mind you getting rid of the ally providing the enemy was cared for. You see the rationale?

A bunch of farmers are standing out there with pitchforks and scythes and blunderbusses and they're stretched across the road. And a bunch of regular cavalry come up and say, "What's the matter boys?" And these fellows say, "Well, it's the skirmish line on that other army. And it's been getting real close to our homes, and there have been a bunch of looters and things around here and we just mean to shoot every one of those characters that we can."

And the troopers always make this mistake. They say, "Well, disperse and lay down your arms and go home."

This is how you get revolutions started. A bunch of guys are protecting their homes in some fashion. You tell them to lay down their arms and so forth. You say, "Well, we'll take care of it," in some indifferent fashion, you know. And, "Well, lay down your arms," and so forth.

That's not the way to do it at all. If you want them actually to go home, the best thing to do is go out and find a looter and hang him; and then they lay down their arms and go home. Got the idea?

They do that with the greatest of ease then. There's nothing to that. You see that as a procedure. They know you're going to do something active, and they know what's wrong with them. They know exactly what's wrong with them. It's the enemy. Well, isn't that what they think? It's the enemy. That's what's wrong with them. They know what's wrong with them. Of course, this isn't what's wrong with them at all. It's their own knuckleheaded insistence on having a goal that they then hang a modifier to, that they then apply in some peculiar and particular direction and find themselves a good enemy and then keep it mocked up. That's actually what happened, wasn't it?

But that isn't the way the pc looks at it. And I think that there isn't a pc in this room at this moment that can't look at this analytically, and individually would be resistive toward the whole idea. That couldn't possibly be it because "look what they've done to me."

Well, of course, you know nobody digs himself out of the hole unless you run off what he's done to them. But a pc won't look at this as long as there's an army standing out there that is going to fill him full of bullet holes the second he takes his finger off his number. So he's going to stay fully armed with all of his tricks. He's going to remain a very dangerous person. He's going to remain as fully dangerous as he possibly can because the whole enemy is there in full panoply.
Now, by assessment, you have actually seen a person go a little bit clearer here, some of you on the opposition terminal and opposition goal. You know, they went \textit{zzuhuhuh} off, you know, a little lighter. Because I see in your reports, report after report... I don't know. You're not picking this up from each other because it's just the natural description of the phenomena that report after report I've read — "the pc felt lighter at the end of session." You've probably written it yourself on an auditing report. "Pc felt lighter at the end of session. Pc felt less heavy. Pc felt as if he was winning." Well, he was. [laughter] That's the first and foremost reason why he felt that way.

But the mechanical reason he felt that way is in toward him, facing in toward him, were these eight billion foot-pounds of thrust, and you've reduced them down to only a billion, see, and with just the assessment. And he sees then, because you reduced them to a billion, that they might reduce further than that. And he now doesn't have to stand there fully armed, braced and barebreasted against life, you see.

Of course, you take away — I've said barebreasted, but he's fully armed and shielded against life, and he doesn't really want you to come along and take away his shield, and he doesn't want you to take away the rest of his equipment because he knows what it's facing. He knows it's dangerous not to have those things. And of course, that is the only reason he interrupts clearing.

The fellow is standing there. He's got a lamppost in his right hand. He's got his pockets filled full of tomato gravy. He has his left ear torn in three pieces and he's got lumbago. [laughter]

And you say to him, "Well, now, son, let's straighten up here. You don't have to have your ear torn in three pieces and you might at least empty your pockets out." [laughter] "Very messy."

You know, he doesn't pay a bit of attention to you. He knows that's what he needs. [laughter] He knows that these are the exact items necessary to defend himself in life. He knows those are the items. Those are the only things that make him dangerous. [laughter]

Why does he want to be dangerous? The enemy, of course. And, you see, you're stupid. You never realized this, but you're stupid. You don't know they're there. He doesn't either, but... [laughter, laughs] Yeah, that is the way the mind hangs together. And that's why you're taking it apart this exact way with Routine 3D.

You say opposition terminal. Well, that's good and solid, and he can put his attention on it in a hurry. And the reason you get the terminal before the goal is of course he can put his attention on something solid and then you can materialize the goal out of that solid. And that's easier to do than put his attention from an idea, his own goal, onto an idea, see? That's a little bit harder to do. So the easy way to do it is to find the opposition terminal. Then he knows who or what he's fighting. Oh, that's great.

Now, let's find out what their idea really is from the pc's viewpoint. Of course, it actually isn't that person's idea at all. The person lived with Bessie Bell for eighteen years, man and boy, and you start running him, and you find Bessie Bell is the enemy and wife of the enemy or something like this, or woman is the enemy. And you shake this all down and you'd
be amazed, but so would Bessie Bell, to find out that her total goal in life – this would not agree if you were processing Bessie Bell, you couldn't use this goal – but her total goal from this fellow's viewpoint and so forth, her total goal, actually, is to make a great deal of noise while setting the table and doing dishes. And that's her total goal in life. You don't realize that. She doesn't realize that. Nobody knows that but the pc.

Now, you just try and run Bessie Bell, if you had her as a pc, on "to make noise with dishes." You know, it won't assess.

Now, from her viewpoint – your pc's goal which is "to be a great building builder," or something like that – well, from her viewpoint, why, his is "to track mud all over the floors and to eat biscuits in bed." [laughter] And that's his total goal. Well, don't try to run it on him because it won't assess.

Well, these are just the offbeats of existence. There's a lecture about this already. It is the first congress I ever gave personally in London. The first lecture. It's "Your Ideas of the Other Fellow." That's the basis of aberration, is the aberrated idea of what the other fellow is up to. And it's as simple as that. But this Routine 3D plucks off the foot-poundage of the opposition, and therefore the pc can reach a little further. The pc is a little freer to look. So then the pc is willing to look up and find out what he might do if he failed. Oh, he's gotten a unfixation now to do this.

So you've unfixed him to a point where you can find his modifier which is perhaps "to run away and commit suicide in case I ever run into a Scientologist." You know, he's had it on the whole track for a hundred thousand years. [laughs] But anyway, he's got a modifier, and he'll give up his modifier, and then you can find it. And now, only now, can you find the pc's goal and terminal and be absolutely certain that you get it right on the bat. Because it's got to be the terminal for the goal plus modifier.

And the reasons you used to get such tremendous terminals lists – you know those things, I've seen them run to a thousand and more terminals and so on – it's just because you go on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on, because, of course, you weren't asking for terminal plus modifier. And you were finding, by accident, the terminal plus modifier. That is, it would finally fall out, but Lord, at the end of how much processing, how much assessment? It was very difficult.

Now, we go on to the other thing – pc's goal terminal – and we get the Prehav level for this particular thing. And now we actually, in 3D – and to be very honest with you at this stage of its development – we are in the zone at this point of test. This other up to step 5 is solid as the Rock of Gibraltar.

But I'm still, as I told you before, experimenting with the commands on this sort of thing. I want to see exactly where this thing whizzes in beings. And you're not up to running any commands yet, and you won't be for another couple of days, so I've got a little chance there to do the side research to make it faster when you get to it.

We could run just what we have been running and win on it. I've already had that checked. And it'll be perfectly all right. I just want to see if we can't really get a whizzer, really get a whizzer going on this one.
Now, I already have found out that this process alone, running the ordinary terminal and so forth, will run levels out so fast that you can no longer run the twenty minute rule. That's quite interesting. Your twenty minute rule of running is still under inspection by me. It is apparently out. And we'll go back to the Joburg rules of running which were the original rules. And we actually are looking them up. I will issue a bulletin on them, but they were running to a stuck. You run it to a stick. You actually let the thing stick. There it is. It's stuck.

And then assess again because you're not going to run it for days. I can trust you not to do that. And the reason we left it still wobbling was so as not to make an error. But you'll find that in running this, even on the old way we used to run Routine 3 terminals, that it sticks quite promptly, and goes downscale quite promptly. And you might even find yourself doing two levels a session. That's right. And you run it to stuck. And when you're absolutely sure that it is stuck and it's not going to move ... I don't know what the time limit was. That's the only thing that is out. And we have to look it up. But it's – I'd say it offhand, it'd probably be about – oh, if it's stuck for about five, six, ten minutes or something of that sort, I think I'd come off of it.

But I'd stick it. I'd stick the tone arm. Not the needle. I'd stick the tone arm. And let it go into there chunk. And I'd make sure it was sticking there because the routine behavior on this sort of thing is kind of a pattern for the pc, and you can tell when it's going to stick, and you can tell when it's stuck. And it's a skill which you'll pick up rather rapidly. And after you've seen it two or three times, you'll say well, that's that. There's nothing much to it.

All right. Well, I'm trying to speed up even that. But the data I can give you on that right now is that you run it to stuck. You'll still be all right, because you can still reassess.

In the first place, you've taken enormous weight off the case. Well, how have you taken the weight off the case? Well, you've paid some attention to the opposition, haven't you? And you paid some opposition ideas some attention. And we got a lot of things as-ised here that were still tough on the case before. All of a sudden as we run these, these get easier and easier and vanish and get all floppy, and they're out.

The bulk of time of 3D is probably devoted to assessment, not to running. That's probably the less time – on running on it. I don't know. We can't say that broadly yet, but that's just my preinformation on the thing as I look at it. Yea, I see it certainly does evaporate in a hurry. I've already seen two levels flattened in one and one-half hours of auditing. That's fairly fast, isn't it? And you run them to stuck and they all seem to run on the same old Joburg pattern that they were running on originally, which is the tone arm goes up and sticks. Runs all right for a moment, a little while, and then it goes up and sticks and then it sticks. And then you've got to reassess.

Anyway, looking at this a little bit further, there are ways, of course, to use these other parts, and that's all I'm working with on the commands right here at this moment having a little spare time. I'm just looking to see if there isn't some way we can weave these parts in, in a perfectly optimum pattern that will get a faster run on them, see? I've already got them woven in, but let's get it faster than that.

And that ought to be a whizzer. So we're in the throes of running one which we have solved and improving it before you get to the running of it. Pretty good.
Now, when we have this being run on half discharged and dismissed goals, my pity, my sympathy is with you. You've already run these goals halfway down. They are not reacting right. Nothing is reacting right. This is all being fairly rapid at this time. You're going to save time in the long run. But nothing is reacting exactly right. Goals are going in, and goals are going out, and sporadically this way and over the tin cup that way, and so forth. And you'll get to the end of your assessment on many cases, and you won't have any goal, and you won't have any modifier, and you won't have any opposition terminal. You won't have nothing. You'll just have a handful of air.

Well, the only thing that makes it random is you're assessing against half-run goals. Now, there's not enough time for you to have flattened that and then run them. So I'm just throwing that problem into your lap. And you might as well get used to having trouble with assessment. You just might as well get used to living with it. Because what is the trouble? The main trouble with assessment is the rudiments go out and the rudiments go in, and so forth. But about halfway through clearing, which is not too many hours deep in a case now, you're going to run into this trouble anyhow.

You'll think that after you get the person's terminal and goal all patched up and they're squared away and so forth, and you finally got it all discharged and all, you get onto the second one. Now you're on solid ground. Well, you're only... you're on uniform ground – quicksand. [laughter] And that is just simply on this basis: That you find the person's goal, and the goal goes crash, and goes half a dial, rock slam, and oh, marvelous. And you'll find the opposition terminal and half a dial, rock slam, oh, marvelous. And you'll find the opposition goal, and it's a quarter dial rock slam, and you go back and check the goal, and that's a half a dial. And then you go back and check this, and you say, "Well, I'll go on and finish this anyway," and an eighth of a dial rock slam is the opposition goal.

Well, you go back and find the modifier now, and you'll find a half a dial rock slam. Marvelous. Half a dial rock slam. And oh, that's good. Well, we thought the whole thing was disappearing, you know, and it's easy, now that we've got the half a dial rock slam, and so forth. All right. Now let's get the goal plus modifier, and let's find the pc's terminal. And we've put the goal plus the modifier together, and we've got an eighth of a dial rock slam. Well, this is not so good.

Well, let's go back and check it against the goal and the other parts. And we find out they're all eighth of a dial. Oh, well, let's go on and do the goals terminal assessment anyway. And we go ahead and we do a goals terminal assessment, and we're just about halfway through the list, and everything is going fine, and things are nulling, and things are nulling, and things are nulling, and we jus – looks – looks marvelous. And we go on down to the bottom of the list, and go back through the list again. We go back through the list again, and then we just go – no list.

And you say well, the rudiments are out. So you go back and put the rudiments in, but they're in. And you go back and look at the list, and then you go back and check the goal, and then you check the modifier. And it's gone. There's nothing. There's nothing no place, nowhere. You've lost it all. It's evaporated.
You get your rudiments in. You check everything. You check everything across the
bords. And you make all possible cross-checks across the board. But that goals terminal –
you never even got to the Prehav Scale. So you say, well, better luck next time. We go back
and we find one, and by George, we find a nice beefy goal there. It's a quarter of a dial rock
slam, and everything is going along fine, and we assess it right on down. Everything is work-
ing out perfectly, right up to the moment we find the opposition terminal. That whole list goes
null. The whole list.

We go back and we say, "We've got to check the goal. It's not there. But it is there. But
no, it's not, it isn't there. No, it is. No. I – the – huh – hmm."

Now, the reason I am telling you this is because you could make the most serious mis-
take of your career to drop it at that point. Because the opposition goal is in, the modifier is
in, the goal plus terminal is in, and they will all do a quarter of a dial rock slam the instant
you find them. And no longer.

So, we get something you will have to learn how to do in 3D. You'll have to assess on
everything going out. And this is a marvelous time for you to learn how right now, because
these things that you're running are practically run out or half run out, and they're washing.

So right at the beginning we get the opport unity of learning the hard way because the
hard – the end of this thing can get very rough on you.

Now, you only want an equal needle reaction to each part of 3D, see, to the goal, the
opposition terminal, the opposition goal and the modifier goals plus terminal and the goal-
plus-modifier terminal. You only want equal actions across those and the Prehav Scale at any
given moment.

And if while you were assessing the action is getting less, you'll find it's also getting
less on the other parts.

Now, for instance, you'll find that if the goal – if you – we can find the modifier, but it
keeps going in and out. I'm talking about an advanced run now. This is all data on advance
runs. This person has already been entered into clearing, and so on. And the thing's going in
and out. It reads every third time you say it. Do you know the goal will now read every third
time you say it? See, the goal was checked out perfectly at first. Now it reads every third
time you say it. Every part you have will read every third time you say it. You get the idea?

See, that's how faintly this can be read. They're all going to act the same, and you're
going to get fooled on that because you're going to get so doggone nailed down to the opposition
goal, for instance, and you finally going to find one. You've got the whole list run down,
and there's only one, and it's acting and it's reacting, and it's acting and it's reacting, and it's
acting and it's reacting.

You say, "Well, we've got to do something else. It's acting and it's react ..." Now check
that goal, man. Let's go back and check the goal.

Is it acting and reacting and not acting and acting and not acting and acting and not
acting, too? Like that other one is? Because that would tend to prove it out. There's another
cross-check, you see? Is what you found now acting like the goal acts? Because the goal action can change every time you find one of these parts, the goal can act a little bit less.

The point of reference – let me put it this way – against which you're verifying is itself deintensifying. So of course, that goal is the point of reference, and as it deintensifies, so do all other reactions tend to deintensify.

But where the goal is in strong, and your – the thing you have just got down to and selected as the final part of your list is going in and going out and going in and going out, and you test the goal. You say, "To build great buildings" and it goes *pow!* And you say, "To build great buildings." *Pow!* "To build great buildings." *Pow!* And you say this opposition goal, see, "To eat up timbers," see. You say, "To eat up timbers." It goes *wiggle.* "To eat up timbers." None. "To eat up timbers." Half a dial drop. "To eat up timbers." None.

And you say, "To build great buildings." *Pow!* "To build great buildings." *Pow!*

You got the idea? Huh? "Build great buildings" is still in and still constant and still of the same magnitude. Well, you've just got the wrong item, that's all. Simple as that. You've just got the wrong item. Or the rudiments are completely crazy on the subject of this particular item where there's been an invalidation of this item, or there's something wrong with this item and this list that you are doing. Not with anything else.

You haven't bled it down to the point where you've got every single possible goal that the pc would have for that. You just haven't got a complete list. You've done a poor job technically. That's all.

See, now differentiate between doing a poor job technically – in other words, not doing this one, two, three of get the rudiments in, bleed the meter down, sensitivity 16, set your meter back to a dial drop and then *assess,* you see. Get your rudiments in, check, you know, that kind of thing. That will hold, and it will hold straight through. Well, you've done something there wrong. The rudiments aren't in or you haven't gotten the whole list or something's off.

See, if the person didn't invalidate on the list, the rudiments would be out, and so forth. And there's something technically wrong.

Now, you've got to differentiate between a technical error and a fading goal. And don't you ever dare cross the two because, you see, it'd be very pleasant to be able to say, every time you made a technical error, that there was now something wrong with the assessment. See, that'd let everybody out from under except the pc. I don't say any of you'll do this, but I do point it out. I do point it out quite strongly that that is the way it is.

You're assessing against a vanishing standard. The standard is vanishing, in other words, this pinpoint on which you're referring everything. You're measuring a room, and you've driven a nail in the middle of the room, and you've got a tape. And you take this tape and you measure the distance to every corner of the room and to the ceiling and the floor and the lightbulbs and the fireplace, and so forth. And you've got all these distances, and they're all relative to that pin in the middle of the room. And being relative to that pin, everything is fine as long as nobody moves the pin. Yeah, it's okay. I mean you can always know where to put this room back together again as long as you've got that pin.
All right. And you come back and you look at it. Now, a whole room depends on this pin, see, all your measurements. And you come back and you look at it and you find out it's half its size. Makes you a little bit nervous, doesn't it. Well, actually, it's fine. The case is going Clear, but you come back again, you take a look at this pin; it's a quarter of the size. And you come back and take a look at it again, and it's appearing and then disappearing, and then appearing and then disappearing. Rrrrrrr. And then you come back and take a look at it and it's just a kind of a little mark that occasionally is there, but usually isn't. And that's what you've got as a reference point to measure the rest of the room by.

All right. Now, this would be very difficult if only the pin moved. Actually, because the pin is a standard, everything moves with the pin. The distances go in and out just as the pin goes in and out, you see?

So if that nail gets half the size then, for instance, your goal modifier, when it's finally checked (although the first time you hit it you get a bang out of it) – it'll settle down suddenly and the pin's gone half its size, the goal modifier is now half the size that it would have been. Got the idea? Everything goes down in exact proportions, which is lucky for you. It's just lucky that it does that.

See, it's all part of the same charge, and as it discharges, the whole charge reads the same. And these are all parts of the same charge. So of course, as the pin goes down, all the other things go down, too.

And when it finally blows up, it only blows up if you've got all parts of it.

Now, this sets up a considerable technical problem for you. And you think I may be stressing this a little bit hard, but you'll encounter this problem often enough.

The problem on assessment is how do you continue the list? It's this idiotic problem. You've got a Goals Assessment, see? Now, that's fine. You can make a Goals Assessment entirely independent of everything else and wind up with a goal, see, because that's the center pin from which you're measuring everything by. Why, that Goals Assessment, that's just dandy. You can get a goal, and there it is. And everybody's happy with this as a goal.

All right. Fine. Now we do an opposition assessment. Ha-ha. That's fine. Good. We can do an opposition assessment, and it's all right. And we finally get there. And we get the opposition terminal, and that's fine. And we put the opposition terminal down.

All right. But notice something here. That in order to get an opposition goal, you must have had the opposition terminal. Oh, you need the part in 2 in order to do 3. Ho-ho! And look, look here. You need the parts in 2 and 3 in order to do 4 and find the modifier. And look, you've got to have the parts of 1 and 4 in order to do number 5. And if you haven't got those parts, you can't do the next step, can you?

Now, listen to me carefully. Wake up and listen to me carefully now, because you never dare leave 3D incomplete on any assessment. Now, remember that. Never leave 3D incomplete from parts 1 to 5. You may never get to 6, and that's all right. But never let it be incomplete from 1 to 5. Never. Always complete that assessment.
Well, how are you going to complete an assessment – this is your main problem here – how are you going to complete an assessment that disappears at item 3? Everything folded up at item 3.

You didn't even get the opposition goal. You got close to the opposition goal, and then suddenly – even the rudiments were in and everything else – the opposition goals, the opposition assessment, and the goal itself apparently blew. It just went like a chain of firecrackers. Brrrrrrp. Bang!

Well now, you say, "Oh, well, that's a good thing. Now we don't have to do 4 and 5."

Well, listen to me carefully. If you don't do 4 and 5, you're going to leave this pc with a hidden aberration that nobody from here on is ever going to suspect. And people will be saying, "You know, Clears act peculiarly." [laughter] Yeah, well, this one is acting peculiarly. He's still got 4 and 5 stuck and vanished and totally out of sight. And that's because somebody didn't complete the whole 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Now, how can you complete the whole 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, if 3 went? Because you've got to have 3 in order to get 4. You must have had 2 and 3 in order to get 4, right? You've got to have these. They're going to stack up one way or the other. Well, how you gonna get them?

Well, listen to this one carefully. You just take the last item you had active and get the next one. You were doing a Goals Assessment, and you do the last item active or the one on the list you can get to kick now and then, which would of course eventually become the last item that's active because it'd kick now and then before it disappeared, see.

So therefore, every time you read one of these things – . Reading them three at a time uniformly is now a good weapon in your hands because if it wasn't null, you're going to make a mark, you see. And you're going down the line, you see. Then you can tell how many times you've been over the list and therefore how many times that thing reacted.

Even though the whole list suddenly blew up on you and wasn't there anymore and you couldn't find anything else on the list, and you just find your hand full of air, well, you do have, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, you do have one item which reacted five times. Oh, well, that's very nice. That's very fine. We have an item that reacted five times.

Now, the only time when you ever turn an E-Meter up to sensitivity 16 to do an assessment, you rapidly read them one time each. This time carefully preserving them to keep them from going out. Read them in a soft tone of voice. Go down the list one time each and note the greatest reaction, and do your assessment at sensitivity 16 as long as you can. And then if it all blows up and goes out the window, you still have got an awfully good idea exactly what the item was. Well, that was it. It was firing there for a moment. Now, it's gone.

Use that and go to the next item. And do you know that you can get a whole assessment done on the next item even though the former item is gone? Because the next item will stay in long enough to do an assessment. And now you'll have to catch the next point on the fly, you know, as it goes overhead, in order to get the next item up the line. Got the idea?

That's the only real cleverness that Routine 3D takes. Of course, it takes a clever auditor to audit anyhow, but this is tricky. This is tricky. It's sort of catching the brass ring on the
merry-go-round. You'll find that that list, however, will stay alive until you get close to the actual one, before it blows and things blow before it.

Now, the beauty of it is this: as you get down toward the end, anything nearly approaching accuracy will probably blow it anyway. So as a person goes toward Clear, the death is our penalty accuracy, if we don't hit it right on the head, it's much less. It's much less liability. Try to get it. Try to get it accurately toward the end of an assessment. And you get something – now listen to me – get something to carry on to the next section, heh-heh, please. And roll it on down.

You know, it's this: "Well, now look, I've said something and then you had a cognition. What was it you had a cognition on? I mean, what did I say that you had a cognition on?"

And the pc thinks it over. "Well, it's so-and-so and so-and-so."

Ha-ha, good. Write that item down and carry it on to the next list. Got the idea? I mean you could catch these things no matter how faint they got, but it can require some cleverness on your part.

Now, you could waste an enormous amount of time on a half, threequarters, nine-tenths rubbed out item and list and section and so forth, driving yourself and the pc completely around the bend by just not taking what you do have left. And of course, by driving him around the bend, you'll ARC break it or something of that sort, so that it all does go out of existence, and then it's very difficult to get in. And you've just complicated the whole thing.

So, develop this little habit, would you please, in doing Routine 3D: As you pass on from – down from the goal, make a peculiar mark somewhere on the list as the likely – you don't tell the pc what it is – just mark it down as the likely one.

If you get in the habit of doing this – marking down the likely one before you prove it – as you go later on the case and the case is clearing more rapidly, you will have something left before it vanishes on you suddenly. And you won't get caught adrift on the open sea on a pocket handkerchief. The likely one. That isn't of course what you're going to force on the pc. And if your assessment continues, and you really do get the one, and you notice how far out you are, you will eventually develop a facility for getting just about what it was, you know, right about there.

And of course, as you go on down the list further, the way it's a likely one is the person is giving you the listing, and that sort of thing. And he's given you the whole listing on down toward the end of the listing. And you start to assess the thing, you'll develop some sort of thing as, "Which one of these items sticks in your mind?"

"Oh," he says, "well, to shoot turnips. That's really stuck there. Thought about that for a moment or two. I did, yes. I thought about that for a moment or two." A little tick opposite.

Now go on and assess, see. And we find out that it was probably "shoot turnips."

Now, you will learn to catch these things on the fly before they vanish in front of your face. Otherwise, your main trouble in clearing is not going to be auditing. It'll suddenly be-
come a nightmare to you. Cases usually audit much more easily as they become Clear, you see, than they did before. They're usually horrible to audit right at the "opening gun," you see.

And that's not true of Routine 3D. The case gets more and more horrible the further it goes.

You get into guesstimates of the situation. And the accuracy with which you must perform, a guesstimate of the situation will be quite a contest as far as you're concerned. But always do all parts of Routine 3D. Never miss. Always do them all.

Go back over and sort of select it all out. If everything has vanished, your rudiments are in, and there's nothing else you can do about it, go over the last list that you did have, somehow or another reconstruct the picture. Somehow or another get what it would have been, and put it down on the next list in order to carry on. Because you'll find that list is still alive.

Now, you can do a complete assessment and be perfectly happy. But remember on that one it's going to happen faster than it happened on the one before. You're going to get a quicker blowout. So on that one, well, it's best idea to get a likely – the most likely. As you go down the list, which one stuck in your mind – of all these, which ones do you think would be the most probable of this sort of thing?

And as we're reading it the first time and we suddenly notice as we're reading down the first line, boy, it was an awful jolt there on ... We noticed that the goal jolt occurred for just an instant on number 16.

Now, we read on down the list. That list is never going to be live again. We go back. There it is. Now we got that one. We carry that over to the next one. Then all of a sudden the whole thing blows like a string of firecrackers.

That's your biggest problem. You see how to do it? Now, of course, you realize that I will scalp you, I will scalp you if I find you suggesting that as the one to the pc. That's just a preventive action.

Now, I'm very glad with the work you are doing on this. I want to compliment you, actually, on the work you are doing on this. It's pretty fine and it gives me great heart in the matter. Your assessment is picking up. It's getting more accurate, and so on. You'll be a perfectly safe auditor on this when your assessments are always 100 percent accurate and you're totally cocky about the whole thing. So that's the frame of mind I want you to assume.

Now, in actuality, your accuracy will increase to the degree that your own case makes progress, too, you see? So we've got that one also. So we're working on a very fine front here. There's nothing much wrong with that.

I do feel for you, however, some of you who have had a goal and it flicks, and you have no parts to put down on anything. You're trying desperately to proceed, and so forth. Well, I would frankly much rather have you suffer at Saint Hill than in Bulawayo or Keokuk.

There is no reason to go on and dignify the name of Bulawayo any longer. It means the place where we all got killed. I don't know if any of those from Bulawayo know this, but
that's what it means. And it's because there was an old friend of the fellow down there named it.

Anyhow, we don't want everybody being killed down in Bulawayo because somebody can't assess on 3D.

The progress you're making on this – do you like the progress you're making on this?

*Audience:* Yes.

Do you see where you're going on this?

*Audience:* Yes.

Does it look like an easier trail to walk through than the woods you were in before?

*Audience:* Yes.

All right.

As soon as you get the hang of it, as soon as you see the put together of the thing, and as soon as your own confidence in your ability to assess and keep rudiments in improves, all of a sudden, it'll look just like that. It'll look like nothing to you. And you'll say clearing, smearing – easy. There's nothing to it. *Bang! Bang!*

So that's what I want you to work on: positiveness of assessment, speed of assessment, self-confidence in the assessments that you do. And the accuracy of the final result. And then you will find that the whole parts will string together and you'll feel good about it.

In the meantime, I'll get you some hot commands whipped up on this one. Okay?

*Audience:* Yes.

Thank you.
Thank you.

All right. It says here the 16th of Nov. 61. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. I'm very pleased to hear that we are getting rapid checkouts. There's lots of people wanting things checked out. It's about time that we got the fire lighted in back of the rocket and took the donkey out of the traces.

This is all about Routine 3D, of course, and the first thing that I would like to remark on is the way people can dream up mistakes, you know. You lay something down and you say, "Well, you put your right foot in front of your left foot, you know. And then, by George – did you know that was only when you used Hessian – when you were wearing Hessian boots? And did you know that was only when the snow was coming down and the temperature was 16 degrees exactly Fahrenheit above zero. Did you realize that?"

This is the kind of – sort of thing I get, you know. They say you do this and you do this, you know. There are no exceptions. There's just – that's it, you see. And then you find out that's only when you're wearing Hessian boots. And you get these weird additives onto the situation and that sort of thing. And anybody could do it. But they just read something that isn't there, you know. Or they just heard something that was never said.

And we've had a couple of you actually reading the whole list, including those that went null. In other words, you list – take fifteen items, so every time the auditor goes over the list, he reads fifteen items regardless of what went null. If it went null on one reading, then we read it again, see, kind of to see if it's still null or something And of course, the pc goes stark, staring mad. A pc will go halfway around the bend. His bank will practically collapse on him because you've got this thing null, you see, and now you've started to audit it. And nothing'll scrub, and the pictures will start collapsing, and bric-a-brac starts flying about, and the rudiments will go out that way, and the pc maybe doesn't spot what's happening, and it is just a – somebody said on a report today – a cow's breakfast. [laughter]

Here and there, there are going to be people who wouldn't realize that that would do anything wrong, you see.

You know how I know this was being done? Because there are exactly the same number of check marks after each read. We get an X and then we get a live read after it, and then we get an X and a live read after it. And although stylized assessment tells us that all we do is put down a slant and as long as it's alive we just leave the slant there and leave it alone, for the purpose of checking, it'd probably be much easier on Ds of Ps if we put a slant down every time it was alive. Some of you are doing that. Then you can see that the item went alive and went dead and went alive and gives you more information. You make a mark every time. The system's perfectly acceptable.

SHSBC TAPES 001-100 1807 04.02.15
Any system you use is perfectly acceptable as long as it's readable. As long as I know – as long as I know what you're doing with the system. You see that? Nobody's forcing that marking system off on you as a system. But let's have the thing discernible as to what was going on. And the agreed-upon one is you make a slant when it's alive. And when it goes dead, you put a cross – you complete that slant and make it a cross.

And now we could tell if this ever happened again if people kept on making slant marks after a cross.

Now, sometimes rudiments go out. And the whole list goes null, and nothing is reading. The goal isn't reading. Nothing is reading anyplace because the rudiments are out. We go through the whole list, and we X the whole list out. Well, it would save us a little work if we made a slant every time that we went through the list and found something alive or out. If we marked it every time it would save us a little work. Why?

Because we only had to go back as far as the rudiments were out, you see. We'd only have to go partially back through the list again. We'd just take those that were still in. We'd see that the rudiments had been out. "There were some stuff alive after the fourth read, and then everything went null, and then something" Well, we've got to reassess again all over. Well, there's no reason really to go back to the beginning of the assessment and scrub it out because we would upset the pc's bank if we did that.

Let's take the point where they all went out and then just back up about two reads, you see? And just reread those and we'll find they're all in again. You see that as a time saver. It's a good idea.

But whatever you do, the only exception – and that's not a full exception to scrubbing them out and Xing them out and leaving them out when you're doing an assessment list – the only exception to it is when everything has gone null and by reason of out-rudiments. And now you don't know where you are at. You get the rudiments in, well, there's no reason to throw the list away. What went out was not the list but the rudiments. And the list ceased to read.

So, you've got to backtrack across all those beautiful Xes, all those items you'd already gotten rid of. You'll just have to move back now into the area where you still had reads and reassess from there on. So in that event, you could see a marking like this: Slant, slant, X, slant, slant, X, slant, slant. That would look very weird, but it would mean that the rudiments went out and everything went null on the list.

But before you got that kind of a pattern, it must have happened that all, the whole list, went null because of out-rudiments. See, you'd have to have realized that. You see what I'm talking about? But just going through, you don't X one out and slant it back in and X it out and slant it in, and in and out and in and out.

Assessment is very remarkable because we are doing basically Assessment by Elimination which at best is a happy accident. I found that auditors were having great difficulty differentiating between the greatest read and the leesest read. And I found out that there was an enormous advantage, and actually helped the case and advanced things and so forth, to
assess by elimination. And I found this oddity. That on Assessment by Elimination, you wind up with one item. And it stays in. Now that was a happy accident.

Well, there's only one list on Routine 3D that violates this one item left. And that is the modifier. The modifier over here, which I think is number 4. Yes. Mr. Modifier can easily be left with three, four or five alive before they all null.

Now, the three, four or five alive combined in some peculiar way gives you the modifier. They don't give you the modifier complete. They usually give you the modifier in phrases. So, one phrase of the modifier was at the beginning of the list and another phrase of the modifier was at the end of the list, and a couple of phrases of the modifier were in the middle of the list. And you wind up there, when you get down in assessing a modifier, and you find you've got three or four still alive, well, just assume that in some combination you've got the modifier. Now, if you combine these around and you take these four ... You know that silly game that they have "Beat the Clock" and that sort of thing, you know, and the girl steps up with this magnetic board, and "a stitch in moss saves nine" or something like this. And she's got some type of thing, you know, and she steps up and she moves these boards over the magnetic blackboard to finally come up with "a rolling stone never has to work" or whatever it is. And you've got – you've got this thing. And they've got to make a cliche. Well, in this particular operation, a similar operation takes place at the stage of the modifier.

Let's say you've got – I don't care if you take five. You've got five final bits. And I can give you an example possibly. But you've got these five final bits. And they're apparently disrelated, you know. "To heave everything overboard" is one of them. "Leave forever" is another one of them. You know, you've asked the fellow what he'd do in revenge or his consequences or his threat or something, whatever you want, in case his goal wasn't reached – what he would add to that goal, you know.

And the list is long, but "just to throw everything overboard" or "heave everything overboard" is one of them. "To leave forever" is another one. And they're disrelated, see; they're a half a list apart. And you get down to the end of the list and you've still got these two alive. And they're very markedly alive, and they both get the same little funny rock slam or whatever it is that you're assessing the goal, and everything else is following through on, on a pattern. And you should at that moment suspect that the modifier "to build" – "to build ships" let us say, was the goal, you see; "to build ships" – the modifier is not just one of these. The modifier is both of them. And your main problem is which one comes first. That's your main problem. Of course, you do that by asking the pc how do these things fit.

Well, of course, you find out it's "to build ships or throw everything overboard and leave forever." "To build ships or to throw everything overboard and leave forever," you see. That's quite easy to disentangle. But some of them are quite esoteric. And what keeps them tied in is the fact that they are denied to the pc.

He's got them mocked up, but now he can't get back at them again because they're bouncers, they're denyers, they're call-backs. It's a mess.

I'll give you a few tips on this. It isn't as crucial now that you're doing 3D. It isn't anywhere near as rough as it was. You'll find that you can sort the modifier out of this long list of
threats that he gives you, and so forth. But for heaven's sakes, write down every one he gives you when he gives it to you because he may say it and bounce, see?

He says, "to leave forever" and that just flicks it and throws it into restimulation and you'll never get it again because he's bounced – he's gone. Now, what do I mean by "bounced"? And if you get the idea of the pc traveling on the time track and then moving off at an erratic angle, he's going from a consecutive moment to moment to moment to moment, very nicely, but he hits moment thirteen, and he goes at right angles. See, he doesn't move up the time track and down the time track. Actually, he just moves at right angles to it. He just leaves that area. And you actually get some of the wildest phenomena.

You'll be auditing along, you'll be trying to find a modifier, and all of a sudden the pc will be in present time. Actually, sometimes in auditing a goals terminal that has a lot of modifiers in the goal that are bouncers – you'll be actually running the goals terminal, and the pc will be sitting there all of a sudden, suddenly, you see, just he'll be sitting there bright-eyed, wide open, and so on. He's looking at you, very alert, and you'll notice there's something strange that just happened and so forth. And he'll say, "Well, I – yeah, it was a long time ago. Yep, well, that's a long time ago. Well, it sure feels better to be in present time. Everything feels better."

You ask him the next auditing question, you know, "What dog's breakfast do you dislike?" And he says, "Oh, I guess I would have liked something or other," something or other, and so on. "But, you know, I think that thing is all erased. It's worked out. You know, I'm not the least bit concerned about it now. Ha-ha-ha."

Actually, what he's done – you don't do anything about it. You just go on auditing him. But you should understand what's happened to him. He's hit the bouncer. And it makes him feel like he's in present time.

Well, if present time was 1 trillion, 765 million years ago, he's in present time all right. But he's gone at right angles, and he's no longer thinking, you see, of what he was thinking about, and it's sort of not any longer in his vicinity. So he's happy about the whole thing. And of course, that's the way he's gotten by in the past. He's hit this bouncer. He's gone off and he didn't have to worry about it anymore. And you'll have a lot of people around who tell you that they have odd things happen to them.

Well, they go on worrying. They can worry just so long. And then they don't care anymore. And they actually are not particularly quoting the modifier, and so forth. They're just – they hit the bouncer. And they've observed about themselves that they just worried so long and then didn't care anymore.

And the modifier would be something like this: "Well, but if I have to worry about it, I will leave forever," you know. And they've hit the "I'll leave forever." Bang! They're out of it. It's quite interesting. It's like keeping track of a ping-pong ball, you know.

Well, there are down-bouncers. "But I will go back and finish it later," see. Now, there is a down-bouncer combined with an up-bouncer. Isn't that nice?

So, of course, when he hits the down-bouncer, he goes down the time track, goes earlier in time. But a split second later will hit the up-bouncer and be in apparent present time,
and you know? And he'll be giving you the modifier list. And you watch. I invite your attention on this.

When you're assessing for modifiers and when you're getting the list, watch the different manifestations of the pc. They get restive, they get twisty, or they'll be very relaxed, or all of a sudden they don't care about it. It seems all right to them suddenly. Everything seems fine. First time it seemed fine for a long time. For a long time. And you'll very often find it's in the next phrase. Exactly what the pc has done one or two phrases ago, you were checking off, you see, is found suddenly in the next phrase to be alive. You get the idea?

You'll hit a bouncer or something and then by your repeating the bouncer, he goes back into this thing, and he changes his manifestation. It's quite wild. And looking for the modifier knocks the fellow all over the time track. The thing is a stuck moment in time. Actually, the goal, the opposing terminal, the opposing goal, the modifier, and the goal-plus-modifier terminal, and the Prehav level are all suspended in one instant of time. See, they had an inception. They started somewhere. And he's nowhere else than there. But the phraseology in it gives him the illusion of elsewhere. And he responds with a total dramatization of the modifier with his down-bouncers, up-bouncers, call-backs.

Now, a call-back "but I will leave and come here, zoooooom, clink, see? Now, those are the, the command. Anything that you could tell a person to do as an order – to go up, to go down, to go out, to go in, to go earlier, to go later – any type of command that you could give somebody who's kind of in an hypnotic trance, you know, make him feel that he was earlier or later, are these bouncers.

Now, "out" actually classifies as a bouncer and a denyer. A denyer is the things which deny knowledge of. And that is "never know it," "never know about it," "can't come near it," – which is a combination of a denyer and a – see? All of these phraseologies which any phrase that you can think of in any language that would deny a person knowledge of something would be classified as a denyer.

All right. Now, the most important of these are the bouncers, whether up or down, the denyer, and the call-back. And that's the "come-heres" in it, you see, and so forth.

Now, classified with these call-backs are the stickers. And you, of course, have been finding stuck on the track ever since you've been auditing And they are stuck phrases in modifiers. "Stay right here and wait no matter how long it takes." That would not be unusual to find in a modifier. It parks the person on the track very effectively.

Now, the oddity is here that these semantics do exist in the modifier and do exist as appendages to the goal. That's an oddity, but they do. And you can count on finding them. The goal, of course, is in plain view: "To build ships." Oh, well, to build ships, naturally – the Queen has crowned him in the past for building ships. He's been complimented for building ships, and so forth. And everything has been going along fine about building ships except one thing: He just never seemed to succeed in building ships. Everything happened but the building of ships.

He wanted to build ships. He knew he wanted to build ships. But he somehow or another never really gets down to building ships. And he gets close to building ships, it's very
upsetting to him. Nobody has ever had a successful career on their goal terminal. They haven't had totally successful careers on that, ever since it became this combination.

There's always been something wrong with the career; and they knew it. It was an unhappy circumstance. They've done it somewhat. They have tried it somewhat. They have always lived with it. And somehow or another it has always worked into the woof and warp of their existence. But they've never succeeded. A person who has a goal to be an actress which assessed out as the only goal and which ran on Routine 3D, you would check back carefully and find that she had many, many, many times been an actress. That's for sure. She'd many times been an actress and gotten shot and stabbed and the theater burned down and producers committed suicide and she committed suicide and everybody in the company who's died, and so forth. And it's just like a Jonah. See?

She had a goal to be an actress. The others were just actresses, see? Actors and actresses, that was all right. But she had a goal to be an actress, you see? Well, why? Well, of course, there's the modifiers. And she's failed in the goal. And as she fails in the goal, she, of course, adds little threats to it to people who shouldn't keep her from failing in it, you see? That's a preventive. The modifier is a preventive. It makes people leery of stopping you along this line.

That's one of the things it does. It's barbed wire, which is hidden under the water. So "to build ships" – this is great, see. "To build ships, and if they don't go down the ways properly, to fix them so they sink at once; because they will be unlucky, and nobody will be able to live with them or know why." Now, we get this bird, and the Royal Navy gets him over here in a dockyard, see, and he's a shipwright. And it's all right as long as they go down the ways properly. This fellow has never worried. But you can see his fellow workers, you know. He says he worries about the luckiness of it, and he wants to know who's going to launch the ship, what admiral's wife, or what politician's wife is going to crack the champagne on the nose, and so on. The funny part of it is there never has been – if you check with him – there never has been a ship launched right. There's always something a little wrong. The champagne splattered too much, you see, or the ways stuck for a moment, or didn't actually bob properly as it went into the water, you see. And there's always something a little bit wrong with it, and eventually you'll find his fellow workmen a little bit superstitious about ever letting him go aboard a ship after it's launched because they sink.

It's quite untraceable aside from the fact that he always goes down and trips over the plug by accident, you see?

But that whole modifier will be effective. But, look, trying to find that modifier. Look if you've got "to sink." Now, a person hits this, accepts this as a literal connotation, of course, goes out of the moment.

And you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "What?"

"Well, what did you just say?"
"Well, I – I didn't – didn't say anything much. I – I don't know what – just a minute. I've got it." There is a comm lag of some kind or another. "It's something here, something here, something here, something here."

And he'll think around for it for a while, and he'll never get it again.

But if you say, "Sink, sink, sink, sink, sink, sink, sink, sink. Now, what was the line?"

"Oh, to sink them."

And he's right back in, and you've got a read back on the meter. Now, the dangers of finding a modifier consist of the fact that they go on and off the meter. Ha-ha. In other words, a person can bounce out of that instant in time and cease to read on the meter.

Now, of course, we've taken the weight, actually, off of the modifier by finding the opposing goal and the opposing terminal. And we've got those things found, so the weight is actually off, and the modifier is more visible. Actually, the case isn't under as much pressure as he was under because you've already located the enemy for him. And it's easier to find the modifier, but you will still very probably get into situations in finding the modifier where the whole list goes null.

Everything else is in, but the whole list is null. You can find nothing. It was reacting. It isn't reacting. It would be the most mysterious thing you ever saw if you don't know the data I'm giving you here. It'll just be a total mystery. And everybody will be able to run Routine 3D right down to step 4. And then every so many cases, they will strike one that is, "Well, I got as far as the modifier. We never did find the modifier. Why?"

Well, the case is very live, and the case dramatizes the modifier so heavily that when it says "leave," he leaves the incident, and it won't read. When it says "sink" he sinks below the incident, and of course it won't read. And when it says "never know about it and nobody will find out," of course, he never finds out.

In other words, he does everything idiot simple that it says in the modifier, which is quite remarkable. A modifier does not also care about spelling. Anything that could be translated through is quite marvelous. He rowed a boat. R-o-a-d a boat, see? R-o-d-e a boat. You very often find him putting to sea with boots and spurs on and think it was quite necessary. Quite in addition to r-o-w-e-d a boat. This is idiot. This is Simple Simon idiocy. And any language the pc gets into, the modifier shortly gets translated over so it's now expressed in the new language. Interesting, isn't it? Because in the first place, the modifier is a thought, and if you believe that all thoughts are semantic, why then, of course, nobody can think without talking.

Actually, this whole thing is conceptual. And you'll get a conceptual line, so at various times of his career, the concept is transferred over into the homonyms and synonyms of the language in which he happens to be living at the moment. And it has different – it has quite different homonymities. I can't think of one in Japanese particularly, but that would be a doll, you know.

Anybody that ever picks up a body in Japan must go practically mad because practically everything means everything. So any concept of leaving would get translated into any
Japanese word that sounds like the Japanese word "leaving." And you'd have homonymity. Well, a homonym, of course, is he rowed a boat. Which "rowed" are you talking about? You see? R-o-d-e, r-o-w-e-d and r-o-a-d. They're homonyms. It's actually, they're close homonyms – sonic homonyms. They're spelled differently which is why I'm trying to use it to get it across to you. But just rowed. Well, in Japanese "to eat rice," "to cross bridges," "to blow your nose," "to kill your wife," is probably all under the – under the same word weh. See, every weh, and that could mean any one of those. You'll see two Japanese in argument and they have to get out pencils and papers and write the katakana characters up in the corner. And they write the Chinese character. And they write the Chinese character down to show it to each other.

"Oh, you're talking about your shipyard. Ah, ha-ha-ha, I see, I thought you were talking about the theater."

What it is, is a very intellectual people unfortunately inherited a melee sort of dialect which wasn't much of a language. And then the Buddhist priests came in and taught them to read and write in Chinese. And so their written tongue is enormously expressive with something on the order of, I don't know, three hundred thousand words in it, all with different Chinese characters, but not pronounced the same as the Chinese pronounce them. But their spoken language is baby talk. And people look at you with awe when you say you can speak some Japanese.

I don't know why they'd look at you with awe about speaking Japanese. Oh, reading Japanese, well, they should look at you as a miracle of all miracles. In the first place, it'd ruin anybody's eyesight as the first and foremost thing, you see.

But that's homonymic. So the thetan would get – would have this thought concept going through – to build ships or sink them if they didn't go all right, if they didn't launch all right. And he'd have that concept through, but it'd transfer into all homonyms in Japanese.

That isn't an important point to you. It's just a little side comment. In other words, he'd think, you know, "building ships, launching ships, sinking ships, and going away," and so on. He'd think this, you see, but it wouldn't be verbalized.

Now, that nonverbalized thing, of course, adapts itself into the language, so he will verbalize it. And probably the first time it ever gets adapted into the language, in some cases in some parts of the modifier, is when you're auditing him. There'll be parts of the modifier which have been dramatized but had never been vocalized. Never have been vocalized, see? He's never vocalized any part of this. It's just remained hidden. Well, the last five hundred languages that he spoke, the modifier actually was never verbalized into those languages either. They were simply dramatized whole cloth.

Well, when you start finding them, you get all these oddities, and particularly those that had been verbalized by him. He very often will use parts of his modifier as a cliche, one of his favorite cliches. Or they will be some kind of a slang phrase in the society which happens to match up to the Englishization of the modifier. We'll see an example of that. Let's see, what's a good cliche?
Oh, "spin in," see? All right, "spin in." Well, there's something in his modifier that is going in circles for the thought concept could go in circles. And he hears this slang phrase "spin in" and it means go crazy. Well, his modifier actually has never meant go crazy to him before, but it'll backflash right straight back into the modifier, and now it means go crazy. You see?

In other words, he can reinterpret this modifier because it's actually just a thought concept which is held suspended in time, which gets translated into the various languages where the person is at work.

Now, you, trying to find these things, are plowing straight at something which he has for eons – oh, well, worse than that – that's a short period of time compared to how long the pc's had this, you know. And he just – there he is. And he just literally – takes it literally, dramatizes it. Anything with the thought concept, there – he'll do it. He'll do it mentally. "Leave?" He leaves. He gets the idea of having left, you see? So the phrase "leaves" occurs in the modifier. He instantly gets the idea of having left. The thought concept "come back" occurs in the modifier. Heh.

You'll see him come back and never know it. "Nothing there. I don't know it – anything about that. I don't know why you keep asking. Is the meter reading? Well, it couldn't be reading. Couldn't be reading, no. There's nothing there." And you in desperation keep repeating "There's nothing there. There's nothing there." It isn't part of the modifier. It doesn't make the needle nick either.

And then I want to show you the next trick. He's given you a long ruddy list, and you've been very, very careful to write down everything he said. A modifier list is, if anything, trickier than a goals list because you must write down everything the pc says very carefully, and you must not lose it.

Don't mislay the scrap of paper, you know. How would he take revenge on people? How would he modify this goal if it failed, and that sort of thing. And, "Well, and when they're launched, yeah. And when they're launched, good. Particularly when they're launched. That's right. Yes, it's a – it's actually 'to build ships and launch them.' It's 'to build ships and launch them.' Yes. Well, that's how I'd modify. I would launch them."

Don't argue with him. Put it down. It's the modifier. You write down what he said it was the first time, see? Because in this particular case he said, "To build ships when they were launched." Get it right, see. But it launched him. Get the idea? So he can't quite come back into the vicinity of the thing again because he's launched. Get the idea?

So he'll give you an – he'll give you an interpretation. So, he gives you the modifier usually right the first time. And then he modifies it. He modifies the modifier.

Now, you don't want the modification of the modifier. You want the modifier. So you write down what he gave you the first time, and don't go arguing with him and don't ask him to clarify it. When you're writing a list, don't ask him to clarify a thing. You just write down whatever he says.

Well, just how else would you – that's a good rule for all assessing and making up lists; just write down what the pc tells you. We just had an example of a goal having been
held up in its discovery for something on the order of about seven months. Not here. A way away from here. And the original goals list was kept in scrap notes rephrased by the auditor. Not one of them was phrased the way the pc gave it. And they were all changed and altered. And they were kept on little scraps, and the piece of paper evidently is written diagonally across corners, you know, and so on. It's just a bunch of junk. And written across the sides, and so forth. And just notes, you know. One word of the goal, you know. Well, he wanted to fly airplanes so whoever it was writing the list just wrote down over here in the corner "airplanes." That was great, you know.

And you know, nobody was ever able to assess that list. And just about ten days ago somebody assessed the list by first getting the pc to give them the goal for each one of these scraps of notes and making a proper goals list of everything the pc said.

And it was such a relief to the pc to get all his goals written down the way he said them, and not rephrased by the auditor, that it practically cleared up the ARC break, and it was only something on the order of – I don't remember exactly – I think it was five hours to find the goal.

And the goal was that close to hand. It was that easy just as long as one did a neat job of listing exactly what the pc gave you. Well, this becomes very crucial in the modifier. You're not going to get anywhere near as many modifiers as you are goals. You might not get thirty modifiers. You might not get fifteen modifiers.

But if you wrote each one down – this is what I wouldn't be able to find out if you did so that's why I'm covering this thing laboriously. The pc said, "Well, when launched – ummm – um – um – um – I'd launch them." You write down "when launched." And write down "I'd launch them." See, write them both down. Write whatever the pc gave you.

Now, supposing this thing is all full of bouncers and call ... I'd be very suspicious of a modifier list that didn't have any of these trick phrases in it.

Very suspicious, because the goal would never hung up – be hung up without a modifier with tricks in it. Nothing is hanging up the goal.

Just as somebody who's used to construction work, you ask him to believe that the roof is standing there with no walls; when you show me a modifier list that hasn't any bouncers, call-backs, denyers or anything of the sort in it, I sort of think of myself as being asked to look at a building where the roof is standing in the air with no walls. I don't think it can exist. I wouldn't bother to walk around the corner and look at it. Something's wrong here. That would be the first – a major thing that could happen.

You'd find out you wouldn't get the person's modifier either, probably, on such a list. There'd be something tricky about the wording of it. It'd be something a little, little offbeat and a little weird about the whole thing. Something like the order "and never be there" and "not know it" and "not find out" and "not have it" and "leave" and "come back" and "go a long time later" and – it's kind of a mess of words that are – that keeps the pc out of the vicinity of the goal.

You see, there has to be tricks like this in a goal line. Otherwise, it would have as-ised years and years and years and ages and ages and ages ago. There has to be something that is
misdirectional. You call these phrases directional phrases or misdirectional phrases. And there's something – there's something about it. And there's usually several combinations of them.

Now, we go down this list that we have written and the pc at never any time says anything that's the least bit weird, you know? It's "to build ships and paint them," "to build ships and make people happy," "to build ships and be happy about it," "to build ships and feel good about it," "to build ships ..." Our luck is out today. That's about what we would think about that time. Our luck is out.

About that time, we would repeat our question more loudly and a little more forcefully. "What would you do to get revenge on people if they didn't let you build ships. Would you do anything like that?"

"Oh, I'd leave them, of course. Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh." Yeah, well, clever that time, weren't we? Crafty, huh? You just back it up to him, you know, and get some more of those, get some more of those. Get all the things a fellow might do and would do. And then go ahead and assess this list, just as such.

And if all of a sudden you wind yourself up with nothing and you assess the list again – you can't wind up with nothing – and you know, you're just winding up with everything null, and it's all out; don't assume that you haven't got the modifier. You've got the modifier, but the pc is dramatizing it to such a confounded degree that he's not there.

You know what you do then? You can take a red pencil and you can go around each type of Dianetic phrase, everything down the whole line, and draw a circle around every, "and come back," "leave them," "and look at it later," "and never inspect," all such types of phrases, all such types of phrases. And now you do an entirely specialized type of assessment on this. You get the pc on the meter, you got that meter sitting there, and you're just going to do this.

Now, I might as well give you this trickery. Now, you don't have to be an expert on it because I've already fixed it up the other way, though in the majority of cases you just get the modifier, bing! But you should know all this about modifiers, you see, because it's a piece of technology, long established. What I'm giving you here is the basis of what I'm giving you in 1950.

Anyway, we take the first one, and that was a denyer, see. "And never find out if I had failed." See, that's the first. "And never find out." We don't care about the "I have failed." That will turn up later. But we do care about this "never find out." What a beautiful denyer, you see? So we got the pc on the cans, we got her right there, and we just chant – start chanting: "And never find out. And never find out. And never find out. And never find out. And never find out. And never find out." Read! Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. We've got a read. "And never find" – that's gone, too – "And never find out. And never find out. And never find out." Now we got a read, all right. Now well mark that particular phrase with a little symbol to show that we got it to read.

The next one is "leave it out." "Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out." Ah, skip it. Skip it. That one's null, see?

The next one we had found – you see, these phrases are masked in the things they had said. And we're just – we're not now assessing the whole thing they said. We're only – we picked out all the Dianetic bouncers and call-backs, and, you know, all that. And we've just got circles around those exact little phrases. You know, it may have been – well, the phrase "and then I would have to get out for sure." We're only interested in the action phrase. The action phrase. So it's "get out." Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. "Get out." We're not interested in "then I would have to." And we just sit there and we say, "Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out.

And the pc'll all of a sudden say, "Yes, get out. Yeah. Get out. Get out. All right. Get out. Good."

Boy, that really hit 'em. "Get out." See? You've worn it out to a little bit. To a degree. And you've got him back in it, see. You grooved there, see. Whew!

So we mark that one over here as that grooved him in, and we put a fact that that is nice and live. And we go down the list and complete it similarly. What are we doing? We're knocking this modifier's edges off of it so that he won't dramatize it, so that he can read it. In other words, he can tell us what it is.

Now having done all that, we have deintensified all of these command phrases. Some of them were live. Some of them weren't live. But we remember, we had several command phrases here that we did get good live ones on like "get out." See, that was a nice one. And we had a couple of others there – "leave." So we know that "get out" and "leave" and one or two or three more type of command phrases occur in this thing. And we just write those things down consecutively in a line. They're totally senseless.

Now, we'll say, "Well, how would 'leave' fit into this modifier? What would it be about 'leave'?"

And we're getting a read now, you see, on "leave."

"What will – what about 'leave'?"

"Oh, I'd leave them. Ha."


All right. Now, let's take this other one: "Get out."
All right. Now, how would "get out" apply in this – to this goal? Now, where would that fit in? The pc will smoke around about it for awhile. And he'd say, "Well, it'd just be 'or I'd have to get out.' 'Leave them or I'd have to get out'," which doesn't make good sense, but you write it down.


"Well, I would leave them and climb to the top, or they'd have to get out. I'd leave them and climb to the top."

No, it isn't quite right.

All right. You've got another action phrase or two, and you fit them in, and you eventually fit yourself together some kind of a wild modifier whereby he would "leave them cold, never let them find out what he was doing, climb to the top as somebody else, and come back and kick them all out." [laughter]

You get the bzzzzz-zzzzz-zzzzz? Look at the command phrases in the thing, you see? It just shoots him all over the top. Shoots him all over the bottom of the thing.

He's at – out at right angles, left, right and center, see? Get the idea? Well, he literally obeys, in his position in time and space, he literally obeys these command phrases. And he touches them, and then he gets away from them, and it's the auditor's job after he's touched them and gotten away from them, not to just let him sit over there in left field, you know.

"Well, I don't think there's any more to that modifier. I don't quite know why you're doing this particular part of the assessment. I – no – I – there's nothing more to the modifier. There's nothing more there."

And you say, "I wonder if it's 'nothing more there'." Well, you're just kind of Q-and-Aing. He's hit an earlier bounce.

"Nothing – nothing more there. There isn't anything to this modifier."

All right, you start looking desperately, and you say, "What was the last thing we were going over?" And you look down here and it was "get into left field and stay there until I make a proper catch." Baseball goal.

There he is. He went over in left field, and he's just waiting there to make a proper catch. And you're just bothering him. You get the idea? You watch these sudden behaviors. You won't get behaviors like this on any other portion of a 3D. The modifier – assessing the modifier at number 4 is that peculiar.

Now, fortunately you don't have to work too hard for these modifiers. No, why? Well, you get the opposition terminal off the setup, and the person doesn't have to make himself so
right, see? And he has less of a sense of failure here, and so forth. Now you get the opposition
goal off.

"Ha-ha," he eventually says. "So that's what they've been trying to do to me. He-he-he-he-he. Well, I – ho! What do you know? Ho-ho." Azzzzzz.

He also doesn't feel so revengeful because he knows who he's shooting at.

Now you ask him for the modifier. He'll give you a list of modifiers, and you can assess them. But when you start to run into any trouble on the modifier, get your rudiments in very carefully. Look over the list you've already gotten on the modifier. Add anything to that list. Ask him again. Try to assess the thing down. You can't get that thing assessed down, it's doing something like suddenly all goes null. Everything goes null. You're halfway down the list, and everything goes null. That doesn't make sense, does it? The rudiments aren't out. They're in. And yet everything went null.

Ah-ha. You look up there, there's "leave." "Leave." Ha, you hit "leave" and he left. Sometimes in repeating these things to the preclear, you know, like "get out, get out, get out," something like that. He just sort of feels like he's being blown, you know, out of the, out of this whole corner of the universe. It's that powerful, and you start repeating it, and of course you discharge it and bring it down, and these phrases may be quite reactive. And you'll find a pc going this way, maybe, you know. Every time you go through the modifier close up, the pc goes this way, you know. Or every time you get into the goals area, the pc goes this way.

Something like that can happen and be in the modifier. You could actually give an incomplete modifier and it'd still be in there. It'd turn up eventually, but I'd try to get a modifier quite complete. I'd shake a modifier down very well on a meter. And then, if you're just round the bend and you don't quite know what to do about the modifier, and the pc is acting very peculiarly about the whole thing, just take your red pencil, schlooop, and go down any list you have made on the modifier and you just circle every command phrase on this. And you just start down with just those command phrases – deniers, bouncers, call-backs, fixers – whatever it is. Just circle each one and then just start in at the top and start repeating the command phrase only until you get a read. And it doesn't matter if that read is constant or sporadic.

If you get a sporadic read, you take that command phrase and you write it down here on another column. That acted.

All right, now, let's get the next command phrase. Let's see if that has anything to do with it, and we repeat it, repeat it, repeat it, repeat it. It knocks.

All right. We write that command phrase down. That's in the modifier someplace.

Now, the next one. Repeat it and repeat it, and it's nothing. It's not there, so we skip that one. And we get that whole list of command phrases. And don't kick yourself too much in the head if you miss a command phrase, because you sometimes will look at the list – and it's not your bank after all – and you don't interpret one of these phrases as being a command phrase.
For instance, "undermanned." Well, "undermanned," that's not a command phrase so you don't repeat it. But the pc in some weird way, because he's a man, he goes under it. See? So don't kick yourself too hard if you've missed some of these as command phrases because if you get the bulk, the laws of average are all on your side. If you get the bulk of the bouncers and deniers, you can fish the rest of them up. See, now you're working on a winning horse here. You'll eventually get a phrase and it stays in.

Now you take one of these others that's been active, and you get a phrase and get the pc to tell you how that fits around, and that stays in. And you're kind of building blocks here with bricks, you know. And you're building a little wall, fixing it all up. And it's this phrase and it's that phrase and then you shift the things all around and how would they be? And he changes his mind a half a dozen times. And all of a sudden, bang! You've got it.

But I don't know that a modifier contains only one phrase, you see. There may not be a modifier in the world that contains only one phrase. Just – there may not be. I'm not saying that all *modifiers* contain more than one phrase, but I'm just saying on the other side that there may not be one that contains only one phrase.

Because look, that thing has got to have kept the goal fixed up and out of sight. And it's got to have stayed out of sight itself. And it's got to have buried the problem. It's the action that the pc takes which buries the problem, buries the opponent, which gets everything out of view. It keeps this thing from ever coming up but sweetness and light, a nice goal "to build ships." Now isn't that nice? And as a little boy he can remember this. He can remember this. Yes, he's had a goal in this lifetime to build ships. Yes, he can remember this as a little boy. Yes, build ships. And you start getting the modifier, and he suddenly starts remembering other things about building ships when he was a little boy. Because every time any other little boy came around the ship sailing pool that had a ship, he was the first one to take rocks and sink the thing, you see?

And every time he did so that he can now check up on, he came down with a cold or got measles or something of this sort, you know. It's quite a – quite a fantastically random area. At first, isn't this sweet, you know, he wants to build ships. Isn't that nice? Isn't that nice? And you eventually find out he wants to build ships and send them out and have them sink every vessel on the high seas, every place, and drown them all. And never have anybody find out about it. [laughter, laughs] See, that's how that modifier eventually trails out.

It's quite amusing. But it presents this peculiar – the peculiar complexities of assessment which I have just given you. I don't think right this moment you're having any trouble finding a modifier particularly. You shouldn't be. The modifier ought to be well deintensified.

But, always be prepared. And I would feel remiss if I didn't give you the answers if you did run into trouble finding a modifier. That's how you go about it. Make sure that you list everything the pc says. Make sure of that. Make very sure that after you've gotten the whole list down and you've got it assessed, that your rudiments are in very neatly. And then that as you go down the list, its peculiarities of going out or in don't upset you. But when you've gotten down to the end of the list and you've gone through it several times, if you don't find anything, know what's happened on this list only, know what's happened. It's went. The pc has departed from the list. It isn't a question of rudiments out. It's solely and completely –
of course, the more the rudiments are in, the more easy it is to find a modifier or anything else. But it isn't the pc's rudiments are out, it's that you've thrown one of these command phrases into high relief. And of course, he's done it.

And the phrase is in there "or do a bunk." He wants to go to sleep. You never suspect it, you see. But literally, of course, "doing a bunk" would be going to bed or leaving. And he doesn't quite know what to do. Does he go to bed or go to sleep or does he leave? And that's enough of a problem to send anybody to sleep anyhow. So every time you do a modifier list, you – the guy goes to sleep and you keep looking for this. Is this someplace in the list, or "sleep my time out" or anything like that, you know?

There you are suggesting things. You shouldn't be doing that either. And eventually you'll find out as you start to take these command phrases, this – you start running into trouble on this. You start running into real trouble when it doesn't go according to – to the book and it seems to be getting pretty grim. It wasn't too bad to find the other three items before this, but this one's gotten grim. Just know what you're looking at. You're looking at the command phrase obeyed. That's all. And so you circle that. Each command phrase you can find in the whole list that he's given you, and just take them one by one and repeat it. "Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave." He doesn't hear you saying anything. He doesn't care what you're doing.

He's going to react to this, that's for sure. It doesn't matter, see? "Do you mind now if it is all right with me, if you and me sitting here in this auditing room, which I trust is all right with you, if you and me sitting here would find me looking at the meter instead of you and repeating only a small portion of this particular sentence in order to discharge it slightly so that we can get on with it." I'd delete all that from my auditing.

"All right. We're looking for this – this phrase that's here. And I'm trying to find this modifier. And I'm going to go over some of these – some of these words with you – Leave! Leave! Leave! Leave! Leave! Leave! Leave!" [laughter, laughs] Bang! And boy, don't think that these won't have an effect on the pc sometimes because you're going over stuff that's raw meat and rivers of blood. And you start saying 'leave, leave, leave' and the pc starts going ... [laughter] You repeat it a few more times and he sits forward in the chair again. Mark that down as live. [laughter]

But by compiling a sublist of your own of the command phrases, you've actually then got – some of these are going to stay there, some are going to go null, some are going to do this, and some are going to do that.

You can actually take the command phrases and make a separate assessment, and now ask the pc what we can make out of the remainder. And he'll give you the rest of the modifier. Because it's just command phrases, it's only command phrases alone in the bank that prevent you from finding the modifier. It's the phrases in it that prevent you from finding it. And that's all there is in it.

And you take the kick out of those things; you can take the kick out of those things. You must realize that an auditor can handle the bank better than the pc, always. So you take these things, and out they go, one after the other, and you take the charge off of them. All of a sudden the pc says, "Well, of course, didn't I tell you? It's to build ships and launch them,
and, if anything goes wrong to sink them.' Didn't I tell you those? Well, they're right there on the list. Yes, I knew it myself."

He gets very often, in all assessment – this will – this will sooner or later – you'll come up against a pc who will do this to you. You have just got through wearing out several ballpoints and reams of paper, the batteries of the E-Meter have been bled white. And you have finally gotten the goal "to tat." [laughter] And the pc sits back and is very pleased about the whole thing and tells you she knew that all the time. [laughter] Because it's a funny thing about the mind, but they actually do get a sensation of having known it all the time.

Well, of course, after you've known – after you've had something preying on your wits for a hundred trillion years, I imagine you'd get the feeling that you knew it, even if you didn't. But they very often – it's one of the funny little phenomena of the pc that they sometimes come up with something that you've just worked like a dog over. And they tell you, well, they knew that. Sort of like "Well, why didn't you ask me. I could have told you that." [laughter] And they know doggone well they couldn't have. And it's very funny sometimes, a day or two after an assessment, to have the pc acting like, well, he just dug it up, and he knew it all the time, and wasn't anything unusual about it, you know. He can breathe now. He was never able to breathe before. He always went ahhhh-ahhh-ahhh-ahhh.

And it's very funny. As you – unless you complete a 3D on such a thing and deintensify the thing, he does go phases of a false knowingness of some kind or another, you know. He knew all about it. And you almost feel like saying, "Listen, damn it, if you knew all about it, why have you had me working here for five days?"

Big stack of broken ballpoints. Wadded paper all over the floor. Folders grown to a foot and a half thick. "Oh, I knew it all the time. Oh, yes, I always could have told you that – that is basically. I – I could – could have told you long ago. Why didn't you ask me? It was always 'to tat,' of course. Always had that goal. Knew that. What's all the fuss about?"

It reminds you of somebody, you know, who's put a time bomb in the bottom of the building and knocked the whole thing over, and the street is full of rubble and everything else, and he's standing there... [laughter] He's unimpressed by the whole thing. [laughs] That is very funny.

But, of course, the whole goal modifier versus the opposing goal – of course, this whole thing is in one package. And it all contains knowingness. This is what the pc, by the way, in the final analysis, will be found to know most about. Because he's been accumulating knowingness of various kinds on this subject since wooo!

You can do this kind of a trick to a pc. You can take – after you've got a 3D done and before you run anything, you can ask him – you can say, "Well, now, what attributes of a cricket player have you ever used in this lifetime?" He's not been – he's not played cricket this whole lifetime. Every time he goes near a cricket field, he goes uuuuuu, and falls in. Of course, he has a bat at home, and he always has wanted to play cricket. He knows he should, you know, but he just never does, and so on. And "what attributes of a cricket player," and he'll suddenly realize that his clothes are all covertly designed in some fashion or another to be cricket clothes, you know.
And when he laid out a garden, he always lays out a playing field. He never has laid out a garden yet. And all of his various equipment, for instance, if he got a shovel in the garden, the only kind of shovel that really pleases him is something that looks like a cricket bat. You know, it's a little off the ball, you see that? And then he lives exactly the same kind of training regimen that you'd have to live in order to play cricket, you see. And he's married the right kind of a woman to be the wife of a cricket player, you see.

And he's mad at her all the time because she doesn't tell him all of the things that a cricket player's wife should do.

But, he's studied the various things that a cricket player should know. He knows all about lawns. He's often wondered why in the name of common sense he can never pass a seed store without going in and getting a new folder on lawns, you know. Because every lawn that he ever plants, you know, just goes up in smoke. It's a complete mess.

And you just ask him that, and he'll start sorting these things out. And actually a lot of this false knowingness will discharge. You know, he says, "Oooo, wait, there is something to know." It's a way of differentiating, you see. It sounds as if you're checking the thing up or something like that and being professional and so on.

And what you're actually doing is getting him to differentiate a little bit. Not a necessary step. That is just – that's just gilding the lily. It's quite unusual. You'll find out the majority of skills will be on the first terminal. First goals-plus-modifier terminal of the pc, the majority of skills which he is now expert in are that – are the skills of that.

Of course, he is here living the life of a plumber and so forth. And the skills he has mastered are those of the deep sea fisherman. It certainly raises hell with plumbing.

Actually, all he knows of plumbing – actually, all he knows of plumbing is what a deep sea fisherman would have to know in an emergency. And he finds it very easy to carry on with plumbing as long as it goes just to that point. Only somehow or another he never gets along in his trade.

He'll actually push his education, and so forth, to that exact zenith necessary to carry out the goals terminal. Just that. He won't push his education much beyond that. There's no incentive.

Of course, there aren't any of these anymore, it's the chief taster to the king. Doesn't matter what he's doing in this lifetime, his skills will be that, and his study and his zenith, and so forth, will be that of a chief taster to the king.

He'll know all about foods and he'll know all about wines, but to a somewhat limited degree. You'll give him a wine list, tell him to memorize the wine list. He'll go on down the wine list, and he'll tell you there are certain things about these wines. For instance, "Port, very dark. It's not a very good wine. Very dark. It's a heavy wine. It's very heavy. It masks impurities. Poor wine. Now, these light wines, they're much better. You have to be sure they're absolutely clear."

And actually you won't know what this guy's talking about until all of a sudden you know what his goals terminal is, and he knows what it is. He'll know why this is his limit of
knowledge of wine. He never seems to be able to educate himself beyond whether wine could be poisoned or not, see? So therefore it's body, color and transparency. See, it's very funny. It's never occurred to him that wine has taste beyond a heavy taste that would mask a poison. So the heavy tasting wines "are very poor, very poor. You should never have a heavy tasting wine. A wine should be very, very simple. It should be very simple on the tongue, you see. Very simple. Like Chablis. Now, there's a perfect wine. You know, drink water, drink Chablis. Same difference, you know." [laughter]

It's very, very amusing, and yet that will be his knowledge of it. He has just got himself stacked in exactly this educational bracket, you see? And then he screwed the lid on from that point on, and that's it. And every lifetime he goes through the same cycle.

But this brings up another point. This brings up another point: is a goals terminal when found is only the total answer to the current case from a mental aspect basis. It will take care of so much in a lifetime that it would be very easy for you to make a total error on the subject and consider that one goals run of 3D and one level knocked out should resolve the whole case. Now, I want to disabuse you of that particular fallacy. That is not going to do it. That is going to go a long ways, and there'll be so many of these things explained, and the person's ceiling is so obviously the exact ceiling of that goals terminal.

Now, all of this looks so good, and there are so many things that you could add up into all this, that it looks as though the case should resolve when you get down to the end of the first run, and the case will not be resolved. The case will still have chronic somatics. The case will still have circuits. And the case will still have a whole new goal valence chain to get out of the road.

Remember I talked to you about onions. Well, you're just getting off the first series. You're getting off the most obvious, most present, most available series. Now, there's another series back of that, and there's another series back of that, and there's another series back of that. I couldn't give you an adventure – a guess, is all I could adventure on that exact subject, that it would be something on the order of, I don't know, twelve, fifteen, twenty. It's a finite number. It's a small number like that. Now, they resolve the case. They resolve the case – fifteen, twenty – but not that first one.

Now, you see, you could ask him and he'd rationalize everything. And everything in his life would settle out, and he could be perfectly content and happy with this as the total explanation of it all, don't you see? He's perfectly cheerful with this, only for some reason or other he still has headaches. And he still has this and he still has that and he still has something else. He's got some negative qualities sitting around here someplace that he still doesn't like.

Now, here's the danger of you supposing that one run, one goal, one number 1, number 2, number 3, number 4, number 5, and a completed 6, would totally solve everything there was to be solved about the case. Now, if you believe this, then this is the error you would make. You would let the pc try to solve the case through one valence. True enough, this is the valence, this is the only one available. True enough, that explains all of the current situation. But how did he get in such lousy shape that he could get this valence?
Oh, well, that's all – that's all to be continued in tomorrow's episode of "The Perils of Pauline." [laughter] That's another story. But your – now, I'm not remarking on that just in play, because this is it.

A pc will try to make an "all" out of a valence. And that's a very, very important thing for you to notice. A pc will try to make an "all" out of the valence. Now, it's an onion with many layers, and you're taking them off a billion layers at a crack. But – and they're all very fundamental, and they're all very marvelous, and they all have various changes on cases, but remember, there's another layer. There's another series of layers. That's the one you've got to get off.

And you expect all of the pressure that goes against the left temple. Ho! And every time he gets this idea, he gets this pressure against the left temple, you see? It's pressure. And he thinks of the goal, and he thinks of the terminal, and he gets the pressure against the left terminal. Oh, man, he's convinced, you see? And he finishes up running the goal, and you know, the pressure isn't gone? It's only partially abated, and it's not gone, and so on. Well, he wants to run the goal some more, you see, because he only gets the pressure when he turns on the goal and terminal and so on, and it doesn't turn on so much now, so he's not quite sure what it is. But there's supposed to have been a pressure across, and it's not quite gone, he can still feel the thing.

Well, while he's running – this is the only thing that comes to you with any importance – while he is running he will use the valence as a circuit to make it an "end all." And this is one of the little covert points of long goals runs. The reason why they run forever is because the pc is trying to make that one valence do for the whole case. Got the idea?

He actually is going on a via now. He'll answer the auditing question, and then he thinks of something between sessions, you know. "Well, I've often had this little pain, you see, underneath my chin. And I wonder what – what a cricket player – I wonder if a cricket player – I – yeah, I wonder if there isn't some kind – I wonder if there isn't some kind of an incident here where a cricket player might have been, you know, hit by a or fell down on a wicket, or fell on his face on a wicket or fell on his chin."

Next session, he's sitting there waiting for the cricket player to fall down on the wicket. "Fall on the wicket. No, I don't see any pictures of wickets. See, well, maybe next session one will turn up where the cricket player falls down on the wicket and gets this somatic underneath his chin. Well, I'll wait for the next session and see how that fits in."

Get the idea? He's trying to use that terminal for everything. Hell, it has nothing to do with a cricket player. That was when he was a janitor in a castle in lower Slobovia and had made a habit of killing women with knitting needles. And one day one slipped, and he's had this somatic ever since. And it's true enough. It's true enough that for that particular somatic every time he has seen a slender piece of metal anywhere, why, it's upset him. But it had nothing to do with being a cricket player. Follow that?

So in running rudiments on 3D, as the case progresses, you must be more and more alert to whether or not the case is still being audited by you because there could come a time in 3D when the case is no longer audited by you. And that'll be the time you've gone through the 159th level, and there aren't that many levels in the Prehav Scale unless you go over the
Secondary Scale. And you've gone to the 159th level of a Secondary Scale and you want to know what's wrong.

Well, what's wrong is the pc has been on self-audit and using this thing as a circuit and passing everything through that he was told to do – is being passed through this terminal – long since it has ceased to be an aberrative terminal.

In other words, clearing can be prolonged by the pc turning the valence into a circuit and trying to make something out of the session.

The pc continues now to try to make something out of every session that isn't there. He's trying to make everything that has ever happened to him in two hundred trillion years apply solely and exclusively to just this one terminal.

Now, what you want to do is keep the pc under control, keep the rudiments in every session, and find out if there's anything peculiar going on or if the pc is doing anything peculiar between sessions. And get very clever about this and ask, "Well, are you looking at – you have any pictures between sessions, huh? Since I last audited you do you have any pictures? Do you ever see any different pictures?"

Ah, that's a cunning question, isn't it. It's the same as saying, "Are you auditing yourself since yesterday?" Only it's not accusative, is it? Ha-ha. "But did you see any pictures? Do you have any pictures of anything since I audited you yesterday? Oh, yeah. Oh, you went to sleep last night. Oh good – good. Now, what were they pictures of? What were you doing with them? Oh, you're looking for the somatic there in your chin, and so forth. All right. Now let's see."

It's going to be a rudiment out, isn't there, because you're no longer the auditor.

So, it is just auditor out. That is all. Because they're getting anxious, they're pressing, they're getting anxious, and the slower you are, the less auditing you give, the more anxious the pc is going to get and the more likely they are to start this circuitry.

And they start this circuitry. The circuitry keeps going on and on and on, and they try to solve the whole case with a cricket player. God! You've got cricket player, and the cricket player – well, before you got through, the only ruler the world has ever had has been a cricket player, you know.

They've always had ideas on government so they sit around wondering, "How would a cricket player have ideas on government?" you see? "Well, there'd be a cricket player opinion, you see, of that. What would be a cricket player's opinion of... And how would a cricket player rule? I suppose you could become a very famous cricket player. And then somebody..." You know, and somebody comes down, "Oh, yeah, I see how it is. And you pass it on..." And he's got a whole mock-up. It has nothing to do with the case.

Before he decided that he had better not be trusted with anything more violent than a cricket bat, this fellow was Chancellor of the Exchequer. There is no remote connection with the government necessary to resolve the case. Your next terminal coming up after a cricket player is Chancellor of the Exchequer, see? That's one of the covert lives he leads. And its
goal is "to handle other people's money," and the modifier is "and leave them flat broke and then..." [laughter] So of course, he had to become Chancellor of the Exchequer, don't you see.

The only – the only way a crooked banker cannot be caught, you see, is be part of the government or something. That or nobody can – it's – there isn't anybody's money, you see. It's the government's money. So that's very easy to handle, very snide of me. But I'm showing you the – I'm showing you the put-together with this, see? One terminal doesn't resolve a case. It's up to you to press on, press on, press on.

Now, you won't get up to running any Prehav levels in the next couple of days, probably. But if you were to do so, if you were to do so, put a standard five-way bracket together. Just put a standard five-way bracket together. And I can't give you any possible variation from this. This is your safest bet and the tested bet of what will happen.

And just put your standard why, how, what bracket together that makes sense, and then run it to a stuck tone arm. And as soon as the tone arm sticks, get off of it. Well, how – what do I mean "as soon as"? Well, after you are sure the tone arm isn't going anywhere else and before the pc goes crazy, you see – that's "as soon as." That is – exactly defines "as soon as," is when you're sure the tone arm is not going anywhere else, and before the pc goes crazy. That actually gives you a margin of about two days of auditing.

I don't think the pc goes entirely berserk until after the second day of being run on a second – on a tone arm. Of course, nobody can find the next Prehav level, and it's a gone dog now. Now, I think you'll find there's a possibility, there's just a possibility that levels on this may only run for a half an hour or so before the next level is gone. It has to be found. So, watch it. Watch it.

We've just condensed a hundred hours of run down to an hour, see. So, watch it carefully, and don't sit around there. Oh, you can run it for twenty minutes to see if the thing is going to move anymore. It isn't going to kill anybody.

He's sort of getting – the pressures started getting tough, tight on his chest. He's starting to talk something like this gurrrrr-grrrrr-grrrrr-grrrrr.

Well, it's time for you to get very alert and say, "You know, I wonder if – how long has that tone arm been stuck? I looked at it about a half an hour ago, and it wasn't stuck then, or was it? Let's see. It's sitting at 4 now. And it was sitting at 4 when we came into session. I've been auditing two-and-a-half hours. I wonder if it moved, well, let me see. I look over this auditor's report here. No, it's 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4. Well, I wonder what's wrong with the pc then. I mean he's complaining about his chest being crushed in."

Well, the reason his chest is being crushed in is the goal-plus-modifier versus the opposition goal are one great big mass. And the more you audit beyond what is necessary to relieve it, the more squash you're going to get. And so you get rising tone arm, rising tone arm, rising tone arm. And some of the tone arm dives, of course. But you'll get a different read on the tone arm. It would go denser, denser, denser, denser, denser, denser, denser. And now you'll notice that the tone arm has stopped moving, but the needle is still twitching. The tone arm is moving, the needle stillwitches. That's a wonderful time to get off of it. You're sure now that that tone arm isn't going to go any further, and the needle is just getting tighter and
everything is kind of sticking up – ha-ha-ha, let's get out of there and let's get another level assessed before we kill the pc.

That is the safest way to do it, but it takes judgment. And I actually cannot in all fairness to auditing, not to you, give you a minute rule for how long you audit it because it's going to vary. And some of these things are going to go fast, they're going to go flat, fast. I've seen one of these things come down the tone arm now. I've seen one come down on something on the order of two hours and a half from the top to the bottom of the scale and vanished. Not much of a run, was it? The right terminal sure bit the dust in a hurry.

So your volume of time is spent on assessment. But you go about it. Just form up a five-way bracket; run it, run it to a stuck arm. You will see the characteristics of the arm. You'll see it, and then reassess. The thing will go up, and then it'll start – or go down, and then suddenly get "stick, stick, stick, stick, stick." Of course, as long as that tone arm is moving around, you go on running it. But it goes up and sticks, goooohm, thud. Mm-mm.

Now if you run a session over that, the pc becomes unassessable. You can't do anything to assess the pc. So you've got to stop it before you wreck the next assessment. That is the whole judgment on it. There is no other – no other judgment can be given you. And you'll see it, you'll see it sooner or later. By the way, the level you're running will still knock, but that's because the terminal knocks. You can still see the level knock, and then you reassess and it isn't there anymore. So don't bother about the level still reading on the needle when the tone arm is stuck after having run that level, because you'll continue to see it read.

Of course, the level is gone. You're just reading pure terminal. You're not reading the level anymore.

Okay. Well, there it is. I'm very satisfied with the way you've been going. I hope the few little remarks I've been making here will make it easier for you to do an assessment and carry on – feel more relaxed about it. And you, I think, should be able to get down here to an optimum assessment. I think the optimum assessment of a complete goals assessment and a complete run through 3D at the first time on a very expert auditor, a very, very, very good auditor who is a very fine expert who knows all there is to know about it on a goal that has never been found on a pc that's never had much auditing, something should be in the neighborhood of about twenty hours. So speed up.

I've only multiplied the factor about four. Suzie – Suzie can do one in 5.5 hours, so you should be able to do it in twenty. Okay? All right. So, tell me that you will do it in under a hundred, will you? [laughter]

I mean the pc Clear, of course.

Thank you.
Thank you.

Okay. Here we are with the 21st of December almost wrapped up. Isn't that right?

You realize you should have been home last week. Oh, no, no. Fortunately, I just remembered. You're saved by the bell here. It's only the 21st of November. Yeah. 21st of November 1961. From the looks of somebody or other around, there's one or two here that look like it – not you – [laughter] that look like they're not going to make it. Well, it's all right. We've been up surveying a burial plot up here on the upper part. [laughter]

Okay. Now, we're struggling down amongst the modifiers and turning fast corners and curves in the vicinity as oppgoals, oppterminals and this and that and you probably don't know where the hell you're at. Ah, you do. You do. You know where you are. Except you. [laughs]

Now, there are five things which make man an incomprehensible being. You'd say any one of these things could make the whole man. Any one of these things could make the whole man and because we're so used to things coming in ones in the physical universe, we don't look for a "personality" (quote) (unquote) – personality, boy, that is the most overused word – to be composed of five separate things. But because it is composed of five separate things, the person is rather unpredictable and incomprehensible. Maybe not to others, but certainly to himself.

Others may have definite opinions on the individual. People tend to categorize. They say, "Well, that fellow is a swell fellow and that one over there is a skunk and she is a good girl and that one is a tramp," you see? But these facts have been well known for their falsity.

We – this fellow goes down and robs the bank and then goes home and is very nice to his children, which isn't covered by his being called a bank robber or a thief or something, see, something...

So man has tended to be very incomprehensible.

Now, I've been on the trail of this for a very long time. What was it that made a man's personality this incomprehensible, this unpredictable? What made human behavior this unpredictable? Was it a survival factor for human behavior to be this unpredictable? A lot of other various things added up along this line, but we finally come to this conclusion: That well, man isn't better off for being a potpourri of five different items. He doesn't lead a better life because of it, and as a matter of fact, the only person he impedes is mostly himself.

These five items are very, very easily listed. You have them on 3D. They are Sections 1 to 5, of 3D and these are the five items which compose a personality:
Number 1: The person's goal.

Number 2: The opposition terminal. What does this person consider an enemy. Now, well, just to go on and list them:

Then there's the opposition goal.
And then there is the modifier of the person's own goal.
And then there's the person's own terminal.

These are five different items and the combination of these five items do not particularly make a new personality. They make five different facets of aberration to the person.

The person is going to do one or another of these five things – going to dramatize one or another of these five things in any given situation – that is not predictable which one he is going to do.

So you don't get one response. Dear old Pavlov, if you were only here now sitting in a back chair there as a student. All right, well, I'm sure that one or two of you are Scientologists enough to process him. You'd say, "All right. What is your goal?"

"To mess up dogs," you'd find out. [laughter]

But poor, old Pavlov, who was really banging his head into this. Stimulus-response, smponse-conce. Who cares! What the devil; what is this stimulus-response mechanism of Pavlov?

Well, you stimulate a dog and the dog woofs. And you stimulate a dog and the dog woofs. Now, that's everything he's – his thinkingness was based on.

If you do "stimulus A always gets response B, ha-ha-ha. Now, we've got it all made, you know. We're all set. And all we've got to do is apply this to man and when we give stimulus A, we get response B, don't we... Ohhh."

The advertising agencies would love to know this, believe me, because they are very certain that if you show a picture of a beautiful girl on a beer ad, you'll sell beer. Not in some localities. Not in some localities. Hollywood? You'd never sell a glass of beer in Hollywood. That'd have to be a pretty boy. [laughter, laughs]

But, even then, that wouldn't be very predictable either. Stimulus A does not get response B amongst men. Only after you've audited one single person and only after the job is done and the package is all taken apart could you then see which of the five responses might have kicked against stimulus A. But in actuality, even then you don't know. It's just one of the five. One of the five is going to kick against stimulus A.

Now, you could figure out a little narrower than this. You'd say, "Well, on stimulus A, 'a kick in the pants.' " Then this person who had a goal, "to stand still in life," who had an opposition terminal, "an elephant," who had an opposition goal, "move," and who had a modifier, "and never fight," and whose own terminal was "lamppost," [laughter] all right, what happens if you kick that person in the pants?
Well, does he consider you're an elephant? Or does he become a lamppost because he's standing still? Or are you his enemy or – what? What happens? Which one goes in? Which one of the five goes click? Well, you've got a number of them there, any one of which could go click and his response is that unpredictable. It's one of five.

Now, we could give a good guess at it and we'd say, "Well, he'd probably keep on standing there and not know he'd been kicked," because of his goal and so forth, you know. He probably could. He probably could. Or he might turn around and scream to the zoo keepers to come and get this elephant, you know. Who knows exactly what he would do?

There's the unpredictability of the situation. You've got five responses to any given action. Now, did you realize that the person, until you've got it sorted out, with equal facility will dramatize either the oppgoal or his own goal, the oppterminal or his own terminal, the goal or the modifier? You just pays your money, and you takes your chance. You throw a dice out and it's as it comes up.

And in any given situation you might get an interlock of two things which are opposed in his element and you get indecisional action or you get inaction. Because he's got two things that key in simultaneously and he could do either one of these things. And they are opposed as far as this stimulus is concerned and there he is. He just stops, you see, incomprehensibly. There is nothing he could do and yet, obviously, if you look it over on the surface, you'd say, "Well, he could have done – obeyed any one of five responses, but two of the responses locked up, so he obeyed actually no responses." You see how confusing that could be?

You understand what I mean? I mean he has an inner conflict, they call it. The psychologists call it an inner conflict.

So you just take your chance. What is this fellow going to do? Well, there is no telling what he is going to do.

Now, in the view of a great deal of bad control in the world, perhaps it's a good thing to respond so randomly and unpredictably that nobody can ever do anything. Now, that's a solution, too: Be so unpredictable that nobody can ever really get around you because he never quite knows what you're going to do.

You know, there's nothing as predictable as an unpredictable person. The only thing it adds up to is a person who is unpredictable. So you can't do anything about them, so it's okay to shoot them. That's usually the government's adjudication. As governments go downhill, they eventually say, "Well, you can't control the people anyway, so you might as well punish them."

So all this combination of the five things winds up is that the person gets – this we can say for sure – gets into a games condition with almost anything. That you can be sure of – that the person will get into a games condition with almost anything. And you will find him denying and being denied and so forth. And if you don't know what the fellow's case is, you wouldn't even be able to predict what kind of a games condition he was in perpetually.

But, of course, after you've taken his case apart, he isn't like that anymore, so there you are. Isn't that an interesting thing, that the moment you find out what man is all about, it
is because you've taken man apart in an auditing session. And of course, if you've taken him apart in an auditing session, he no longer reacts that way.

So the problem of "What is man all about and how will he react?" then dead ends at this point. Yeah, we can say, "Yes, we know what man is all about." In any given case, it then ceases to be of any use to us.

It's fascinating, you know. I mean we know everything that he's all about. All right, at the moment we find out, so does he and he's no longer like that. So therefore it's of no use to anybody at all. He's some other way now. He's on his second goal combination.

Now, these five are in domination. They are dominated by life and are dominating life and it is some kind of a system and a game and they add up to a random series of games that the individual plays that he is no longer capable of playing and that he doesn't like to play anymore.

So they actually add up to a denial of a game. So actually he can't play or relax or have a game because he's in a games condition. He's in an overwhelmed state.

All right. We look at this and we see then, that the low percentage of clearing, the very low percentage that we were getting, you see, must have stacked up to this: that we had a fortuitous combination, almost by accident on the case with Routine 3. It was a fortuitous combination.

We actually did get the person's goal. That we knew. That was real. We had that, that's fine. All right. Now, we might have gotten the opposition terminal for the pc's own terminal and we might have gotten the pc's terminal. And because there's a conflict between these two things, we might have gotten some other terminal. See, we might have gotten some other subordinate terminal to the opposition goal or something. See, we got one goal and then we pick it up and because it acts like the goal is no reason it is the pc's terminal.

If we've got the goal and its E-Meter reading and reaction, there are still four more things to get. Almost any one of these things could produce something that looked like the pc's terminal. That's interesting, isn't it?

Now, you start grinding away and getting desperate and getting your rudiments out or something like that and the pc is no longer in excellent communication with you and what do you find happening. Well, you in desperation are buying anything and in desperation the pc is selling anything, so of course, you're liable to come up with anything under the sun except the pc's right terminal on 3A.

So there must have been a lot of terminals that could be run, but not to Clear. See, lots of terminals that could be run without ... And they're just the terminals that are subordinate to these first five items. But if you've got the wrong one of these and were running the wrong one, the person practically could be audited on and on and on and on and on. And he'd feel better and he'd know that was it and it would make sense to his case and everything. And he'd just go on and on and on, that's all.

So your percentage of actual Clears coming out of any given body of people would be a low percentage. What it is, I don't know. Maybe it was 20 percent, maybe it was 15 percent,
something like that. But, you know me and I have never settled for these low percentages. Yes, benefit cases – oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, that's fine. We can benefit cases. The number of cases that we can benefit just willy-nilly from here on out are – it's a very high percentage. We can do an awful lot with an awful lot of cases without knowing anything about the rest of this because we've been doing it for years actually.

But now, when it goes to go for broke and a Clear for somebody, straight across the boards, if we did a terribly gentle, very exact job, perhaps, of sorting out the person's facsimiles – as was done so many years ago under a very, very high level of ARC and a tremendous amount of gradient scales, you know, moving them up the line – we probably would have triggered our way through this without seeing any of the parts, see? We probably could have gone through it without noticing any of the parts. It sounds strange, but we probably could have. But regardless of that, we're taking a tightrope walk these days in Routine 3D across the Grand Canyon, which lies between life as it was lived back then and Clear and it is a tightrope walk.

There is only at this moment one process which could be reliably counted upon to do this exact thing There's really only one that you could just count on like that. Bang! You'd say, well, if we got these parts, we're there, see. We're at that point. And we can count on that process. Now, with clearing under 3 – Routine 3, we could not count on that process to absolutely carry every case away through to Clear. I'm talking empirically now, because look at the number of cases that were started on Routine 3 and look at the small percentage of Clears that resulted. That's the only type of percentages that mean anything to me. It's not what I hope, it is what is.

All right. Now, if we can lift the sights on this, wonderful. All right. Now, Routine 3D – I've already been accused of underselling Routine 3D because I haven't really been making very much noise about it. I have been too busy. I've been too busy getting it checked out, cross-checking and researched and so on. I took a look at, well, past cases for sure and present cases, and realized that we were working against a deadline – only about ten days ago – and I realized that we were working against a heavy deadline. And I had a bunch of background information that I'd been sort of looking at, you know and fitting around and thinking we were getting along all right and so forth and I was not necessarily taking my time, but I just saw this and said, "Hey, wait a minute. A lot of these people are going to be leaving here in the middle of December and some of them won't go away Clear, not at the rate they're going now. Student auditing is not very fast. Little errors get made and so forth. And the way some of these cases are running right this minute, I just wouldn't bet on it too much. It isn't a good show."

So, I went out and got several tons of coal and poured it on the ba – the front burner and the back burner and turned on the blower system, heated it up to about 31,000 degrees centigrade and pulled the rest of it all together and got a fast look at it and Suzie can tell you this; it was a terrible mess weekend before last. And checked it out during the ensuing week. I didn't check it out because I knew I had it by Monday morning. It had been waiting there for a long time. Did spend the rest of the week checking it out and actually trying to get ahead of you on commands and I'm just about that far ahead of you.
And those of you which are marching right up to it right about now can breathe easier. But there's an awful problem that lies on the middle of the tightrope and that is where all these five elements come together in a bunch and you call it the Goals Problem Mass. Technical term; you might as well get used to it.

Those who have run 3D have seen a Prehav level move up the tone arm. Your Prehav level moves up the tone arm. Then you get a new Prehav level and it backs down and then raises up again and sticks. Have you noticed that? That's the way the old Prehav Scale has done on Routine 2 and Routine 3. That was the way it did. Now, the second I got the modifier, it started moving up, clank. It moved up much more rapidly on the Prehav Scale, very rapidly.

And now with 3D, you sometimes don't get more than one or two brackets run before the tone arm goes up and sticks. That's fascinating, isn't it?

As a matter of fact, if you were very alert, you could see it stick on two commands, just like that. Bang! Bang! And it already looks like it's there and it doesn't do much moving on from there on out.

Well, now, that gives you some index of the speed with which we're dealing

On Routine 3, it took hours and hours and hours and days and days and days and weeks and weeks and weeks, sometimes, to flatten a Prehav level until the tone arm went up and stuck. And then we had to get a new level.

You've already seen this in action, remember? Took it quite a while. You – I don't think you've ever even seen a stuck arm because we stopped running it before it stuck. But it took a long time to flatten one of those levels, didn't it?

Now, if you'd flattened the level all the way out, it would have gone up and stuck. Been doing that since February, down in South Africa, one of the earliest observations of this. Well, why is that? Well, some kind of a mass moves in that isn't being as-ised. And you run this level and it as-ises all of that level there is in the mass and then the mass closes in on the pc. Thud!

Well, with 3A, if you've just done 3A and nothing else, you still would have gotten this stuck phenomena and you would have seen it, but it probably would have happened in two or three or four sessions. And now it happens in two or three commands. Now, you get relative speed, see. It's getting awfully fast as far as the run is concerned.

Now, what is this thing? What is this thing – the Goals Problem Mass?

Well, now, I could tell you an awful lot of theory behind this, but I won't bother to. I'll draw you a picture. I won't bother to draw it on the blackboard. Draw it in your mind.

What's a problem? A problem is postulate-counter-postulate, terminal-counter-terminal, force counter-force. It's one thing versus another thing, isn't it? That's a problem.

You go home, you have an argument with your wife. She says, "We're going to the movies." You say, "I'm not going to the movies. We're not going to the movies." All right. There it is. As long as she is saying, "We are not going to the movies," and you're saying,
"We're going to the movies," or vice versa, neither one of you go anyplace. You just stand there and natter. That's it.

So there's your problem and you've got this thing in balance because you've got two forces or two ideas which are interlocked, of comparable magnitude and the thing stops right there.

All right. Now, with these two things, one stuck against the other, you get a sort of a timelessness. It floats in time. Timelessness goes along with this.

We have the idea of democracy in the United States and communism in Russia. Now, the only reason that ever adds up to any kind of a problem that anybody can do anything with, the only reason it never adds up, is simply of course, is because the United States started the philosophy of communism in 1776, and is a sucker for it.

You hear the communist slogans and so forth. All you have to do is go up to the Capitol and just walk through and look at them on the plaques. They're all there: equal rights, equality, socialism, fraternity. All these things are there.

You go over to Paris and you look at the slogans of the French Revolution. You'll find they're all there.

The Russians have always been about 150 years behind the times and they have a hell of a time catching up. Always slow, always slow. They finally learned how to do ballet about a hundred years after the French and they're always late this way, see. It took them some eighty years to pick up communism from a German in the first place. You see, they're late.

And you actually don't get much of a problem-counter-problem. There isn't really a problem-counter-problem. If they all got together and argued about it... A 1776 patriot in the vicinity of Boston, arguing with a 1961 communist in the vicinity of Moscow, would have a hell of a time. They couldn't find anyplace they were in disagreement except the Bostonian would be trying to tell the Russian he was going a little bit too far and he was being a purist about it. That's just about as far as the argument could proceed.

And this would be an interesting scramble. They couldn't find out where they were having a problem and that is the difficulty with world situation today. They really are not sure where they've got a problem. All they are sure of is that there are two forces in opposition. The Russian forces are in opposition to the American forces or the NATO forces or the English forces, don't you see? We can be sure of that.

I don't – the reason why I don't think it'll ever come to much is there's no basic postulate-problem difficulty behind it. For instance, England of course, sowed her seeds of destruction about 1100 and something, with the Magna Carta. If you ever – nobody in England, of course, knows very much about the Magna Carta. They talk about it a lot, but they never look into the background of the Magna Carta. But that was a real wild-eyed Red document when it was first dreamed up. That was a wild one.

And perhaps wisely, nobody ever, you know, kept a copy of it. But do you know that was to turn all the land back to the serfs, and it was all going to be socialism and so forth. And the people that walked up there to that field to push a pistol against somebody's head – I for-
got who it was, gunpowder hadn't been invented yet, but you get the allegory. And by George, they had these—these terrific ideas. It was equality and there was socialism and all of that sort of thing. And there was going to be equal justice for all and everybody was going to be equal one way or the other and the nobles sold them out. The nobles sold everybody out. The nobles settled more or less for their fare. And they didn't settle for the serfs' and villains' side of the picture. But the serfs and villeins were there in the background. And what they expected to hear that day as the final pronunciamento was vastly different than the pronunciamento which was finally signed and read. Because they expected to hear that, "Slaves, break your chains and that is it." And they didn't hear that.

Now, whether this story of the Magna Carta is accurate or not awaits until one of you who were there gives us the dope, straight. I wasn't there at the time; I was busy elsewhere. But I'm indebted to the story of the Magna Carta and what it was all about to the late George Wichelow and he was a great student of human liberty and human rights and he used to reel this thing off by the yard and so forth.

And I don't know where he dug up all this history, but it was sure interesting. We stood up there on that field one day, and he was showing me where they all sat and what they all said and all this sort of thing and so forth. And I could get the idea of old George there, right up there in the front rank, you know, looking meaner than hell. [laughter] He really had it taped.

But, anyway, the facts of the case are that these political philosophies that are being brooded about in our 1961, at the moment, are not particularly in much disagreement. The last political philosophy there was disagreement with everybody went by the boards in 1945 when a certain chap on the other side of the channel over here took the finger off his number. I've forgotten his name. Schicklgruber, I think it was—house painter.

And he didn't get the word. He didn't get the word. The philosophy of pure force could no longer exist in this world. He thought it could and a few million dead men later, why, people decided he was wrong.

So there was an active force and there was war. Why? Because you had an ideology of the superiority of a race and the magnitude and glory of force and "the chosen people" sort of an idea of where the rest of the world was going to be enslaved in some aristocratic feudal system, somehow or another, by the Wehrmacht. This philosophy was no longer acceptable.

Well, I remember the Germans back from Roman times. They—you'd go up there, you know, and they'd be wearing Roman costumes or something of the sort. Oh, they'd be out of date, you hadn't seen them in Rome for a century, you know. They were always behind the times. That's another crew that always—always a little bit old or a little bit late. Old-fashioned, you know. You go up there, the girls are wearing the wrong hats every time. [laughter] And they, however, carried over that many centuries. That's sort of an exaggeration.

But the philosophy of pure force—philosophy of—what the devil was his name? He was some fellow that was sick all the time—his name wasn't Zarathustra, but you get the idea.
Female voice: Nietzsche.

I don't know what his name was. There's no reason to send it down to history because I don't think he could write.

Anyway, perhaps it was unfortunate for Hitler that he could read, but that philosophy had long since gone out. And that philosophy posed against the philosophy of equality and decency to your fellow man, equal chances and equal rights under law, couldn't live because this other philosophy, as I'm trying to show you, isn't Russian, isn't English, isn't these things. It's something that's been around for a long time and actually was inculcated into this part of the world by the Romans.

The Romans had two distinct philosophies in their political network and that's why they were always at war. They had the philosophy of equality and justice along with the philosophy of total dominance – "get thy neck bent over so I can get mine heel upon it, crunch." You recognize that.

The Roman while spreading equal rights under law, Roman justice, the rights of citizenship, the rights of property, the mechanisms of government, at the same time dragged along with him – like the carcass of a rotting horse hauled along back of a wagon – slavery. And it was incompatible. He himself had never digested his own political philosophies and he couldn't live with what he had. And his states he created one after the other, each one went down because there were too many violent counterpoises which could be launched here. And Christianity was a crystallization of the Roman philosophy of equality and socialism and that's why it eventually conquered the Roman state.

Up to that time, equality and decency to your fellow man was rather counterpoised by total cruelty, total barbarism about your fellow man and specialized justice and specialized cliques and so forth. So, you had a problem within the state. You had two active philosophies which are counterbalanced and the Roman, of course, could never settle his political affairs. He might make an empire, but he actually could never do – make up his mind, "What philosophy are we ruling by here." He always had something else, don't you see?

And then the philosophy of Christianity won out and has come down to us and is the philosophy of Russia today; only they call it communism.

Anyway, and we've got another Christian philosophy today, and we don't know what we'd call that. But it's definitely – if you study the philosophy of the early Christian, you will find that community property and all the various things which they worship in Russia today are early Christian principles and actually made their emergence on this planet at about that time of Christ. So the Russian is awful late. God, I wish somebody would bring them up to present time.

Anyway, there's no potential war because there's no disagreement. Now, most Russian practices are subversive. Well, we can disagree with that. We use them ourselves. They use blackmail and they do various things which are not quite decent in conduct of human activities and that sort of thing.

We could argue about some of these ideas. We could say they go too far. We could say the cult of the personality goes too far and that sort of thing. But actually we're protesting
against things which we ourselves, in the western world, have held to be true for the last couple of thousand years. Fascinating, isn't it? We'd be fighting our own philosophy if we fought communism too hard. You notice, however, that the most dissenting voices against communism are those who are – say that pure communism goes too far. Have you heard that? You've heard that? Yeah, it's quite common. That is of course the only real postulate could be launched against communism to make a problem. Because they go too far.

If the fellow's able and gets a name for something, of being a good clown or something like that, why, you have to shoot him or something, you know. That seems a little bit dull. But, anyway, if you extend any socialism just a couple of thoughts further than the existing socialism, you'd find out that's what you'd have to do.

You couldn't allow anybody to have a name. They'd all have a number. I mean we've had a famous English writer here for many, many years. The late H. G. Wells has given us some marvelous things. There's Aldous Huxley, *The Brave New World*, things of this character. There have been more cracks made at the supersocialization of things, don't you see.

So you're arguing by degrees. And do you know that you really can't have much of an argument by degrees. You can't have much of an argument by degrees. You'll see two fellows; they arrive on a corner. One says, "Let's walk half a mile."

And the other one says, "No, let's walk a mile."

And they start arguing about it and they'll walk three-quarters of a mile. Because the understanding is incipient in the difficulty. In other words, we've already got an agreement that they're going to walk, you know. It's just a question of how far. So there isn't much of a war involved. But we get one fellow – we – he says, "Now, the thing we ought to do is stay right here on this corner and that's it and not move another foot."

And the other fellow comes along and he says, "Well, the thing we ought to do is keep running around the block and the only safe thing to do is keep running around the block and always be in motion and never stand still."

Well, these two fellows will – they're having trouble, too, because their point of view is a little bit distant. But nevertheless they'll get into an argument of some kind or other. Each one will wind up saying the other one's crazy and there's no fundamental agreement on what they're doing and they'll be very upset about it.

Do you see that? It takes an argument of some kind to take this. All right.

The wife says, "We're not going to go to the pictures."

And the husband says, "We are going to go to the pictures."

Now, you've got an argument. They can communicate because it's about the pictures. That's the only reason they can communicate in an argument, because it has a common meeting ground.

All right, you go through various things and you'll find these problems come up around gross differences of opinion. And all problems arise around gross differences of opinion or gross vectors of ideas. Vectors of ideas is a better thing here for your understanding of this than anything else.
You've got one fellow who says, "Go north," and the other fellow says, "Go south." Well, of course, they'll walk apart and never meet again and that's all right.

But supposing one is standing north of the other one and south of the other one and they're directly standing in each other's paths and one is going to go north and the other is going to go south, and not – and their modifiers in both cases would be "and not budge an inch out of my path." Oh, you've got a nice problem there because you've got two ideas and now you've added mass against mass. See, they're not just standing and nattering. They're in each other's road.

One is going to go this way. The other one is going to go that way. And if they move in the respective direction where they think they should be going, they're going to run into each other. Now, you've got the idea is different and the mass is going in different directions.

And when those two masses collide, if each one were trying to move at the rate of one hundred foot-pounds forward, they'd just stop there forever. If nothing else unsettled that situation, each man, one trying to go south through the man who was trying to go north and the one trying to go north through the man that's trying to go south and each one of them trying to walk forward at the rate of one hundred foot-pounds of thrust, well, it's going to stop right there. That's it. The trail is ended.

And they get an idea that that time lasts forever because there's nothing ever unbalances it. So it takes the mass and the idea to make a real problem – the only point I'm trying to make.

You can have the mass in some disagreement or headed in some direction and so on and the other mass coming in the other direction, they hit, but there's no ideas around. Of course, there's nothing to make it hang up. It's just a couple of pieces of mass. It happens all the time. Good heavens, stars a thousand times the size of Earth have hit stars in this universe, but nobody around and no planets depending on them or anything else and so the astronomers noted down someplace that there was a big flash. That was it. So, there was a big flash. So what?

It's far more important in this universe that Mamie Glutz has in her mind a force that is going to go north and a force that is going to go south; and the force that is going to go north finds the force that is going to go south in its path; and the force that is going to go south has the idea it's going to go north; and the force that is going to go north has the idea that it's going to go south because that's the way it will continue to be to the end of the whole universe.

And that's what is known as a Goals Problem Mass.

Do you see that? That's two equal lock-ups. Crunch!

Now, let's run a bunch of unsettling factors into the man who was going to go south and into the man who was going to go north. And now, let's add some other factors into these fellows so as to unbalance the hundred footpounds of thrust each one is furnishing against each other.

Now, of course, 101 foot-pounds of thrust will cause the man who was trying to go south to actually back northward and you no longer have a perfectly balanced problem. So the
second that the person who is trying to go south finds himself about to be pushed north, what is his first action? It's to add enough weight to try to overcome the fellow who is going north. So he puts on a 102 foot-pounds of thrust and then the fellow going north tries to – south tries to put on the other 103. And then the fellow going north puts on 104 and the fellow going south puts on 105, and – and so on. And it gets to be a little teeter, see. They're just teetering at each other.

In any mind, on any central issue, there are two different ideas which are available at first to the auditor. Let me qualify it like that because this isn't the whole ideas – of ideas that are in the mind. Actually, there's quite a few of these things in the mind.

It was like I was telling you the other day, there's a thousand skins on the onion, there are a million, billion skins on the onion. You can take them apart a lot of skins at a time. And the first Goals Problem Mass that is available to the auditor for auditing is that one which has the visible goal.

Now, all that's visible of this thing is just the goal that the pc says is his goal. It finally comes out to be by assessment the pc's goal.

Now, if you've ever seen a goals list that ran 350 goals which is a very common pc's goals list, you would see that this goals list might have been, any one of them, the road in. Until assessed, the Goals Problem Mass might have been located by any one of 350 different tags, until you assess it. So you see the number of complexity. Because, do you know the pc didn't know that either? See, the pc was – is in ignorance of all this. He's doing it all and he's in total ignorance of it, which is quite amazing.

So he's trying to do this. All right, we look at this Goals Problem Mass and we find out that it could have had any one of 350 possible roads into it and by assessment we finally find out what it is!

All right, now, all we've got is the pc's goal. Now, that is idea one. That is the fellow with the idea that he's going to go south, you see.

All right. Now, why don't we at once – why don't we at once find, then, the opposition goal. Shouldn't that be number two? No, you've overlooked something. You have a pc's body in the auditing chair. You have already found the gross terminal that has this goal. Only you don't know what to call it yet, see? You've already found it.

So, actually, you didn't find the goal as the first action. The action occurred before the auditing session.

You got a pc and put him in the chair, see? Well, you found something there. There's some mass connected with it. Now, you'd better get some counterbalancing mass in a hurry because you found this person's goal. Now, of course, if you found the other goal – you'll find this in experience, too, as you winnow these things out, you'll find out that it's almost impossible to get the opposite goal before you get the terminal. You've got to get the opposition terminal. We've got to get something that matches up to the pc mass.

All right. And then we find out what is the opposition goal.
All right, now, we've got the clear-cut picture, got the clear-cut picture. A something-ness – a valence actually, undiscovered, but nevertheless there and observable by this time to both the pc and the auditor – is trying to move south with a certain idea of moving south. And it is – something else is apparently present which is trying to move north through the pc. And this something else that is present happens to be an International Harvester. See, that's the opposition terminal, see. It's an International Harvester. We never knew it before now, but that's what it is. It's what it assessed out to be. That's what's trying to move the opposite direction.

Good. All right. That's fine. And now let's find out what the opposition harvester is trying to do and we eventually do a big assessment. And we find out that, according to the pc, its goal is to, of course, just to move south. To move south. That is that simple.

It's going to move south. He's going to move north. All right. Fine. Didn't matter which way it was. They're going to move toward each other and it's going to lock up. One goal is going to lock up against the other goal and one terminal, not yet found, is going to lock up against the other terminal.

Now we go back and find out what little piece did the pc add to overcome the counter-pressure and we get the modifier.

Now, that's the additives. That's the one pound that went on top of the hundred foot-pound, you see? That was his new idea, well, if he announced this idea, then the International Harvester would move backwards, see? Get the point?

So he's walking against the machine. The machine is coming against him and they were both balanced up. The ideas are both balanced. The force they're using is both balanced and at this moment, the pc with wonderful insight adds a little push in that direction.

Now, you know that there's a modifier to the opposition goal. Did you know the opposition goal modifies?

Now, why don't you find it? It's not the pc's goal, that's all. It's not the pc's modifier. You found enough pieces already. And actually it'll go on and on and on. You could do this assessment for modifier to the pc's goal and modifier to the opposition goal and modifier to the pc's goal and modifier to the opposition goal and modifier to the pc's goal and they'd probably go up to something that's looked like the new goals list. And it might go into hundreds because, of course, every time the pc is trying to go north and every time the machine has tried to move south, new ideas were added, to make the passage. But they're just stack-ups. You got to draw a halt someplace or another and where you really have to go is you do have to find the modifier because you need the modifier, otherwise, you're not going to find the terminal. The pc's terminal cannot be found without his modifier. But the opposition terminal can be found without the goal.

But, if you assess too much and too many, if you assess too much and too many opposition, you're going to get the wind blowing.

If you don't believe it sometime, run the opposition terminal on the PreHAV Scale on just one assessment and ask the pc how he feels. Well, that's what? That's a whole seventy or eighty repetitions of the opposition terminal, one right after the other.
Well, it's the found terminal, see. It wasn't odd terminals – differentiation. You're saying to him, "Man going south. Man going south. Man going south. Man going south. Man going south. Man going south."

And after a while, he sort of gets the idea of the *bzuu, bzuu!* He's losing. He actually will start to kind of back up. He can feel the wind go past his ears. You know, uuuuuuh, "What's this, what's this?" you know. Uuuuuuuuh.

It isn't necessary. It'll all run out.

Now, you are indebted to the gross values of auditing. In other words, auditing these days, done well with the rudiments in, can handle an awful lot of additives. You do the simple, central mechanics and the additives fly off like a Roman candle. There's nothing much to it, you see.

If you had to run everything that actually should be run, of course, you would run the entire lifetime of the individual as that terminal against every opposition that he ever encountered and every thought he ever had and every dinner he ever ate and every lunch he ever ate and every breakfast he ever ate and every bed he ever slept in and every time he'd ever hurt his finger and every time he ever wum, and every time he ever wum and wum-wum, and he'd have to know everything there was to know on the whole track all the way along the line for the last 200 trillion years.

Now, how long do you think that would take to clear him? In view of the fact that he can be shot in one second and if he had been shot and you were running it as an engram, it'd take you five or six hours, I'd say the factor was several thousand times the actual time length. That's how much – how long auditing would take.

Let's say it's ten thousand times as long to audit out a wound as to be shot, see? So that'd be ten thousand times 200 trillion years is how long it'd take to run out the pc's bank. Now you get some kind of an idea what I've been tackling here.

The only thing that's got the bank messed up is the Goals Problem Mass. That's all that's got the bank messed up.

All right, enough of this. You walk into the Goals Problem Mass, *clank*. The moment that you ask the pc for his goal, you'll sometimes see a pc's tone arm on some pcs start up at that point and it goes up – *clank, brrrp*. Then come back down a little bit, and you change the thing and *brrrp, clank, brrrp, boom*. Rudiments go a little bit out, up goes the tone arm, *clank*. Sort of sticky. Then all of a sudden you pin the goal down and it sort of frees up. Well, actually you move them closer to the Goals Problem Mass than they had been before. But you moved them closer with more understanding.

So although they're standing closer, they've got a better tone arm and needle. Interesting. But remember, you did move them closer to the Goals Problem Mass and therefore their tone arm will now go higher or lower and misbehave worse and stick heavier. You make an error now on rudiments and of course they – it gets much stickier. Interesting, isn't it?

Now, as we go up the line on this and we find the opposition terminal, we of course, are that much closer to the Goals Problem Mass. *Ummm*. Ah, but because we know about it, he can stand that much closer to it without being burned. We just get our needle disbehaves a little worse, occasionally when a rudiment goes out – why, it all of a sudden ... Have you no-
noticed a pc after you've been auditing him for a while, the needle gets awfully sticky if something goes out and the tone arm sort of misbehaves and goes higher and then usually will go lower and then frees up quicker.

He gets worse and gets better faster. Well, that's because he's standing up closer to this Goals Problem Mass, see? You've got his attention coming into where his attention is really stuck.

All right. Well, he's much better off when you find the opposition terminal, that's for sure of that. Everything is fine. He's also standing another few feet closer to the blast furnace, when in view of the fact that the total fire in the furnace consists of not knowing what's in the furnace, that he knows a little bit about it, makes it possible for him to do so.

And then you find the opposition goal and you move him a little closer to the furnace, closer to the Goals Problem Mass, actually and you can lock up his needle quicker and free it and lock it up and it goes freer and it's been drifting freer and then locks up easier. There's nothing more horrible than somebody who hasn't any idea of what's wrong with him. Doesn't even know that he ever even has any trouble in life. The tone arm is always at 3. Needle never moves much. Give the cans a squeeze and the needle rises. Nothing wrong with him. He doesn't need any auditing. He doesn't know where he is. He doesn't know what he's doing.

Well, with this individual you could just hit him over the head with brickbats and you would never get his tone arm to do anything but sit right there at 3. Right there – there it is.

You can ask him the most challenging Sec Check questions. Never moves. That's your dead thetan case. Now, when you get this guy wheeling along the line a little bit, don't start worrying because he's got a high tone arm. Well, his tone arm will go up, clank! after you've found two or three of these elements in 3D. It's liable to be way up and real stuck. Then the – he looks at the other wall and comes down. I mean that could happen, see?

But actually, it really doesn't happen until you get into the Prehav run, which I am trying to actually cover in this lecture for you.

Now, what occurs? You're moving him closer to the mass. There is an actual mass. It is a measurable problem. It is – does have mass. It does have existence in space. True, it's the pc's space, not the physical universe's space, but it has an existence in its own space. It is contactable. You can measure the density. And that is what the E-Meter is doing, is measuring the density of the Goals Problem Mass and that is all the E-Meter is doing.

Now, I invite you sometime to conduct this experiment. Get some pc who has a sensibility to mental masses. This is the bulk of your pcs. It's not pcs who are way downhill and "Oh, well, I don't think I ever want any auditing because actually there's nothing much you can do." Don't get one of those kind. Get somebody that has an idea and he can see a picture, he can see something of this sort.

All right. Now, ask him something like this: "Have you ever had a problem?"

"Well, yes, I had a problem. I had a problem with my mother."
"All right. That's fine. Now, tell me a solution to that problem. Thank you. Tell me a solution to that problem. Thank you. Tell me a solution to that problem. Thank you. Now, do you see any masses in your vicinity?"

"Oooooh, as a matter of fact, I do. There's ... Yeah, yeah, yeah."

"Well, where is – where is this mass?"

"Oh, I don't know." And so on and so on and so on.

"Well, tell me a solution to that problem."

"What problem?"

"Well, this problem with your mother. Where is the problem now, by the way?"

"Oh, it's out there about twelve feet away from me."

Very interesting. What is this problem doing with a location in relationship to him twenty years after and two thousand miles away.

What is this problem doing there? But, it's there.

You say, "All right. Now, tell me a solution to that problem with your mother. Thank you. Tell me a solution to that problem with your mother. Thank you. Now, where is that mass?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, it's out here about five feet."

You say, "Good. Thank you very much. Now, tell me a solution of that problem with your mother. All right. Tell me a solution of that problem with your mother. Thank you. Tell me a solution of that problem with your mother. Thank you. Now, where is this problem?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, it's right there. It's right on the end of my nose. It's very funny you mention that because it's come right in. It's sort of a mass, and it's right there on the end of my nose."

You say, "Well, that's fine. Tell me a solution to that problem. Tell me a solution."

Now, if you were a psychiatrist, you'd keep that up for the rest of the day. And you say, "Where is the thing now?"

And he says, "As a matter of fact, it's sitting inside my nose. It's back here in my cheekbones and it's awfully tight. There's something tight in there."

You say, "Good. Now, think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you. Where is this problem?"

"It's right here at the end of my nose."

"Good. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Where is it now?"

"Well, it's out there about five feet," the pc will tell you.

"All right."
And you run "think of a problem of comparable magnitude" and he'll finally tell you it's out there twelve feet away. It's out there one mile away. It's out there about two thousand miles away. Well, it's back where it came from. Because you kept running that, providing your rudiments were in, you didn't keep kicking him in the shins or give him electric shocks or back treatments at the same time.

Anway, we got a situation there where we can move these masses in and out. You can actually move masses in and out by addressing the subject of problems and solutions.

That's very important. That's a very well-known and very old datum in Scientology: that you can move problems and masses in and out with problems and solutions. You can move masses. The more you solve the problem, the closer the mass gets. What is more, you approximate the problem the further it moves away.

Unknowns do the same thing. This is about — what was it? I think it was about 1956, late '55, '56. I remember up in London, I remember going over and talking about it at the Coach and Horses one day over a nice steak. Anyway, and the civic planners have now swept all that away and I don't think you can get a steak in London. Well, that's progress.

Anyway, the whole of this mechanism is of vast interest to you in clearing because all you're handling is the Goals Problem Mass. And what is that mass? That's the mass of the pc, the pc's terminal, the opposition terminal, the opposition goal, the pc's goal, the modifier and now, every other force that has been added in to help each other out. And of course, that can add up to hundreds of each item. Hundreds! And until you looked at the thing, you'd have actually thousands of items in a total confusion and you wouldn't know what to do with any one of the items, but it'd be a nice big, black mass. That's all. It's just a conglomerate something or other, see?

And everything is pushing and everything is resisting and everything is pushing in the opposite direction and being resisted in the opposite direction. And it's all just locked up just as nice as anything you ever saw. Thud!

There it is. Nothing is going to go in any direction, and everything is being helped from going in any other direction but the direction it's not going. Pc's personality.

Now, you've got these — all these factors. And if you've got these five factors, you've got the basic factors — the only factors necessary to take a problem apart. But you've got tremendous factors that are added to these fives. Each one of the five might be an army, but it has a — scores of auxiliaries. Each factor has scores of auxiliaries. And if you tried to look this thing over on just a quantitative basis, you'd never tackle it. The pc never has. He's never dared. All the pc's ever done is have trouble with it.

All right. You get too close to the Goals Problem Mass, all sorts of odd things occur. The pc feels like he's getting his skull pushed in. Maybe he was upset. And before you're running 3D, he's going to be plenty upset, at various points, in a sort of a puzzled way. So it takes confidence here and it takes an auditor's smooth auditing in order to get over the jumps.

Because what happens? When you got the five, he feels much better. But he's liable to be dramatizing any one of the five. Now that they're live, he's still close to the Goals Problem
Mass. Any kind of an ARC break on any one of the particular subjects is liable to throw him into a dramatization of that item.

Of course, you've got him at a loss at this momentary stage. You know exactly which item he's dramatizing if you know his 3D. At least you can tell him, "Well, all right. Let's not be a – " whatever it is.

But there's no sense in doing that and it's accusative, it's liable to cave him in and cost you several hours of auditing because he'll eventually come around and tell you, "Well, all I have done is cost myself five hours of auditing" You know?

But he actually can go in and out on these various items and he goes flicker-flack. And he'll dramatize these things and he'll get these tremendous ideas. And he'll get up in the morning – he's got this awful compulsion, you see, to eat cider buns, but they don't exist, you know and ya-uuuuuuuuuh. And he'll realize a few minutes later, an hour or so later, "Oh, well, naturally, a bun vender. They have people who buy buns from a bun vender and my opposition terminal is a bun vender. Oh, well, it's obvious. Well, how silly I am. I wish I could certainly find a cider bun." [laughs]

It isn't in a very high state of key-out. That's because it's closer in to the Goals Problem Mass, so it's actually being enforced at this stage.

It's less than it has ever been. Do you understand? It's less than it's ever been, but that doesn't mean that it never gets dramatized, it can be pretty soon.

It's easier to get a pc into session and easier for a pc to go out of session, just as it's easier to free up the needle and easier to stick it up. You find a much more active picture going on here. It is not so comfortably status quo.

Now, let's say, for the last many thousand years this Goals Problem Mass has been in a marvelous state of status quo. Pc left it alone. It made him dramatize it and it was riding along. It was all in perfect counterbalance. Time, what was the time? The time of it, of course, was the time of it. That was time. There was no other time than the time of it.

And it coasts along forever. It endures forever. Nothing could affect it. There you are. You had an armored citadel. Any given situation, the pc had – had his no choice of doing one of five things, modified of course, by the hundreds of things appended to any one of the five. Fascinating, isn't it?

The pc never had to think, never had to live, never had to be there, never had to enjoy anything. Had lots of fun getting in his own road. Spent endless hours trying to understand himself. The advantages of having one of these things are absolutely uncountable. [laughter]

Every time you decide that you better walk down to the corner and get a little bit of fresh air, why, you find yourself sitting more deeply in the chair.

Say, "What happened to me? That's a funny thing. Oh, well, that's life, I guess. The brain, the brain is what's doing it."

I think the psychologist has got these things so heavily that they've got them inner superimposed inside the skull in some fashion. I think that is why the brain is.
But now I'm not talking and haven't been talking about an imaginary item. The thing is a sensing item. It is an item which can be sensed. This thing can be experienced.

You plaster one of these things all over a pc's chest or face or stomach sometime and then try to convince him there's nothing there. He feels this heavy pressure, he'll tell you about the pressure, terrible pressure. Pressure.

And you say, "Well, there's nothing there really. It's just your imagination. What you should – what you should realize is it is best of all possible worlds where there is nothing but mind and space and infinite mind and there is only infinite mind." Well, you could convince him of this, perhaps, perhaps. If you deflected his attention so that he didn't feel it.

But the next time he was walking down the street, there'd be a slight wind or a car would backfire suddenly and he'd have this right back where it is again and you'd have to tell him with more duress, "Well, pray harder to God." Now, that would work just so far because a certain percentage of these fellows had God as part of the Goals Problem Mass and where you had that, you almost slaughtered him.

See, maybe God was the opposition terminal. And you say – he'd say, "Pray to God. Well, maybe I'd better pray to God." And all of a sudden he feels very degraded, very crushed and degraded and he can't tell why.

"Religion does a great deal for many people and many things and they're very happy about religion. Why shouldn't I be? I guess I just haven't said my prayers right. All right, I'll try again tonight," you see. And he gets up the next morning and feels three times as degraded. Nobody could figure out why.

All right. That Goals Problem Mass is a mass; it does exist. And as you get 3D, you're actually taking apart from a distance the component parts of the Goals Problem Mass as it most intimately relates to the beginning of the onion skins that you're trying to peel off.

That's the first series, and of course, it's much harder to locate. Now, that we can locate it at all is due to the fact that it is an electronic mass. The mental electronics go into its composition. And, of course, when we tick something in it, why, we get a vibration, see and it shows up on the E-Meter. And that's how you do an assessment.

The pc could never live in the middle of it, let me tell you. He'd just fall to pieces. His skull would fall off or something. It's not that the thing is dangerous. But when he got in there, he couldn't tell you what he was looking at because all he would do – would dramatize everything that was in it. And then he'd dramatize all the auxiliaries of everything that was in it, too. Well, but he can stand off and with good rudiments in and good ARC, he can assess like mad.

Now, why do your rudiments go out? Well, the auditor, in some way or another... We've got the various reasons, the things that have to be settled out so that he doesn't experience this, like all the rudiments, of course. You get your rudiments in, why, the auditor is not totally identified with these Goals Problem Mass. He's got it separated out. So the auditor can sit there and audit the pc, until he does something to restimulate the Goals Problem Mass.
And we know the various things that are the most heaviest restimulators on any case. And when these go out, part of the Goals Problem Mass goes in and it can get sufficiently heavily charged or in, that your meter stops reading. And you can't assess, that's all. You just – well, it's something like: "Oh, well, up to this time we were going along fine, we had telephone bell wires and there was a telephone bell wire strung between the Goals Problem Mass and the E-Meter and everything was fine. It was going along and the trickle of electricity came along, and all of a sudden we strung a hemp hawser."

E-Meter won't read. See, you've just mucked the whole thing up one way or the other. You put him out of communication. You've startled him. You've upset him in some way. He can't get in communication with it because this thing restimulates and now he is only "it." So you've put him on the wire. You've put him on – into a position now where he just does nothing but "it" or what "it" says.

And, of course, "it" won't read itself. The only thing that can read "it" is the E-Meter with the assistance of the pc and you. And you're trying to study a piece of coal out there, a mountain-size piece of coal at about a half a mile away – is what you're really trying to do. It's remarkable, remarkable that you can do it. It's absolutely phenomenal. I never saw such a thing. It's remarkable that there's any solution to it.

And you think so when you first start running the pc into it. And that will be when you have all five elements nicely found, all buttoned up and you're all set with your first Pre-hav level and you say, "Here we go, we are now going to run Interest on a waterbuck. How would you interest a waterbuck? How would a waterbuck interest you?"

The opposition terminal is a lion. "How would a waterbuck interest a lion? How would a lion interest a waterbuck? How would a waterbuck interest – ." (Oh – what's the matter with this E-Meter?) "How would a waterbuck interest himself?" (What the hell is the matter with this E-Meter?) [laughter] "Haha. How would a wa- . Did you answer the last question? All right. That's fine. All right. How would you interest a waterbuck? How would a waterbuck interest you?" Coo!

The thing is up there at 5.25 and the needle is getting paralyzed and whenever you say "waterbuck," you get a flicker-flick. And you say happily, because you remember your 36 Havingness Processes and your old Confront Process, and you remember blowdowns and you know that meters can do this sort of thing. Oh, I assure you that this is not going to happen very fast, that sort of thing. It's not going to happen.

A meter would blow down because you were running a chunk off something. Why, you're not going to run any chunk off a mountain. You're just going to run a mountain off a mountain. That's it. You've just run the pc into this thing with a Mack truck. Crash. There's nothing going off of it. It's going to up to whatever it goes up to or down to whatever it goes down to, and it's going to stick and that's all.

Now, if you overran this by 30 commands, now maybe you've probably got trouble. You might have a little difficulty reassessing.

If you overran it a session, oh well, just give the pc a knife, tell him to go cut his throat. It's much less painful. Much kinder. Because you're going to have a hell of a time reas-
sessing. When that thing goes up and sticks, be sure it's stuck and get whether or not it's stuck by watching, in this particular run, the needle.

And you see the needle has frozen up here. It's just stuck up an inch from the set on the meter and it just keeps sitting there. There it is. It's in that same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's just about that many commands, you see, so I'd better start saying, "Well, just a couple of more commands and we will end this process if that's all right with you. Humm-humm-humm-humm-humm. All right. That's fine. Good." And we reassess.

And you'll be confounded when you go across the level you reassessed, you would swear that it wouldn't possibly have flattened in fifteen commands or something like this. Next time you go across the level, you'll say it'll sure fall again. It doesn't. It's just as quiet, just as nice. It's all rubbed. Because that was all the interest there was in it. You got the lot. It won't kick again.

Now, your next level – Withdrawal or something – and you run that and that might last a half an hour, it might last fifteen minutes, it might last two commands. But you run it to a stuck needle. Stuck tone arm and then stick the needle. Stick them both. You're perfectly safe. You can still reassess. Overrun it two hours, cut your throat – be much kinder.

All right. Now, what upsets all this? Now, I think you could run all the Prehav levels there are and find them over into the Secondary Scale and run all these things and so forth and you'd eventually run it down to a free needle. This is a probability and perfectly all right and there's no reason why it wouldn't work.

But the thing you've got to watch is if the number of levels alive increase. You enter the thing with ten levels alive; there's ten levels of the Prehav Scale that you've got a knock on. And the next time you assess, you've got twenty-five levels alive and the next time you assess, you have fifty-two levels alive.

Ah, well, you shouldn't have reassessed that last time at all. You should have quit some time earlier. You should have done something, but check something out because you've got the wrong terminal. There's something wrong with your 3D assessment. You get increasing numbers of levels alive in the Prehav Scale.

All right. So that's pretty vicious. The probability is if you know how to read an E-Meter that you will never do a wrong assessment, if you know how to read an E-Meter and if you don't permit the pc to twiddle the fingers and do other things to sell you on reads and all that kind of thing. If you really know E-Metering, you'll never get a wrong assessment.

Now, as you look over the pc, follow this rule; that increasing levels alive on original assessments, you know what I'm talking about. You read down the seventy, eighty whatever it is, Prehav Scale and you've found that they were ten of them alive and then the next time you assessed, they were twenty alive. "Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, something is wrong here."

Now, if the rudiments are in and if the pc really ran it, and everything is all right and you've done a fairly good auditing job, the only thing left is that the 3D is somehow wrong.
But if you run into this situation, don't worry too much: there were twenty levels alive and then there are ten levels alive and then there were fifteen levels alive and then there were eight levels alive. In other words, don't worry about that. You'll get a fluctuating number.

But it's quite common on somebody who has been misaudited on wrong terminals to find every level – pardon me, not every level alive, but maybe forty, fifty, sixty levels alive. And there has been a case on record of every level alive. Boy, that was really wrong. So you want to watch that and that is your checkpoint. That is the point you check. That is your best checkpoint.

Now, this other thing will occur. As you run this, later and later on, as you run – it runs on this terminal and with this package of commands. Later on as you run, you're going to get more and more tightness and a greater, faster restoration of flexibility, till it gets like this at about seven, eight levels deep on the run of the terminal.

It looks something like this: Pc is going along dandily. Everything is dandy. Everything is fine and the thing is going high and sticking. It'll keep going high. It'll even get higher. This condition even worsens, you understand, five, six levels deep. Actually it may go higher. It may have only been going to 4.0 but has now gotten into the habit of going to 4.5, and it's now getting up to 4.75 before it sticks, you see. It gets worse before it sticks every time. Feels more frozen too, and it feels more stuck up to the pc.

The pc doesn't like this. The pc doesn't know what this is all about. Pcs don't like this very much, you know. It's fast assessment and fast runs and then the new level and the pc doesn't quite know what they are doing on the new level. And they're just setting down for the long haul and then there all of a sudden, things are getting tighter and tighter and tighter, and – and this is harder and harder to run and all of a sudden they go off and they – you're off of it again and reassessing again. And they didn't even get a chance to find out what it was. And you'll find a pc will get rather confused on this, but that's perfectly all right. That's not half as confused as he has been.

Anyway, you'll find that as the pc looks at the wall or moves his elbow or bobs his head, the E-Meter changes. Well, let's say eight levels deep, the pc's attention is momentarily deflected by a buzzing at the window. And the whole thing blows down to 3, apparently a blowdown and it looks like a blowdown, but it is not a blowdown. The pc went out of session. In session the pc reads 5. Out of session the pc reads 3. Bang! Bang!

You just ask the pc if they wouldn't like to put down the cans a moment and stand up and stretch. Yeah. They stand up and stretch, sit down, pick up the cans again – oh, they are way out.

They're nowhere near the Goals Problem Mass. They've gone zoommm! And every time the thing blows down, you'll find the needle's a bit looser. It's a bit tighter or a bit looser. It's tighter higher and looser down and it finally starts to look kind of floaty.

Now, if we just went ahead and did nothing else but that, we would probably win. But it's a rather arduous activity and it's left in as a main – mainly as a preventer and to keep the pc from going off the deep end while he's got all the raw meat at the beginning run. It's an easy run and it actually softens up the case and it makes things easier and gives you a time to
check the terminal and make sure that it all ran all right and so forth and it's actually advancing the pc toward clearing.

But there are faster things to do to actually obtain a free, floating needle, which is what you're very close to on this first run. You'll – you'll swear to Pete that you must be looking at a... Occasionally, you'll see one come in and go out again running some of these things.

Now, there are several things you can do. I'm not going to delineate these things; it's toward the end of the lecture and none of you are up that far anyhow. But remember now, to watch after your assessment – on your first assessment run on the pc's terminal – to watch it very carefully that you don't run that tone arm up and stick it and keep it stuck for an hour or two. This is just cruel and it is stupid and the case is getting nowhere and of course, violates a moving tone arm. If the case is getting anywhere, the tone arm is moving and believe me, that tone arm isn't going to be moving on the early runs. It goes up and it sticks.

Let it go up as high as it'll go up. Don't check it from going up. Let it go as high as it goes. Fine, so it went to 6.5. Who cares? If that's where it's going to stick, if that's the Goals Problem Mass density, all right. So it's 6.5. It just makes it a little tough on you because the E-Meter won't read 7.

But you know, a constant little rising drift of the needle and so forth, that's not a stuck meter. It's when that rising stops and when everything stops and when everything has been stopped and it isn't going anywhere at all. You get off of that, man. Just get off of it as soon as you're sure.

Now, you've got lots of latitude. You could probably sit there and run it for another half an hour without doing anybody any damage. You'd still reassess and so forth.

The pc would squawk. They'd say things are getting a little bit tight and they couldn't think of answers and they feel uncomfortable and they were beginning to feel a little bit nervous and what were you doing and the rudiments tend to start to go out, and things like that.

But you could run it over a half an hour without getting into severe trouble. I'm asking for you to overrun it maybe 10 or 15 minutes at the absolute outside. It's much more comfortable on the pc. But run it to a stuck needle – stuck arm, stuck needle.

First the arm will stick and then you'll watch the needle stick, too. It won't happen suddenly. It'll go – everything will drift to a slow halt.

Now, you're going to make this mistake. You're going to say, "Well, look, if I say the level to them – Interest, Interest, Interest – well, I still get a bang on this thing. The level is still registering on the meter, so therefore it couldn't be stuck." Well, that's all you are going to get off of it, is the level ticking. You can get a tick off the level, and that is the last motion in it.

And when you reassess the level, you won't find that tick is in the level anymore. If anything, you're ticking off your own auditing commands, which is the probability. But it'll actually freeze up and will still tick. You know, I mean you say, "Interest." And when you first assessed Interest, you got a half a division of theta bop, see, when you assessed it. So you say, "Interest" to the person and you get a half a division theta bop. You say, "Interest," you
get half a division theta bop. You say, "Interest." It has to be a very meaningful interest for you to get a twitch.

But you can still say that to the person after the arm is stuck on running the level Interest. And then come off of it and reassess, and you will find Interest is – won't ever get another read on Interest. That's it, it's gone. See what I mean?

So don't – I'm just telling you, you can make a little mistake. You can say to yourself: "Well, no – . When I say 'interest' I can see that thing going bic, you know. I can see it going – [snaps fingers]. So therefore, therefore, Interest as a level is still alive." No, it's not.

Interest as a level is as dead as the tone arm is motionless, as the needle is going nowhere on the whole command.

You'll see these things really slow down. It's just like sinking a pc into the middle asphalt. Thud. He just walks down to a complete stop. And of course, you've run him into the opposing vectors and that sort of thing. Very interesting, because you'd swear you were killing the pc and you'd think it was a poor show. And you'd think there was no way out of it.

Well, there are ways out of it. The Prehav Scale itself is a way out of it, well audited. There's one more thin strand of rope that goes the rest of the way across the canyon, which is a pat series of auditing commands that will walk out of it.

Unfortunately, there is just one series that walks out of it very easily and very rapidly. Others walk out of it in other ways. And there are many other things you can do. Don't think we've run out of that. But there is at this moment only one auditing process.

We're at this frail point of Scientology. As far as broad, general, thorough everybody clearing is concerned, we have one Routine – 3D – that is that will lead them actually directly toward Clear, not straighten up their lives or that sort of thing. We got Class II techniques that do that. But I'm talking about clearing techniques. We just really have one.

Don't think you still have 3. I wouldn't let you run it. I mean Routine 3. I wouldn't let you run it anymore. It would be senseless. It's too hit or miss.

And we've got one process that finishes up the Prehav Scale. We got one Prehav Scale and after that we've got just one process that apparently does it all. Boy, that's no riches, is it? And if you bitch these things up on a pc, I'm going to give an auditor a process to run on you that'll run you straight into it and that nothing can undo. [laughter]

Because it's something on the order – I will warn you, on some pcs it's something on the – it's scary. It's something on the order of sending a guy to swim the Hellespont with one piece of string to pull him back with, you know. It's a little bit scary.

So do a good job on it, huh?

And that's why you must never, never, never, never, never, never, never let anybody run 3D that isn't a Class II Auditor of superlative skill and who is able to do 3D assessments. You understand? Don't let anybody monkey with it or you'll have more pcs to fish out of the drink. And at this stage at least nothing to fish them out with as far as I'm concerned, because I know nothing now but this tightrope. There's just one rope, one Prehav
level line and one process which salvages it all. That's all we've got. Those are all the riches you've got. You're rich as long as you're skillful, but then who isn't.

Thank you very much.
Okay. Here we are at the 22nd of November 1961.

And there you are. Horrible, isn't it? [laughter] Grim, huh?

All right. Your E-Metering is the sole reason you are having any difficulty making anything work – period. That is it.

Now, gross auditing errors are always something you look for. If you're ever supervising a group of auditors or an HGC or something of this sort, let me call attention to one horrible, horrible fact: the request for the extraordinary solution. Anybody supervising a group of auditors routinely gets requests for extraordinary solutions, and if you don't know this little datum, you will lay ostrich eggs. You will give people the extraordinary solution. It is never the extraordinary solution that is needed. What you have to do is locate the gross auditing error. That is always the case.

I myself have had to learn this the hard way over the years. Staff auditor used to come to me occasionally and say, "Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and we have to do this and we have to do that, and my goodness, and the pc just can't remember, and the cats are running in and out of the bank, and everything is going mad and would you please, please, please tell me some good process to run on this pc that can handle all this."

Well, I'd take what he said, dream up a process for what he said and then go in and run – he'd run it on the pc. All right. That was very fine. But here was all that was wrong. Usually, by the way, the next day he would come in and say, "Well, that didn't work." How interesting. And I eventually learned to be smart enough and clever enough that – I was taught this in California, by the way; I was taught this the hard way – to say, "Well, what didn't work?"

I'd told him, you know, this or that or the other thing, and then he'd say, "That didn't work." And I would say, "What didn't work?" And he's supposed to have run this, you see, within the last couple of hours. "What didn't work?" Well, he's very often fumble with his papers or try to remember or something of the sort. "Well, come on. What didn't work? What were you supposed to do?" And I finally found out that the extraordinary solution was never applied. It wasn't that didn't work; it was whatever was done didn't work. But there was a wide difference between what was supposed to be done and what was done.

All right. That's not apropos of anything. That's the gross auditing error. The gross auditing error is the extraordinary solution which was thought up at such ardor, of course, never got applied to the pc and so, of course, it didn't work, and that was the gross auditing error. Do you see what I mean by a gross auditing error?
All right. Gross auditing error – another example of one: They didn't have a session. See, that's order of magnitude, see? I don't mean they sat there and didn't do it right. I mean the pc just didn't arrive and the audit – or the auditor didn't report. See, that's the gross auditing error. That's why the process didn't make any advance, why the pc didn't make a recovery. All right. The E-Meter was broken throughout the session and the auditor didn't notice it. Gross auditing error, you see?

And your imagination, when you're called upon to do supervision work of this kind, must never be drawn in – as it would be, actually; it's quite natural for your imagination to be drawn in, wondering what is wrong with this pc; because you yourself are an auditor, don't you see, and you know if you were sitting there, you'd be worried about the pc. So when the – when it's reported to you such-and-so about the pc, you of course do a Q-and-A and you start worrying about the pc.

Well, don't worry about the pc if you're supervising auditing. Worry about the auditor. Just short-circuit it just like that, because today, today we don't have flubs. Five years ago? Yeah. Six, seven years ago? Oh, yeah. Extraordinary solutions required every now and then.

But you mean to tell me that somebody can actually have a Problems Intensive run on him right and not have anything happen of any kind whatsoever? You mean to tell me that somebody can have a Form 3 Joburg run on them from one end to the other and not get any kind of a cognition or a case gain? This, by the way, is just not possible. It just couldn't happen if the Joburg were administered, if the Problems Intensive were done. See?

So, now, look at it this way: Nothing happened to the pc's case by reason of having had a Joburg run from one end to the other and a Problems Intensive. And we get the pc's profile, and it's not gone down into a more normal profile from a very, very high one, or it's not gone up from a low profile to a middle-ground one, or something like this; there hasn't anything happened to this graph, and yet for twenty-five hours, allegedly, somebody was supposed to be giving this person a Problems Intensive, and somebody was supposed to be giving this person maybe a Security Check, you see, along with it, or security checking the areas of prior confusion and nothing happened to this graph.

Ah, well, don't blow your brains out because you haven't got technology that works. No, you've got a gross auditing error of some kind or another. And the gross auditing error is of the order of magnitude that I just gave you. It actually isn't even as mild as, well, the auditor hasn't been security checked and therefore he doesn't have much reality on a Security Check or has withholds and won't dig them out of a pc. You see, these are all rationalizations, and these are all true, but they are not big enough to get in the road of a gain. See, that's what you should realize. These little errors aren't big enough to get in the road of a gain. Honest. You can sit there practically cross-eyed and run some sort of a Form 3 and clean up every question on the thing. And you mean to tell me at the end of this thing your pc is not going to be in good shape? Oh, but you could run a Form 3 this way: broken E-Meter, cans aren't connected, break in the wire, thing sits at 2 all the time, still.

"I know," you say, "well, that's impossible for anybody not to realize that."

Well, that's the trouble with it. It is so incredible that it never gets recognized. What is going on is so incredible that it evades your sense of propriety, your sense of the fitness of
things, your sense of what is right and what is wrong. And it is so violated – that sense – you see, that you never see what is wrong.

You may have a whole HGC – maybe new auditors, something like that – and they're all running Problems Intensives, and they're getting no results. Oh, yeah? Well, how fascinating! Well, then, let's look at the D of P. Does he know how to run a Problems Intensive? Let's look at these auditors. Do – what are they doing? Well, maybe using some version or form or something. There's something wrong here someplace. Or they aren't holding sessions. Or one of them is a yogi, and all of the pcs are sitting there meditating for twenty-five hours. Or there's something real wild here, man.

And amongst these wildnesses is not reading an E-Meter. And that's what I'm talking to you about today. Just reading an E-Meter. That's all. I'm trying to make the point here. Not reading the E-Meter is a gross auditing error. That's all.

Now, you cannot afford a difficulty with an E-Meter while doing a 3D. Ha-ha-ha-ha! Ka-wow! In the first place, you're sitting there chanting over and over and over opposition terminals and opposition goals to a pc who is at best in a rather shaky state. And he just feels like he's being totally overwhelmed. And if you don't read an E-Meter rapidly and you don't assess rapidly, the pc just goes more and more sluggish and gets actually harder and harder to read and it becomes more and more difficult to do an assessment on the opp goal and the opp terminal.

Well, what could start this? Some misconception. It isn't anything esoteric. It is just some misconception about an E-Meter. It's just something that the auditor just had not quite had straightened out, that's all.

He's been – well, I've used this example before. The old-time, self-taught pilot was the most interesting character amongst all this. The old-time, self-taught pilot used to go out and get in an "airplane," and he used to take it off, and he flew by the seat of his pants, and he had no bank-and-turn indicator and no altimeter, and he got accustomed to knowing when he was a thousand feet high because the houses were of such and such a size. But, of course, this has never been borne out by an altimeter. And he gets in a modern plane that's all equipped with instruments, and he looks over the side, and he sees the houses are of such and such a size, so he knows he's a thousand feet high. Well, actually, from the day he first started to fly, there has been no slightest check on this particular point. He knows when he's a thousand feet high. He knows this, you see? And he's supposed to be in a flight pattern, and the flight pattern can't be varied by more than five hundred feet either way or he runs into other airplanes. And right away his estimate of a thousand feet high is put to an instrument test, and it is found to be very incorrect. He's always been flying at two thousand feet when he thought he was at one thousand feet, and I mean it's as simple as that.

Now, because he has learned this way, he gets into the habit of challenging the ammeter – the altimeter. The altimeter says that he's at two thousand feet, so it must have been broken, it couldn't have been set back at the last field, obviously, so he ignores it. See, he still takes the size of the houses. And then one day there's a dull, splintering crash in the sky above the control tower and bits of passengers come fluttering down like snowflakes. You see, he
didn't know he was doing anything wrong, and anything that contradicted his basic training pattern, of course, must have been wrong, so he never did a cross-check.

And we have auditors around who are doing this sort of thing. Now, before you feel bad about it and feel that I am chewing you out in any shape or form about it, let me tell you a funny story.

Once upon a time, in 1951, at 910 North Yale, Wichita, Kansas, an instrument was laid down on my desk. And it was a funny-looking instrument: It was black, and it had a dial, and it had some – it had a kind of a needle on it, and it had a – some knobs on the front of it. And so I looked at it and yawned and said, "Well, that's very interesting," and so on. And there was a message with it. It was from old Volney Mathison, and he said, "When you gave a lecture out in Los Angeles down at South Hoover, you said you would give anything to have an instrument ..." (it was – it must have been in November of 50) "... have an instrument that would tell what the pc was doing." And I had meantime been trying to develop all sorts of observational things, you know? You know, if a pc does this or that. I've even run pcs with my fingers on their pulse, you know? "If I just had such an instrument, or if such an instrument could be developed (because it doesn't exist at this moment; the old galvanometers are too bad), why, I would be a very happy man indeed."

And actually he'd gone home and breadboarded one up, and it had taken him many, many months, and he'd finally hooked together this contraption, and he'd sent it to me and there it was. So I thought that was very, very interesting. And I had it taken home to 910 North Yale, and that night, why, I sat looking at this thing, and we hooked it up and put somebody on it and tried to make the needle wiggle, and so forth, and it didn't work. The needle wouldn't wiggle. And – couple of little tiny metal bars – they were only about a, I don't know, a quarter of an inch in diameter. Somebody was supposed to hang on to these metal bars, and they just were not big enough to even wrap your hands around. So I got to thinking about this, and Elliot got to thinking about this, and so on, and all of a sudden, why, got a brilliant idea and said, "You know, I believe a couple of soup cans, if they could be hooked on to those wires, might give enough surface to read." Because we couldn't get a read. We couldn't even tell if the pc was on it or not on it, you see?

And so Jim went out in the kitchen and he took the labels off a couple of soup cans, and he came back in and he screwed a couple of clips onto the leads, and he put these soup cans on the thing, and then we could squeeze them, and, by George, a pc would read and the thing wouldn't be flickering all over the place, and it was – you could read something was going on. So we knew something was going on, and that was what we knew about it.

A projection meter showed up a short time later, but it was the same breed of cat. Wasn't anything you could do with these things. They were very interesting and something might come out of them.

That's why you occasionally hear electrodes called cans. That is the total reason. Because for the first many years of E-Meter history they were always soup cans. And at the HGC in Washington, DC, people have just been stuffed to the gunwales with V8 vegetable juice, for the excellent reason that the American Can Company will not sell a naked tin can. You have to buy it full of something. So the way they got electrodes there, for the manufac-
ture of E-Meters, was to buy V8 vegetable juice, being the cheapest tinned anything. And, of course, they're perfectly marvelous steel cans, and they cut the tops off very carefully and poured the vegetable juice down anybody, you see, that would stand still, [laughter] rather than throw it away. Everybody was sure healthy in those days. And those were the – those were electrodes.

And so fixed was the idea finally in my mind – because I've seen plenty of them. I've seen tea strainers with a strap around the middle of them that could be held in one hand. That's very nice – a tea strainer, could be held in one hand, separated one from the other. It's a little – looks like a little egg. And a can lead to one side of it, another lead to the other side of it, and that held in the hand. They're actually not very good, but they do work, but not very well. And Mathison's got sold on that and of later years he built nothing but tea-strainer-type electrodes, and he didn't get very good reads either.

But anyhow, that's a workable type of electrode. But I was so used to people changing electrodes and so used to the behavior of an E-Meter when operated on a metal soup can that I couldn't shift. I didn't know what I was reading the second we moved out of that perimeter. See, I'd gotten everything more or less trained into that perimeter, until the British meters coming over to be checked out by me all had these aluminum pipes. And I'd look at them, and I didn't know, and so forth, and I'd take the aluminum pipes off and put vegetable cans on and test the meter. And then I would send the aluminum pipes back with the meter and tell them they better use cans, and so forth.

And one day I asked old Don if he wouldn't run a check between these aluminum pipe pieces and tin cans, and he found out there was no difference between the two. Now, actually there is a difference between the two. The tin can gives you a better surge on a can squeeze. And the aluminum pipe being smaller, when the pc closes his hands to get a drop, more skin is touched to the thing and gives you the appearance of a looser needle than is actually there. Interesting. Whereas a tomato-juice can, it's the metal itself which is collapsing, and you're not getting additional surface by reason of a can squeeze. And they're actually a bit better, even today.

But anyway, to go back to old 910 North Yale, for days and days the thing just sat there. I didn't pay any attention to it. And then Mary Sue and I got busy on the thing, and I started sketching it out, and I'd put her on the thing, and then we'd put somebody else on it, and we'd test things out, and we finally got so we could locate incidents. That was very early in 51. And we got so we could locate incidents pretty well and then started to do actual research. And the first skill of the E-Meter was actually dating That was the first skill of the E-Meter: dating – learning how to date something on the track.

And the second we started dating things on the track, we started to find the most incredible things. To this day I can still find a sixteen-dial drop on almost any pc. Did you ever see a needle drop sixteen consecutive dials? Well, the incidents on the beach, the on-the-beach incidents, and so forth, if you locate them just right and you move into them suddenly, will give you a sixteen-dial drop. Interesting, isn't it? That's the widest drops available. All kinds of electronic incidents. We explored all over the doggone place with this E-Meter.
And I finally got so that I could operate an E-Meter. But I still thought the higher it went, the clearer the person was. Imagine that. During all of 1951 that error progressed, and you will see it to this day on Mathison meters.

The old Mathison meter is now built for chiropractors and has fifteen or twenty dials that operate on the front and back, and you have to have both your own feet bare so as to have spare hands to twist dials. It doesn't give you any gen. Chiropractors just get them to impress the patients. They don't read anything with them. But the meter is now totally impractical – that particular meter. But nevertheless, it's – the germ of the E-Meter was in that chassis.

I had to fool with an E-Meter for about three or four months before I could make one do anything. They were just dead ducks as far as I was concerned. They were just a piece of metal. And I'd put it on a pc and I would much – be much happier to take my judgment of what was wrong with a pc than what the E-Meter said. And the first five months of E-Meter experimentation and use, and so forth, were on – right on that basis. I didn't know what a meter was talking about. I had no reality on the meter. And here's something else: For the next three years, at least, any time you put another E-Meter in my hands I had to learn to use an E-Meter all over again. All you had to do was change meters on me. Well, of course, meters in those days were tremendously variable. There were big differences from meter to meter, don't you see? But it would really just take me weeks of fooling around with the meter until I had any confidence in what it was reading at all because they looked different to me.

Now, that's why I insist on standardization. And that is one of the reasons why I raise so much Cain about squirrel meters, meters built to anybody's specification. Somebody says, "Well, I want one with a very sensitive needle." You see? Well, all right. So you build a E-Meter, and that fellow will learn how to use that E-Meter, but that E-Meter now doesn't react like any other E-Meter, so you can't relay data between him and somebody else, don't you see? And if that E-Meter ever falls into another auditor's hands, the other auditor isn't used to it and doesn't trust it. See, it takes a terrific standardization of meters.

That's why I reserve the rights to check out and pass any E-Meter and why we actually are the people who put them together. Because if we – it's not that we maybe put them together better or worse than anything else, although we have achieved some tremendous gains in these things, but we know they're standard. We know we can take this meter here and issue it to you, and it will behave the same as the last meter of this type you were running, see? And I can pick up any meter out of stock and operate with it and it won't operate any different than any other meter. And it's perfectly all right.

Of course, I've gotten used to it to a point where I can actually run these old-time battery meters. We've got some in the electrical shop in there. You ought to see the things. They were the original London meters. They are the weirdest meters you ever wanted to see. They're a little battery-operated meter with a funny-looking circular dial. They're funny. You wouldn't hardly believe they were an E-Meter. And as far as operation is concerned, their sensitivity is that if you had a bull on one and you hit him with an ax, it'd register.

But anyway, on this basis it would actually take me weeks to learn a new meter. And if anything happened to my E-Meter, I would just groan loudly because I knew now that I
would have another meter around and I just had no confidence in the new meter at all. It was something – I didn't know what it was telling me or why it was telling me that, and so on.

So I have a very vivid subjective reality on what an auditor faces when he starts learning to run with an E-Meter.

Now, for a number of years we went along without E-Meters. Now, one of the reasons why, through the middle fifties, we didn't press E-Meters or do anything much with E-Meters, and so forth, is they had become too complicated. And if you leave anything in the hands of Homo sap very long, he will manage to complicate it. He'll put two dials on it where it only needs one, and he'll put three or four variables on it, and then he'll hook some more pinball machines to it, and the next thing you know, you've filled the room full of junk in order to find the temperature of somebody's tea. You know, you've got all kinds of relays and shunts and printed circuits and electric bars and everything else, and eventually you can tell how hot the fellow's cup of tea is when all you had to do in the first place was ask him to sip it. The order of magnitude which they run into of accuracy and all that sort of thing is too bad.

But, auditors, frankly could not run E-Meters easily or well, and it was enough of a barrier to me that I just called a halt on the thing, and eventually in Washington in the late fifties got a meter designed which I was happy with and which was fairly steady and reliable. We're working on that particular basic meter, which was transportable. Do you know the old meters were mains meters? You plugged them into the mains, and you didn't know whether you were going to electrocute the pc or not.

One of the reasons we stopped using Mathison's is because you could get full mains current between the two electrodes, occasionally, and the cases very often shorted. They were not well made, and you put a pc on them, and he's liable to get a bad shock. But more important than that, even when they were working properly, the current between the two electrodes was some high amperage and the pc could feel it. You know, any pc could feel it.

Now, once in a while you'll get a pc on one of these little battery meters, one of the modern meters, and he'll tell you he can feel the current. Well, he's really being very hypersensitive to electricity. It isn't uncomfortable. He can feel a kind of a tickle of a surge and so on. Well, that means he's just implanted too many people in his day, that's all. That's – it's made him nervous about electricity.

Because I don't know what the true amperage is that goes between the two electrodes in a modern British Mark IV, but it is something very microscopic. I haven't measured it so I won't give you a figure, but it's just so tiny as to be nothing.

Now, we've advanced meters to a point, actually, where the shelf life of the batteries in this meter – the old meters, you see, were mains meters. We tried to make battery meters, and then the batteries would go flat in the middle of the session, and you'd have randomness this way. And we finally got a meter here that the shelf life of the battery – that's how fast will the batteries discharge lying on a shelf – and the operating current of the meter is almost exactly the same. And it – frankly, it doesn't matter whether you leave this meter on or turn this meter off; it uses the same amount of current. Isn't that interesting. Now that – that was quite a development. We're indebted to this Fowler and Allen over here for that.
Now, the British Mark IV, of course, has a high degree of standardization. Some improvements could have been made on the meter, such as improving the sensitivity so that you could turn it off further. But what do you know? If you turn the sensitivity down any further on a meter than is on this British Mark IV, the pc never reads anymore. You've got to have a certain degree of sensitivity in order to get the pc to read. And on a full-dial drop at zero, you'll notice the pc reads, if he's about -- well, he's a -- if a pc is a Release, why, he will read then pretty well. Well, if you could reduce the sensitivity, the first thing that would disappear off of it would be the pc. Get the idea? I mean, it has to be a dial drop on a Release.

As a person becomes closer and closer to Clear, although the needle is swinging wider and wider, the surge that the pc puts into the meter is less and less because he's got less and less charge on the bank. So you have to have that high a setting to get the pc to register. And as a person is run through 3D, you'll notice this particularly. You'll notice that you start getting the thing wider and wider swing, and it starts banging around, but frankly the pc isn't reading very much, and you're down there just trying to read just awful hard, and you've got an awfully wide swinging needle, and the pc isn't reading very much. Actually, that little tiny read would have been quite a charge.

Now, when you start out the pc, there is no excess swing. It is all pc. The pc is plugged into the physical universe with soldered connections, you see? And you say, "Well, do you have a present time problem?" *H-wha-a-am!* You see a half-a-dial drop. "Yes, well, what was the problem?" you say, thinking, you know, the bank has been robbed or he's just been disinherited or something of the sort.

And it's, "Well, my -- I don't know. Well, *ug* -- actually, it was my wife looked at me as I went out the door, and uh, I don't know whether she's mad at me or not."

And you look in vain for any more problem than that. But it's a terrible problem, see?

Well now, that similar thing, "Do you have an ARC break?" and you get this little tiny twitch.

And, "Yes. When you came in and shouted at me that you weren't going to audit me anymore." And it's just a little, tiny twitch. See, the pc isn't heavily charged. These things don't have a violent effect upon the pc, but they still can be read. Do you see what I'm talking about?

As the case advances, actually the amount of charge still on the case is less, so therefore you don't get much read. But therefore you have to have a fairly advanced sensitivity in order to read what charge is left. That's the important point on that.

Well, all these meters these days read the same, and that's a good thing. Actually, the British meter reads remarkably similar to the early American meter. All meters from here on will be British Mark IVs. We're cutting out the original American meter. Why? Well, it just hasn't kept pace with this meter, because I've been, of course, working with development on this meter here for another two years beyond the American meter.

The American meter is more rugged and stands up to more punishment than the first British Mark IVs, but we finally got these things so they don't. Actually, the American meter will do the same as a British meter if you do the same things with it. You realize that a British
Mark IV most of the time has been shipped through stratospheric conditions before it arrives at an other-continent destination. And it busts it up. It – that is to say, it'll burst the batteries. You know, subzero cold and all of this sort of thing. A meter going from here to Australia has been transferred between British climate and many, many, many, many degrees below zero as the jet flies, you see, and has landed into smoking hot India, smoking hot Saigon, you see, and has gone from ice-cold to smoking hot to ice-cold to smoking hot to ice-cold to smoking hot and is then put into your hands in Australia. Well, that's what we've had to do with meters: get them so they'd stand that, because ordinary batteries won't stand it. If you – if you, for instance, leave this meter, or any meter, in the baggage compartment – you put it in your suitcase, in other words – and let the people put it in the baggage compartment of the airplane, get it the other end, every now and then you'll find your meter arrives unworking. Why? Batteries are shot. It's been treated to extremes of cold and heat but that is not anything to do with the meter. That's to do with Homo Sapiens's inability to construct a proper storage battery.

I remember in the old days we used to have some batteries, you know? They were some real batteries. Be a little thing about the size of a button, you know, and a little tiny disc, and you could carry a half a dozen to spare, and one of them would drive a car a hundred thousand miles or run an artillery cannon, you know? That was pretty good. You used to shove these things in – that's why you can get these Buck Rogers flying belts and things like that. It's all contained in the battery.

The ability of the mechanics – the electromechanics of any civilization are totally dependent upon source of supply and its portability. I learned that when I was about seven or eight, nine. I was trying to build Meccano set locomotives that would run themselves around on the floor, only I couldn't get a light enough electric motor, and I couldn't get a light enough set of batteries, so the resultant locomotive, of course, couldn't pull the load of its power supply. You keep running into that all the time. Any civilization is limited in its electromechanics – in its cars, its airplanes and everything else – to the engine or the battery supply. That's the whole works.

Similarly, this one has been limited to that. But that's its main frailty right now, is that if you get it too cold and too hot repetitively, why, its batteries burst. But of course, any batteries burst. Has nothing to do with the E-Meter. You can't get a battery that won't.

But the shelf life of the battery is the same as the running life of the E-Meter. Don't faint, don't faint because you come in, open up your E-Meter case and find out you left it on. Turn it off by all means and centralize your center button, but don't faint, because it didn't burn any more on than off. And the batteries in them last a year, a year and a half or something like that and then you dig them out and put a few sixpence batteries in them, and they work the same. All right.

Regardless of all that, the E-Meter has evolved up to a greater constant. You can take one meter, and it works the same as another meter, and so it's safe to learn to use an E-Meter. They're not going to vary, and nobody is going to shift E-Meters on you.

If we bring out another meter, it will be so confoundedly different than an E-Meter in terms of read that you'll have to learn it all over again anyhow, but for another purpose. It'll be an oscilloscope or something of that sort, although our first little timid ventures into this were
– they sort of left a tremendous amount to be desired. They left me with awe for our present E-Meter. Our present E-Meter is absolutely fabulous.

If you don't believe it, conduct some experiments with an oscilloscope and you find out they're all body read. You can't get the mind to read, but you can sure get the body to read. A person gets within four feet of the electrodes, and the oscilloscope starts dancing. In other words, the presence of the auditor against the meter would be probably a greater influence than the presence of the pc against the electrodes. So if the auditor was worried that day, why, you'd get nothing but bounces and crashes. You see? I mean, there's something. It's a rather marvelous instrument.

I notice now that we have pioneered forward and people are now selling pocket lie detectors and toy lie detectors, and that nearly every large psychological establishment is complete with lie detectors. Don't get them confused with an E-Meter. They haven't got anything as good as an E-Meter, and they don't know how to run them.

Now let me come to this other point, help your pride along a little bit. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of cops, bums, psychologists, tramps, drunks, in the United States that have been trained to use lie detectors, and trained up at the Keeler Institute for a year or two to read lie detectors, and they cannot make any sense out of them at all. So don't feel bad about this.

Now, a lie detector has several different facets that an E-Meter doesn't have. It's an electrogalvanometer, and the original circuit of this is about a hundred years old. It's a Wheatstone bridge. And this is so different than the original Wheatstone-bridge circuit and so different than an electrogalvanometer, there's hardly any – they're hardly cousins. They work on the same principle, but you have to know a lot more. And the original is still in an eighteen-thousand-dollar lie detector. They've still got an original Wheatstone bridge sitting there – not a decent E-Meter, you see?

You'll be fooled, because you go in and it's got a nice chromium-plated face, you know? The dial is all duded up, you know, and nice curlicues on the needle and very modern pastel designs, you know? And you'll say, "That's really something." If you took the back of it off, you'd find it's the same thing as Wheatstone built a hundred years ago. They haven't advanced a hair. Now, that is an electrode proposition, but is sometimes used as a footplate, sometimes used as a handplate, sometimes used as an armplate. And one of the ways they do it is put a plate over here on the side of the table and split it in half and make somebody lay his arm on the plate and strap it down. That's one of the crude effects of it.

What they depend on has absolutely nothing to do with the mental currents in the mind. These boys are so sold on meat! Man, you know, you'd think they'd been in the butcher business for years. They're really stuck on this stuff. And they're so sold on meat that they take all of their reads – that they believe – from respiration and blood pressure. In other words, they read the pc with body motion. Don't think there is any difference. This is what they're using to hang men with. Body motion – that's the respiration and blood pressure.

And they take one of these standard – it's the same one that your medico used on you the last time you had a physical examination. You know how damned uncomfortable that was. They wrap this rubber balloon around your arm and they have a pump over here and they
have a mercury stand, and they pump the thing up, see? They pump it up, you know, and the blood goes *svooo, svooo, svooo, svooo, svooo*. And you feel all – feel like somebody is breaking your arm off, and it breaks a lot of the veins in the arm too, by the way. Yeah, you can see the scars of these things for a week or two after they've been on somebody. And they pump it up, and then there's two little pens, and they go along on a long tape, and they trace every pump of the blood and every *uh-ha-uh-ha*, pant, of the lungs. And they put some kind of a plate across the fellow's che-

When they get this guy in there, you'd think he was being put in a jet plane to go on one of these fictitious Russian trips. Man, he's really wired for sound, you know? And he's got this thing, and this looks like a backpack or something, and so he goes *uh-ha-uh-ha, you know*? And that one little pen goes *uh-ha-uh-ha-uh-ha-uh-ha*. And then he goes pump-pump on the blood, and the other pen goes *zzzz-zz*, and actually this psychogalvanometer, as an afterthought over here, makes another trail on a third pen. And they have these three pens going like this, and the operator can sit there with this polygraph, and then they write down the various questions on the edge of it, and the pens go wiggle-wiggle, and if the fellow was tired that day and was panting more than the other they hang him. The error of those things is fabulous. The machine costs eighteen thousand dollars.

Now, they try to train people on these, and out of these thousands and thousands of people that they've tried to train, let me tell you something: There are only two hundred operators in the United States the police departments trust. Two hundred operators, out of the thousands and thousands and thousands they've tried to train. That's interesting, isn't it? And remember that not one of those two hundred operators knows anything about past lives, restimulation, mental masses, mental image pictures, engrams. He knows nothing about the Tone Scale. He knows absolutely nothing about the Chart of Attitudes. He knows nothing about stimulus-response stimulus. He knows nothing about overt acts. He thinks the mind is a piece of meat, and if the person pants he's guilty.

All right. Now, there's E-Metering as it exists out in the wide, large world these days. So don't you feel too bad if you have a little bit of a struggle trying to learn how to use an E-Meter. Because if you can't read somebody's breathing, you ought to quit.

Understand, these are three little pens, and they make a wild, widely different trace. And every time they say "pocketbook" – they've got some pickpocket on the thing, you see – and they say "pocketbook," and the thing jumps, you see? "Ah well, he's guilty. That's it. That's it. Arrest him! Take him down. Shoot him." Boom. You know? Well, you and I know – "pocketbook," for Christ's sakes. Supposing we had a – supposing we put a Scotchman on the thing? [laughter]

Well, there are two hundred of that kind of experts. So you are actually being asked to go way, way, way, way in advance of any of these characters with a much more modern machine, which doesn't have little pens that go *blingety-bling*, and that doesn't give you a long trace.

Now, some chap in the United States invented for us, as a favor, a sort of a polygraph that would give an E-Meter trace, and it gives you the thing on tracing paper and that sort of
thing. As far as I'm concerned, one wasn't built up that I was – put into my hands so that I can
duplicate. But it was designed.

Now, maybe this would be a good thing that as you were assessing, you could put the
number of the assessment question down against each piece of polygraph and then analyze it
later, and so forth, at your leisure, and that sort of thing. But at the same time, you would find
this so gruesome in terms of speed that you would go mad, because you've got to write a
bunch of things over here on the polygraph and do a reanalysis of the whole thing, and you
wouldn't really know what you were doing at the time you were doing it; you would know
later each time, you see? And you wouldn't come up with your answer at the end run.

Well, the way you – the way you've got to do. of course, is to pick off the information
as it occurs, and you are actually the recording medium and you write it down – the informa-
tion that has occurred – or you act on it. But you do something with the information when it
occurs. This is a present time machine. If you get the information you have to use it now. You
take a – you haven't got time to analyze graphs or something. If you're trying to get rudiments
in and you find a rudiment is out, you want to be able to put that rudiment in now. So you
haven't any time to send it down to the laboratory and then after a while everybody makes it
out in quintuplicate and then takes some Thermofax of it and sends it back, and then the fol-
lowing day you have gotten to the second part of the rudiments, you see? You can go on now
because you have found that the room was all right. Doesn't sound very practical, does it?

Now, as a substitute for that, you've got to be able to catch these reads on the fly.
You've got to catch them when they happen. The read happens, you've got to catch it when it
happens, and if you're not sure of it, you've got to ask for it again.

Now, the gross errors, however, in reading an E-Meter – I hate to tell you this to your
face because you are undergoing them right this minute, but of course, to an old, grizzled E-
Meter operator are, of course, laughable in the extreme. They are utterly ridiculous: like hav-
ing to keep the needle at set before it can be read. Where did this come from? See? An E-
Meter operator has actually got to be able to read a needle when it just is flying all over the
place. Well, that it's flying all over the place doesn't invalidate any information you get off of
it. Your read occurs while it is – while the needle is drifting around. It doesn't matter whether
it's drifting up or drifting down. You ask somebody for something, that needle is going to stop
for a minute or it's going to shift for a moment in its pattern, and it's going to change what it's
doing as a response to your question, and because it changed for a response to the question,
why, then, of course, it's a valid read.

But you will find that if we had it here, why, somebody else can run into it elsewhere.
And you find out that people actually believe that the meter can only be read when it's at set
and dead still. Well now, you cannot crank one of these meters down far enough to make it
dead still and still have it read on the pc. It just can't be done. I'm now – I'm sorry if I'm step-
ning on some toes here.

That's why I've told you. Now look, I've been all over the ground on this. I even be-
lieved at one time that the higher the arm went, the clearer the pc was. And you'll find that
marking is preserved to this day on the old Mathison meters. It shows the Tone Scale is plot-
ted over here and that's why you call it the tone arm. It's a total misnomer, and 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and
6 are plotted against those points – this actually – this numbering is different. This is more reasonable because we've gotten at it. But actually the old Tone Scale numbers that you have on the plus and minus Tone Scale were over here on the tone arm, and if you got over to Tone 40, why, the fellow was totally out the top.

So now I've made mistakes on these meters and I've had a hell of a time reading some meters. And I had a manic-depressive on a meter one time. That needle was shimmying around. Wow, you talk about an unreadable – sensitivity all the way off, and I've never seen a needle like it since, by the way, and it was just in constant hectic motion. It was just swinging about a quarter of the dial constantly, and there was just nothing you could do to shut it down far enough to make it readable. It just was a wild something or other. Why? Well, it was reading all the time. Yeah, but what was it reading? Of course, that was on an old meter; I couldn't vary the sensitivity.

People, you know, often used to go off the bottom of the old meters and off the top of the old meters! This, fortunately, is continuous all the way around. Nobody ever goes off the top or the bottom of the thing, but they sometimes go to 7, and that spot isn't marked on the meter. And because the pot on the tone arm here gets in your road, you can't turn it to 7. But you now and then will front up to this incredible thing that your E-Meter isn't reading, and you – don't be embarrassed if the first time this happens to you, you think your meter is shut off or the cans have busted down or the connections are gone or it's unplugged or something has happened because you can't find the pc on it. Well, the pc lies between 1 and 6, and I call to your attention that on a Mark IV you cannot get the needle to 1 to – between 1 and 6 at the bottom. Actually, he will go from 1 around here to 6.5, 1 to 6.5, 1 to 6.5, 1 – that's to catch the consecutive read. Actually, he's passing through the bottom. It's 1 to 6.5, it's 1 to 6.5. You know, instead of just swinging as you would swing between 3 and 4, you've got to pass around the whole top of the dial in order to get to the other side. You understand? So all of a sudden your E-Meter will shut off and not be reading, and actually the pointer should be down here at 7. So an E-Meter can go to 7.

Little thing like that... All right, if you didn't know something like that, first time it happened to you, why, you'd say, "Oh-oh, there's something wrong with E-Meters. I – I – I – I don't know. I don't trust E-Meters." Well, it's just something you didn't know so you didn't trust it. The meter is unreadable at that time, of course. The needle is doing exactly nothing.

All right. So I've been over all these jumps and I know the various bulls you can make so don't get your – don't be embarrassed. If there's something you don't know about an E-Meter, ask somebody who knows E-Meters, and be satisfied you've got the right answer, because it's the gross auditing error.

How can you get rudiments in if you don't know that a rising needle, stopped, is a read? All you got to do is make it halt just for a split second. You say the guy has a rising needle. Well, of course the needle rises. A rise means nothing. A gradual rise means absolutely nothing. Any kind of a rise means nothing. It just happens, however, that the needle is going over here from right to left. Well, the tone arm would never move if your needle didn't move, so of course the needle is in motion all the time anyhow.
So, up it goes. It's going from over here on the right, up to the extreme left, and somewhere along that line ... It's just doing that, that's all. You ask the pc – you say to the pc, "Well, is it all right to audit in this room?" Well, sure, the only action the needle can possibly have is to twitch. It stops a rise. In other words, it just twitches and goes on rising, of course. Well, that means it damn well isn't all right to audit in this room. That's an out-rudiment.

All right. How about that little twitch? Pretty hard to read, isn't it? You got to be right on the ball there, haven't you? And if you're not on the ball, there you are. Bang! You missed it.

Another thing is it happens instantly, so if you look attentively at the pc and you say, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" and then look at your meter, of course you've missed the read because the read occurred instantly that you said it. The moment the sense got to him, it registered, and it registered that – for that brief instant and was not registering anymore.

Now, a needle swings and moves around, but do you know, we found somebody reading it mostly on body motion, horribly enough. Don't be a psychologist. Don't read an E-Meter on body motion. Well, what's body motion? Well, the only way I can tell you what a body motion is, is to have you do the drill very arduously in E-Meter Essentials. Actually do the drill. Actually get somebody to sit down and go through all kinds of body motions, various classes of body motions. There's respiratory motions; there's fingers off the cans, fingers on the cans; there's this, there's that, and you eventually look at these things and they look entirely different. They haven't any bearing whatsoever on a natural E-Meter read. And as soon as you've seen body motions – you get practice and you know what body motions are – you'll never mistake again a body motion.

But I've seen a very old-time auditor sold with a body motion. I've seen an old-time auditor take a totally incorrect and improper assessment on the basis of a pc selling it. And the pc was lifting her little finger on the back of the can because she wanted that one. And every time that one came by, the pc would lift her finger on the back of the can and put it back on again. And it gave a little, tiny, funny-looking theta bop. And the old-time auditor said to me, "It is a very peculiar-looking motion to the needle, but that's what it is." Oh, and a very short time later realized that the assessment must be all wrong because it was all going haywire, and went back and checked, and the pc just lied like a soldier but finally admitted this; and the auditor got the pc to do it, and they reproduced the motion on the needle and that was what the auditor had been assessing by. It was just a total sell all the way along the line. Very interesting, isn't it?

Well, it's very interesting that a pc will throw a session to this degree. Even an experienced Scientologist being audited can throw a session. Say, "Well, I know what it is. I was up till all hours last night and I was worried about this thing, and I know what it is: It's a soldier. The devil with this monkeying around. It's a soldier, that's all."

And the auditor the next day says, "A soldier," and does something like twitch his shoulder slightly, and it gives a read, of course, on the meter. All the pc has done is practically commit suicide. I mean, it's just as interesting as that. If he wants to really pick up his case and throw it in the sewer – just throw it – try to sell the auditor an improper item, because these items are what they are. But auditors will do it when they're being audited. Even
when they know it, they will still do it. So that doesn't mean just because you're auditing some "old Scientologist," you know, who's been in the business for a long time, that your assessment is always reliable. Oh, no. The older they are, the wiser I get. [laughter] Now I am alert, because this fellow knows how to throw one. He's an expert.

You get a fellow sitting there, and he's trying to cooperate and he helps you out one way or the other – well, if you don't know these various characteristics, you can read them wrong, that's all.

Now, there's nothing very esoteric about it. As a matter of fact, there's a wide, wide difference here. There's a wide difference between a body read and a mental read. They are so recognizably themselves that it's something that, well, it – a fellow feels when he's trying to explain it – as you will someday, even if you don't feel secure about it now – someday you'll say, "Well, how could anybody tell the difference – fail to tell the difference between a theta bop and somebody belching? That would really take some doing." Well, of course, a belch, you're liable to get a rise, and you're liable to get a fall. You're liable to get the proper body motion – the fall and then the rise usually – and it's to a certain distance. But you certainly would never mistake it for a theta bop. You – it'd look like a belch to you, see?

And when you get that, that type of certainty, where the pc could be sixty or seventy feet away from you in an entirely different room and you couldn't see anything that the pc was doing, you could call your shots on the meter – I mean, what was a read and what wasn't – why, you'd be a very good E-Meterer. And I'll let you in on something: I don't think I could do it. I don't think I could be certain every single time that the pc had all of a sudden shifted his finger. I don't think every time, because one of them might be done perfectly, you see? It might be a total fool. It might be the exact read. But to get it exactly very often, no. So you've got to double-check: When you don't know what it is, you ask again.

And you've got the instant read, and a person can never sell you, if you know instant read and can recognize instant read for what it is, because it takes him a moment to hear you and act, but it takes the reactive bank no time at all to act. So the instant read on an actual is very rapid, and the instant read on a sell is not an instant read at all; it's always latent. You're now talking between a tenth of a second, you see, and three quarters of a second, and the auditor recognizing the difference between a tenth of a second and three quarters of a second, that's pretty sharp, isn't it? That's pretty close together. All right. But, nevertheless, you can tell.

Now, if somebody is going to throw an item, here's what you do. You say, "All right, category," they're falling on this word category, you see, and you have to say, "category," and then they go "Dzoooh! That certainly turns an awful somatic on in my head." That's a standard selling tactic, by the way. Pc is doing it consciously or unconsciously – I don't care which; it's still a sell. The pc knows they're doing it, really. Maybe they do get a somatic in their head. So what? Maybe it's on some other goal chain, too, so they'd really get in the soup if you bought it.

But anyway, you say, "category." Well now, the person has to hear "category" himself and put "category" into action, and react, in order to react with a sell on "category." In order to sell you "category," there's always going to be a late reaction. It's not very late, but it's just
a little bit. Now, the reactive mind doesn't have that much lag in it because time is nowhere in the reactive mind, which is what makes it the reactive mind. So you say, "category," and the reactive mind goes – well, you hardly got the "-y" out, you see – "categor-y" – and you've hardly got the "-y" out when your E-Meter has reacted. In other words, it's a much more rapid reaction than a sell. But actually visual inspection: Well, it's a – you could be sleepy someday and not see the difference between them and all of a sudden say, "Well, we finally found out what he's got here. He's a 'category.'" All right. That's fine. You go on and use that in the next assessment. And the next assessment doesn't pan out, and suddenly nothing pans out anywhere, and "Hohh! What's wrong here?" Well, what's wrong here is we didn't read the E-Meter. Something happened in there.

But now the gross auditing error on the E-Meter is not being able to read an E-Meter at all, of course. Somebody walks in off the street into a co-audit, we put an E-Meter in his hand – we don't even let him go through Comm Course – we put an E-Meter in his hands, and you say, "All right, find basic-basic on the Mama chain on this case." He doesn't even know what you mean, you see?

Do you know the fellow will actually sit there studiously – this is what fools you, you know – and he will figure with dials, and he'll look at it, and he'll think that's all very interesting, and he will look at it very studiously. And he'll spend a lot of time looking at it.

Now, if a stranger came along that didn't know much about E-Meters either and looked at him sitting there with the needle, he would immediately think of him as an expert. Isn't that right?

You'll make this error yourself someday. Don't feel chagrined when you do. You will have somebody sitting there who has been through an HPA Course way back when, and they apparently know how to read an E-Meter, and they're sitting there studiously, and they look at the E-Meter, and they look at the pc alertly and they ask questions, and they look back at the E-Meter, and they look just like they're running a case. It's the darnedest mock-up you ever saw in your life, and you can be fooled by it, man.

You have to go back and stand back of the fellow, and all of a sudden you see a little theta bop, see, you see this little theta bop and you say, "What's that?"

The fellow says, "What?"

And you say, "Well, that – what the needle is doing there."

"Well, it will quiet down in a moment, and then we'll get some other data." And find out that the person is reading nothing but body reactions – throws away all reads and reads body reactions. So actually the pc had to move his head or cough or do something in order to get an E-Meter read. Now, that's a gross auditing error! You get what I mean?

But you – don't be too dismayed when you find this. Just be busy and do something about it, that's all. That's the remedy. Just do something about it. Be effective. Make sure. Don't ever take chances on whether or not the auditor can run an E-Meter. Always find out whether or not he can.
I, frankly, for years have been in apathy on the subject. That's why you don't see more industry in all directions, you know? And why I'm not always in there, "Now, you make sure you run that E-Meter right!" – you know, in a calm frame of mind about it. I sort of hope that you'll pick it up right, because it's difficult to read an E-Meter. That's right. It's difficult. It takes a lot of time.

A person should sit down for hours and hours in monkeying around with a case and find out what the meter does and find out what the case does and get used to the thing, get familiar with the whole thing, and then finally find that when he says something that the pc does have, then the pc did get a tick, and he asks and the pc does have that item out. You know? Victory! And chase it along the line and get used to consulting the meter and feeling certain of what he reads, and knows that what he reads is there, and he eventually fades in and he becomes a very easy operator. And all of a sudden – the magnificence of it is that processes, they go easily; he does assessments, and it takes him a few minutes to find this item and a few minutes to find that item, you know?

Well now, from gross auditing error, we get the arduously-worked-with E-Meter: that if we sit on the edge of our chairs and keep our eyes dilated to the proper dilation and watch all the time like a hawk and never take our eyes off the meter really – you know, it's something like there's a snake lying just in back of it or something – take our eyes right off – never really right off the meter, but always kind of ask the pc questions with our eyes glued on the meter, why, we won't miss. You know, that's a sort of a uh-ha-uh-ha, you know? That kind of an attitude. All right. That attitude is more desirable than the faked attitude, see?

All right. Now let's go a little bit further on the thing, and the fellow who consults the meter when he wants to know something, but consults it with – I've been running a half-flattened goal on somebody recently, and boy, that thing is gone; the person is almost cleared on it, see? And, man, you talk about something that is microscopic! I've been wondering whether or not we shouldn't get some magnifying glasses for these E-Meters.

They have an old radar, an old marine radar – Marconi makes them – and they're a nine-inch magnifying glass that they put on a radarscope. And you put it over the top of a dial, in other words, and it makes the thing get huge. Magnified read. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if you didn't see something like that come up suddenly. If I can get a light one that develops easily and that hangs over the top from the box onto the – over the needle area, it might help us out, because, man, I've been getting myopia.

You know? I mean, I've been reading this meter. Did it fall? Didn't it fall? Did it fall? It's just – I'll get – I have to actually set the thing into the set area in order to read it – you'd laugh to see me trying to work on the thing – and measure its motion against those little "set" dashes. You know? And squint down and look at the thing and wonder if it got any closer to the dash or if it didn't. Boy! You talk about hard to read! This thing is weird. This goal terminal 3D assessment was done after the goal was half gone, and it's all panned out, and it's just washing out. I mean, there isn't anything left there, but I've still got to have some more items. And I tell you, I've been panting

That's why you found me – you found (I know you never expected to find it) – that's why you've found occasionally a sympathetic note struck in my auditing messages, and so
forth. Because I actually feel for you trying to – trying to sort some of these things out. And if you yourself are still quesy about how you run an E-Meter or you don't have any very vast certainty on what you're doing, and then you suddenly have to confront one of these microscopic situations of, "Well, we've got to find one more level on the Prehav Scale and somewhere on the Prehav Scale there is a level here someplace. And if we look close enough to the E-Meter we may be able to spot that there is a level here someplace" – aaaaargh! Or trying to assess out on somebody who – well, his opposition goals list went totally null. And trying to get just one of them to kick, "Just once, please! Just once. Just one of them, please. Just one. Haaaah! Well, we can take that one and get on with the 3D." It's fantastic, you know?

Well now, that's very extraordinary meter reading. You should look on it as such. It is extraordinary meter reading. It's not ordinary at all. So you might have been good enough to do a Sec Check and you'll all of a sudden find yourself being called upon to do a 3D assessment on a half-gone goal or something like that, and you find yourself in another category entirely. You find out that there was a – not just a high school of E-Metering, but that there was a college postgraduate course on the subject, too. Well, I didn't even know that's expected. That has to do with having microscopic, magnifying-glass eyes and a few things of this particular character. Now, they're hard to read.

Now, as we look into our ability to read a meter, however, the basic trouble that you run into with a meter is not, however, of that magnitude. If a fellow is smart enough to read a meter when it's doing that kind of thing, he certainly isn't doing all of these other things.

Now, one of the things is sometimes an auditor who is green on an E-Meter – when the needle is drifting around – the auditor has an awful time trying to differentiate. And you've got a sensitivity 16 setting, and the advance from left to right, and so forth, of that arm has to be considerable in order to keep the needle even on the dial.

In other words, you have to keep moving the tone arm just to keep the needle on the dial and readable. And it's moving to the right and left very rapidly. The natural motion of the machine and the pc, and so forth, are all quite rapid, so that you're getting some kind of an action here where your needle is – wouldn't be doing anything quite as bad as that, but it's rises of that sort – that's a sensitivity 16 on a lot of cases – and you've got to pick out of that thing somewhere a read. And you find that it's impossible to do so.

Well, obviously, it's more beneficial to the pc to drag it down to a one-dial drop for your rudiments. It's more probable that you'll be able to read one if you can't read a flying needle. If you can't read a flying needle, obviously it's better to read any kind of a needle, if you'll make less mistakes, right? So you can back your sensitivity down to a one-dial drop for your rudiments, if you can't read a flying needle, or if the needle is flying around too much. Obviously, the thing to do is to get the job done. That's first and foremost.

Now, don't lay aside the E-Meter in trying to get the job done because I can tell you frankly that for the last couple of years it has not been possible to do an auditing job without an E-Meter. It just can't be done. You can do kinds of patch-ups and you can do various things, but to really get somewhere with a case you just can't do it. It takes an E-Meter. All right.
Now, the question is, how do you read the E-Meter? Well, you better learn everything there is to know about learning how to read E-Meters. And E-Meters can be read. They can actually be read. You can catch them as they fly by on sensitivity 16, but if you're not up to that yet, you'd better be reading them at a sensitivity where you still can read them. You understand? And you'd be amazed, because a rudiment that is really out far enough to cause you any difficulty in an assessment will, of course, read on a one-third-of-a-dial drop. If your auditing is anything at all like auditing, you should be able to pick up the rudiment on a third-of-a-dial drop, that is out. You should be able to. You should be able to, if it's going to interfere. Well, that leaves these little tag ends and twitches, and so forth, that you pick up at sensitivity 16 just sort of really smoothing it out, you see? That's the non plus ultra.

But let me tell you something: that if you take too much time to smooth it out, you are laying in more out-of-sessionness than you are getting in. Do you see that? By all of this persnicketiness, you can drive the pc further out of session than the out-rudiment would have driven the pc. By being too slow and too ineffective in handling the meter, and too persnickety about exactly how you're setting up the session, the pc – if you're wasting time at it and so forth – well, you say, "Well, do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "Well, yes, I have a present time problem, and it's so-and-so."

And you say, "Well, how do you feel about that now?"

And the pc says, "All right."

And you say, "Well," again, "do you have a present time problem?" and you don't get any reaction on the needle at a dial drop.

Let's put this now that you had it at a 16, sensitivity 16 drop, and you said, "How did you feel about that now?" and there was a possibility that that needle vibrated slightly. So you say to him again, "How do you feel about that present time problem now?" and in doing so, of course, you lay in an invalidation and an ARC break to some faint degree, and you get a tick. And now you try to clear this tick. Well, you put it there. You see that?

So if an auditor isn't pretty smooth at getting the pc over these little bumps, it's actually safer to get him to get it in at a dial drop. Because he'll start reading his own ARC breaks. Even the faintest flick of annoyance on the pc will read at a sensitivity 16. You know, you would just ask – you've asked the question three times. You asked the question once, and you couldn't get the answer because the needle was flying by too fast at that moment, so just to be sure for your own sake you ask it again. You say, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" Well, look, the guy just answered you – no, he didn't have – and you've asked him again now. All right. That's allowable, see? You get away with that and you say, "Well, that's fine. Thank you very much," and you go on. But let's say you missed it the second time, and then he said again, "No," and your fight is between you and the E-Meter, not between you and the pc. See, the E-Meter is not a tool; the E-Meter is getting all the attention in this session.

Remember what I told you: You could get away with anything in an auditing session as long as the pc was absolutely sure that your attention was on his case. And if he begins to believe that your attention is much more involved with the E-Meter and much more interested in the E-Meter, and that you are much more fascinated with what the E-Meter is doing than
what he's doing, he's going to ARC break on you, and you're never going to get the meter clean. You see? So there's a point of tolerance in here.

Now, therefore meter reading cannot be separated from smooth auditing. You've got to be able to do a smooth auditing job to do a good meter-reading job. But when we get down to gross auditing errors: The auditor is auditing; he doesn't know how an E-Meter operates. He doesn't know if an E-Meter – that's worse – he doesn't know if an E-Meter operates. He doesn't know what the E-Meter is supposed to be doing, and he can't quite possibly be sure if he does say. So to check himself and his knowledge of the E-Meter, he is always asking the E-Meter again, and he seems to be very nervous on the subject of the E-Meter. You've violated in-sessionness on the pc.

So it goes from gross auditing error, such as can't read it at all – doesn't really know what it's supposed to be doing and saying. We pass from that into a sufficient fumble that we manage to knock all the rudiments out faster than we get them in, you see? And then we pass over into acceptable E-Metering.

And so we start a session. We set up the E-Meter. We're very comfortable about the whole thing. We ask the pc, "Do you have a present time problem?" We don't get a fall. We say, "That was – that's fine. Good." And we go on to the next, and we go on into the session. We start an assessment, and we know where this thing is going to fall and how it's going to fall and what it's going to do, so it doesn't bother us; and we're reading this, and the pc – this is not getting in the road of the session. We're – feel comfortable enough with this E-Meter that we're not getting in the pc's road, and the pc, of course, will just roll these things out just one right after the other. You pick these things up, straighten them all up, just nothing to it.

Now, that's the bridge I'm trying to get some of you across. We're knocking the gross auditing errors out. But the other thing about it is, now we've still got to get the confidence and the roughness – the feeling of roughness – out of the session just because there's an E-Meter sitting there. You know, I mean, all this stuff.

You'd be surprised how difficult it has been for me to do this half-gone goal on the basis of actually not being able to read the darn E-Meter because it's flicking so little. So I've already come up against that problem: trying to read the E-Meter as it flew by on a twitch that might have been there but wasn't, but maybe it was; and then not asking again more often than is absolutely necessary in order to keep the pc in-session, who isn't very interested in it anyway. And it gets up to quite a test of E-Metering. So there's various degrees of E-Metering.

Now, when you leave here, I want you to know everything there is to know about this – the handling and operation and behavior of this machine, and I don't want you to be making any goofball mistakes with the thing. Why? Because you'll pass them along. See? There's only a few ways to read an E-Meter that are right. There are only a few reactions that are right. There are only a few things to do that are right.

The main thing I want you to do is get rid of your additives. You know? Like you always have thought that an E-Meter actually should be set – if the E-Meter was not reading on the Clear reading of the pc at the beginning and end of session, the rudiments were out or
something. I get hints of that every once in a while on an auditor's report: "The tone arm was very high." All right. So the tone arm was high. So what? This is news?

I got this on an auditor's report just last night. Don't anybody who wrote this feel chagrined, but – because it's not very much. But it was this: "I seem to get the tone arm down lower in finding the last two items and in checking the last two items of 3D than I did in getting off some withholds off the pc." Well, look! 3D is, this is something like saying, "The power plant over there that has a hundred-thousand-horsepower diesel engines in it develops much more horsepower than Johnny's little steam engine." Well, of course! You know? But of course. But the auditor was apparently amazed about this, you see? There was some amazement about this, that, you know? He'd gotten so used to getting the tone arm down by getting off some withholds that he thought this would always happen, and that withholds – you get the withholds off, that was the best way to get the tone arm down.

Now, you start telling some people, "Well, the best way to get the tone arm down is get some withholds off." Oh, no. There's a better way of getting the tone arm down, and up, too: 3D. That's infinitely better than getting withholds off. But, of course, getting withholds off is infinitely better than anything we had before that. Well, we've got orders of magnitude here which are not comparable.

I can just see somebody sitting over in Canada someplace at the present moment on a private-practice thing just absolutely sure they weren't doing well with the pc because at the end of the session every time the tone arm did not come down to the pc's Clear read and just worrying themselves sick about it, and just nagging the pc, "Well, you must have another withhold," you know? They got the pc sitting in the middle of the battle of Acre, you know? "You must have another withhold about your wife," you know? "Are you sure there isn't?" Just must have. Why? Because the tone arm is up. You get what I mean by additives?

Now, you know, it's very hard to imagine these additives – for me to imagine them – because it looks so simple. But I know that I myself, in years gone by, have been guilty of additives about an E-Meter, such as the higher the tone arm gets, the clearer the pc is. That's an interesting assumption to make, isn't it?

Well, it's an easy assumption to make because you get – some pcs feel better with a high arm than a low arm. Did you know that? They get that arm up there, and they're in the midst of all of that black, "gooey" asphalt mass, and they just feel fine and – sort of an anesthesia, you know? They're three-quarters unconscious. And you get the tone arm down, and then they move and they can breathe, and it hurts and they don't like it. And you listen to a few of these pcs, you will eventually make that conclusion. Well, it's better to have a high tone arm than a low tone arm. All depends on the level of case that you're busy auditing.

Well, I don't mean to labor the point. I don't think the point can be labored, however. If you're having a hard time with assessment, don't kick yourself in the head. Find out what you don't know about an E-Meter, that's all. Don't put on any brassy front about it, because I've already told you it took me years. All right. Well, it shouldn't take you quite so long, but remember that you have to be satisfied that the E-Meter is operating and that it is reading and that there is something there when it reads. And when you're satisfied with this, of course,
then from that point your certainty goes up, up, up, higher and higher and higher, easier and easier and easier to do, and finally the E-Meter is not a very important part of the session. It's a vital part of the session but not an important part of the session. It's not something you spend a lot of time worrying about or being upset about.

When you've got that kind of thing out of the road and you're no longer worrying about what you're doing, you're not self-conscious, you're not pressuring against the E-Meter about everything you're doing and it's not nervous and all that; you know, you'll be absolutely fascinated at your ability to hold a pc into session with anything. Just be fascinated. Why? Because you can put some time on putting the pc into session. You know the rest of the tools. You see that? So the more attention you actually have free to put the pc into session, why, the more the pc is going into session.

I have been able, while doing all this microscopic stuff, to carry on a rather chatty-type process with this pc, by the way. This pc was tremendously amused at some of the things she was running across. Tremendously amused. Sections of track she'd never heard of before, you know – on a goals terminal – goal-plus-modifier terminal run. And the whole area had been covered before arduously by a 3, a Routine 3 run. But there were areas of the track which were now being disclosed she'd never dreamed of because now she was closer in to them. And she was discussing these things, she was being very happy about these things, and she was saying how nice these were and how amusing that was and laughing about it all. I've been holding the pc in-session, and keeping the pc from comming themselves out so they didn't answer the question, you know – just, you know, talking themselves down too much – still staying very interested, everything going along fine, and at the same time reading this cotton-picking needle. Impossible, you know? Was the thing moving? And watching this tone arm like a hawk, because it – at any time that thing might go up there and start parking, and I didn't want it to park too hard and erase what little motion there was left in the needle. [laughs]

But that comes of experience. I hold a pc in-session, of course, because I'm actually not too worried about this. Of course, the E-Meter is an old friend. I've done more doggone research with an E-Meter and found out more things about an E-Meter. The first thing I had to find out about an E-Meter, however, was did it work? Did it actually register something in the pc? And when it was talking, what was it saying? And how was it saying it? And after I got into communication like that, well, it only took me for – a few years. And admittedly, you're smarter than I am so it only should take you a few weeks. Okay?

But please when you leave here, make sure that you're very expert at this – in your own minds. Be satisfied in your own minds. For instance, if you've had some assessment flubs – if you've had some assessment flubs – don't take it for granted that it was difficult to do the assessment. Don't blame it on the pc. Just start wondering, "Am I doing something odd here? Am I doing something odd with the business of assessment? Am I reading a meter in some peculiar way?" It's just like the old airline pilot. He looked over the side and he always knew when he was a thousand feet high – except he was always two thousand feet high. And it's just that kind of an honest error. And so, make inquiries. That's why you've got Instructors. If they can't answer it, ask me. I can.
I don't think there's anything an E-Meter will do these days that I can't predict one way or the other. And I know very definitely that an E-Meter has a limited usefulness because it only goes to Clear. All right? So there's a whole new frontier got to be developed beyond that point. And that's a wild frontier. But you're having to cope with a meter which isn't reading much toward the end of the run anyhow.

And right now, with a half-run goal, trying to assess it, trying to get Prehav levels for it, all that sort of thing – ha! I feel sympathy for you, because I'm doing it myself. But remember, I'm winning doing it. So, so can you. All right.

But get certain about meters. And if you're ever, ever around supervising other auditors, just because they're sitting there looking intelligent, and you're not getting any kind of results from standard things, what's the first thing you ought to suspect? That all of that sitting there looking intelligent at the E-Meter had nothing to do with handling E-Meters. That there is something wrong with E-Metering, and that's the point I wanted to make in this lecture, and I hope you'll profit by it.

Thank you.
Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale

A lecture given on 23 November 1961

Okay, well now here we go, and this is the 23rd of November, 1961. And you are well on the way; you have been once more rescued by the Marines.

You have a new scale: the Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale.

First and foremost let me make it very, very adequately plain to all those present and accounted for, that: A scale like this does you absolutely no good if you can't read an E-Meter, or if you can't detect a pc selling on the E-Meter, or if you keep asking somebody during an assessment which implant he is now in or [laughs] – or, or, or! You understand?

Now, given a perfect, exact, completely checked-out 3D – in items one to five – everything's perfect now you see. Given that, this applies. But not given that, this is of no use to you whatsoever. This is of no use to you and it's no use to Scientology. It begins where a 3D Form finishes at Step Five.

I received a nasty letter from – the other day from a fellow in California. This is not unusual. [laughter] North Pole, South Pole – it doesn't matter where – South America, Australia, even in the middle of the Boola-boola-boola-boola-boola tribes of South Africa – I get nice letters, saying, "Thank you Ron, everything is going along fine. The data is working." But California, no. No, they have trouble in California. Everybody here from California is arriving at this moment. And what error did I finally find out – much to my chagrin, after I'd shot this fellow off the target rack and he's lying in bits of pipe clay right now all over the floor – I find out that one of the better known California auditors has been auditing him on Routine 3. This fellow is not trained to run Routine 3.

I don't care how long he's been auditing, I've never seen any results. He couldn't, he couldn't do a Routine 3. And frankly what he probably did was run some – he's by the way one of the Central Organization's wildest and greatest opponents out there. He is – he is the burning torch for doing things wrong. [laughs] And what he's doing running Routine 3, I just wouldn't know.

But of course, this letter from this other fellow, I found out belatedly, was in the middle of some kind of a (quote) intensive (unquote), on Routine 3 by an auditor that wouldn't know what he was doing. Of course, the fellow blew up. Naturally he's mad at everybody. Naturally he's very upset. Naturally he doesn't know whether he is coming or going or on a trip to Mars, or in one of these fictitious Russian space shots. He doesn't know where he is at or why. Because he's being audited by somebody who doesn't know what he is doing, and has not been trained to do that.
And therefore, you can here and there and everywhere expect trouble in large quantities – expect trouble, and more trouble, and more trouble – where auditors are sec checking who do not know how to run a meter; auditors are doing Routine 3 where they don't know how to run a meter and you think that's trouble. Well, now there's plenty of randomness connected with that fact. There's plenty of randomness.

I don't have to burn the midnight oil by the way – even the late English sunrise is furnishing me enough light to keep ahead of you. I'm knocking off these days at seven o'clock in the morning, and so forth. Pretty wild! I can stand it if you can.

Anyhow, the point I'm making here is that with Routines 1, 2 and 3 – Routines 1A less so... Almost anybody apparently can run a Routine 1A. I don't know how they do it, but they do it. They just sit down and they just run that one command and it's fine. Actually Routine 1A probably still ought to have a place in our activities, because apparently nobody's gotten into very much trouble with it, except they've failed to flatten it maybe here or there. That's the only trouble you could get into it.

But besides the point, they've gotten into trouble with Routines 1, 2 and 3, and they've managed to make engram running and other things not work at various times. What do you think is going to happen with Routine 3D? Now, just let me ask you that burning question, ladies and gentlemen: What is going to happen when they collide with Routine 3D? What is happen – going to happen with this character out on the coast – who is the Central Organization's most inveterate foe, who is the pc's most inveterate poison and so forth, anyhow – when he finally gets a copy of it and to make a couple of quick kabutniks, he runs somebody on Routine 3D and never gets any part of it checked out and didn't know how to read the E-Meter in the first place, and ... ?

His favorite idea, by the way, is, "Well, let's see, all right. Now, we're going to do an assessment on you. What is your goal? All right, that's fine. What is your goal? Okay, that's fine. Now, let's list some of these goals. Hey, you know, that's a good one. That's an interesting goal. I've been wanting to do that myself for years. All right, well that's your goal. Okay." [laughter]

Now I'm not joking; I'm not joking. Right here I've probably laid in an ARC break today, by just cutting one person off who was doing a 3D items on up the line, just cutting them off, until I can get time to check this personally. Because it is that vital – it is just that vital – that you don't run anything wrong on a 3D. It is absolutely vital.

Now, I tell you from the depths of my dark, deep bin of little known facts, that this one should be pretty well known. You won't get anywhere on some cases and a case will be upset, and well, it'll just go on and on forever. And it isn't too violent, nothing drastic will happen, except maybe nothing will happen and somebody will be rather upset. That is all you can say about it.

But look at what is at stake. Do you realize that with a completed 3D – and you will realize this shortly, and I of course am, after being committed to the action and there is no withdrawing from it, of course, you can imagine that my fingernails have gotten terribly short here in the last few days, watching you and what you were doing with this. They've practically gone down to Chinese fingernails.
The point I'm making is: that with that care, with a careful assessment, knowing how to do your meter, handling your pc straight, getting him right up to the point with each item absolutely accurate; and then launching into the Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale for assessment; that person with high probability, is within just sauntering distance toward Clear, see? There's only one route. It is one tightrope walk. And you get up to this – the running of it, the actual running of it – and he's practically there.

Because the running of this is nothing compared to the assessing of it. You don't even have to do tricky command forms. I mean the command forms are all laid down almost verbatim in advance. You can change from a "Why" to a "What" to a "How," occasionally, to vary the monotony, but it's the same bracket, the same bracket, the same bracket, the same bracket.

And these things assessed properly and those levels run properly, and he's going to come out the other end. But your eyes are going to be a bit round while he's doing so.

I can now tell you, after experimentation on the line, that there is nothing will fish him out of it if it is wrong I have been testing it all. I have been going back over everything I could go back over. And there's only one thing that brings him through and that is: Pre-Have assessment runs on the exact terminal. Nothing else disturbs the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, this is utterly fantastic. I mean, how come I suddenly dreamed up this particular type of weapon? It is the only weapon that works. Nothing else works. You can go back over the years and – and as I have been doing – and taking this item and that item and the other item and trying to combine it up against terminals and trying to get a terminal to run, and trying to do something else with the terminal, besides this activity. Nothing else works.

And this is mostly assessment. It's minimal running and maximal assessing. And now that I have added this many levels – huh-huh-huh-huh! Shudder! Look at all that assessment. Look at that much assessment for a level. Just look it over.

Now true, I've put it into a form where it's relatively easy to assess and will put it into an easier assessed form than this, even this. It'll have the same items on it but they may be slightly rearranged so as to make easy assessment. That however, is experimental and you now have the levels.

So it's more assessment than it is running. You – I say that advisedly, you – because on some brackets you may not be able to get one bracket. You may stick the arm with one bracket with a new level. And then you go back and the new level is flat. That's all there is to it. It's flat. That's it. It's fantastic.

Because, of course, you're right into the middle of the problem. You're not running an engram; you're running a mass. And we're running something new, and I think you could find it on the books of about 1954, that you shouldn't tackle these black masses. We had Admiration Processing way back. I guess that was 53 wasn't it, early 53. And we ran Admiration Processing and I said, "Well, you just better leave those black lines closed."

You can open them with admiration and you can't do anything about them, and nothing works on them. But this chug-chug-chugs right through them. This eats them up, which is quite interesting. All of this is on the basis – just telling you – that given a perfect assessment and then given proper assessment on this auxiliary scale, and then assessment – and then the
running of the level assessed and flattening it and running it properly, and then finding the next level, and running that properly, and so on – if you were very, very rapid, on some cases you're going to discover that you could get in as many as five levels run per session, on some cases. That's quite amazing. Now, not all of them will go like that. You'll be doing probably more like two levels a session or something of that sort. Maybe one level will run a session or two. That is the expectancy of auditing. But there isn't anything else that's going to get them out of it. This is the only thing that pushes them through it. And that is hair-raising, you know? That's like walking across the top of the Empire State Building on a tightrope strung above it, you know, with no umbrella and no parachute, in a high wind. It's kind of hair-raising.

And you think I'm going to sit by quietly while somebody out in the lower marshlands – you know, where that – all that oil is down there, is in San Pedro, where it's all mucky, you know, around San Pedro there – I think that's probably where this person comes from. Anyway, they were spawned there, spawned there, and – I'm not going to sit by quietly while these guys muck this up.

these things all add up to, of course, not getting it done – so you just wash those out and skip 'em. You see the forthright look that it takes.

Because I can tell you, what I have done in the development of this material is impossible. It could never have been done. It's impossible. The last fifty thousand years it's never been done, so why should it ever be done? All right, that's impossible. All I'm asking you to do is do the impossibility of "do it." That's simple, isn't it?

That's a good bargain, isn't it? I couldn't possibly have done it, you can't possibly audit it: I did it, you do it! That a good bargain? It's rather adventurously stratospheric in its viewpoint, but actually that's what it takes.

And you see in a little needle here wandering around... I'm satisfied that we can't build a better meter. I'd be happy to build you a better meter. Years ago I used to tell Mathison... The reason Mathison and I came to a parting of the ways is: every time I'd tell Mathison to take something off of his ruddy meter, he'd put something on it. And it finally got so doodledaddled up, you know, that I couldn't find where to plug it into the mains. And after I'd practically executed a pc or two – there were some people around I happily would have handed a pair of electrodes to; [laughter, laughs] actually contemplated a time or two; ran it out in auditing one day – overt on the meter! Why, he was just getting so complicated.

What I really wanted was something that would flash a light when you had a read. It would just flash a light when you had a read, and you had to interpret no more than a light. Or: two lights, which was a red-green light, something like this, and you got a red-green or you got a green-green or you got a count system of some kind or another. Possibly something like that could be made. The point is, it never has been made and every time I've tried to improve this particular existing meter, I have run into the thing that the mind, after all, doesn't register very much on the meter. It doesn't register very much. And when you start to amplify its registration, you run into the registration of body motion. And you amplify the registration of body motion and the mental motion becomes unreadable.

That's what I've continually run into in this. Now, I could of course, have – could taken some time off and built a much better meter, instead of doing a lot of other things, maybe, but I've been at this – making sure this meter stayed in good shape now – for about ten years, and it's the best we can do. Every time I branch off into some other field to give you a better meter, why, some limiting factor of some kind or another defeats it, and I come back and say, "What a wonderful meter we've got. It's just fantastic that this meter will do these things." Well, all right. This is the meter we're doing it with and I have good confidence in the meter.

Now, amongst us we have people who don't have much confidence in the meter, and quite rightly, because if you don't know how to read a meter, you of course can't have any confidence in the meter. And after a meter has been thrown for you a few times or after you've thrown a meter a few times, or after somebody's missed a withhold on you, your ability to run the meter deteriorates like mad. Did you realize that? You say, "Well, I can beat the meter from where I sit, so therefore the meter isn't very accurate and so forth." Well actually, please realize that you were beating a lousy operator, not a meter. You can always beat an operator. When the operator isn't good enough, you can always beat the operator.
But to watch these little – this little black needle doing little odd dances – and as it swings back and forth to catch the fact that something stopped it for an instant, and to catch that sort of thing – requires, frankly, a rather high degree of skill.

It is an order of skill that Einstein respected, because Einstein has – had written – I don't know where Einstein is now. Has anybody audited Einstein lately? Anyway, he isn't very old. It'd take Mary Sue or somebody like that to audit him.

The idea he had was the idea of the observer. He had the idea of the observer, and it's a very, very good thing for you to know this particular thing in connection with the meter.

He had this concept of an observer. Now, of course, the old man, in floundering around in the field of physics and small currents and that sort of thing, he was limited by the fact that nobody ever got him any data. He also – always had to go out and read the meters himself I suppose, or something like this. And it finally drove him down to writing a paper on this. I wish I had a copy of the paper. I don't. I have never read it. I have only been told about the paper. But his viewpoint, "The Viewpoint of the Observer" is the name of the paper, "The Viewpoint of the Observer."

And what is an observer? An observer is somebody who, without the introduction of an opinion, can look exactly and directly at a needle or registering item, and say exactly what it did, without further introduction of opinion. He doesn't say why it did it; he just says what it did. In other words, if it went up on some meter to 105 and then it fell back to 102, then his ideal on the thing would have simply noted that it went to 105 and fell to 102, and that's all the person would say.

You see, now, psychology, not knowing this, has never given us any data. We have been denied the whole pack of data that the psychologists might have been collecting for us because the whole thing is full of opinion. There was never an observer amongst the psychologists. There are no observers amongst the psychiatrists.

The psychiatrists go in and they don't limit themselves to saying, "This fellow takes three hops across the room and bounces against the ceiling" You see? "And his name is John Jones, and he has been incarcerated here and our classification for it is ceiling bounceosis," and so on.

No, he doesn't do that. He says this fellow keeps leaping about and we have made a very deep study of his familial background, and we find out that there was three and one-tenth percent schizophrenics during the last 1800 years connected with this particular familial line. And we know this to be the case because his skull is cleaved in a peculiar way which is only found in the Cro-Magnon pits of northern Italy.

Oh, what the hell. Do you know that on some half-written psychiatric reports, they give you the whole engram the person is in. And then add something like this: We have tried and tried to disabuse her of this particular opinion and we have not yet succeeded, but we will. Or the patient's comment after treatment was, "Well, it still seems awfully real."

The psychiatrist was just going headlong into pictures. In other words, he was so interested in doing something, he never looked at what he was doing it to or he long since would have found the mental image picture. Do you realize how far we are ahead of these
people? It's hard to realize sometime for a Scientologist, I—just how far we are ahead of these people, and how far we are ahead of existing technology.

Nobody has pictures. What is a picture? A picture has no influence. If they ever mention anything about pictures, it's just vague imaginings. It's really very interesting that they have never done any observation.

Now aside from this point, aside from it and totally, this quality: the ability to observe as a single action, is what it requires to E-Meter. It's the ability to observe as a single action independent of all interpretation.

Now if you take that as a separate action of the auditor, and only when that action is done, only when we have done that action do we then do anything else, you will get the whole problem compartmented properly.

In other words, we don't sit there and worry and stew and fuss. We don't sit there and worry and stew and fuss about what we are going to do if the needle does something, you see. Now, our action is: whatever else we are doing, we are also an observer and we observe exactly what the needle does, and don't wishfully hope it had done something else. You ask somebody for a PT problem. You're all set, you want to do an assessment, you want to get another level, you want to go on and charging down the line.

Everything is going to be just fine and you get into the rudiments and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" very cheerfully, pressing on. You get a clank and it falls. Oh no! Now we're going to spend the next few minutes, probably, you see, having to handle this and not getting on with our affairs and that sort of thing. Well, its a great temptation at that point to just wish there hadn't been one, and there's not much of a step from wishing there hadn't been one to not seeing it. You see? There's not much of a step between those two points. In other words, you've got "wishful observering". [laughter]

Falls on the wrong level; falls on the wrong goal. We know this person—we know this perfectly sweet, young girl that we are auditing here: this kind, sweet person would never have as their basic goal in life, "to murder men." We know that. So we just skip that, you see? We throw the observation, because it assaults our reality.

But why should the observation of a needle assault reality? Why? Why should it assault reality? And the observation of a needle in its action on a meter is simply an observation and it is something to be noted. It's regardless of whether it's right or wrong or it's against what we're doing or for what we're doing or anything else.

As long as you keep this idea of "the observer independent of the doer," as the auditor, you're all set, see. You're sitting there watching the needle and you're running engrams. Well, therefore—a thetan can do a lot of things at once, by the way—and therefore, well a part of you is simply looking at it and you're asking this and it notes that it falls at that particular point, and so forth. Well, that is the action of an observer.

Now, what you think about that, and what you're going to do about that, are entirely different segments. They haven't anything to do with this fact. The needle acted in a certain way. All right. We observed that it acted in a certain way and that is all there is to it. So, pure observation is a subject that is very worthwhile for an auditor to look over.
Go out and take a look at the trees sometime and just try to observe a tree. It's quite interesting. Just do nothing but observe a tree. Don't think about the tree or have an opinion about the tree, one way or the other, but just look at a tree. Do you understand me? All right.

Now, let's take that up one more stage and look at a tree when there's a wind blowing. And look at what is happening there at that point of the tree. Of course, there you have the tree and the leaves are wobbling. Now, if you can hold this as an observation independent of an emotional reaction, an opinion or a doings, or a summation, like, "Well, its going to come up and and and rain, in a little while, obviously, because the air is rather damp." Well, that's part of a whole new package of observation. You're predicting already, before you have noticed. Now, people get to the point where they predict without bothering to see. And this is a characteristic of the human race. They're always predicting without seeing.

You're just – this time-honored example of these fifteen people who stood around and saw the automobile accident, and you'll get fifteen different automobile accidents. And that is because they've added all sorts of connotations to it. Whose fault was it? You see? A guess at the mental attitude of the drivers; a wonder about the pain of the occupants; estimate of the amount of damages; worries concerning how fast a crash wagon can get down there, or an ambulance can get there, or how long it is going to take to get the road cleared: color the observation, actually color the observation. You had to – it doesn't seem possible until you look it over. Here are two cars and they came together and made accordions out of their respective bonnets or hoods. There they are – daduthng.

Well, what exactly happened there? Now, you ask somebody, "What exactly happened there? Without any other opinion, exactly what happened right there at that point?" And you know, you get all sorts of additional data.

Well, this fellow came down the road and he was in a hurry. See, we don't know that. We don't know that he was in a hurry. We know that he was traveling fast. Maybe when that particular fellow was in a hurry, he went twice as fast. But in any event, we now have hazarded some idea of the mental attitude of the person who was driving one of the cars. And then we hazard a mental attitude of somebody else driving a car and it doesn't take very long to color our own mental attitude. See, what exactly did happen?

Well, two cars came down, they went on an exact certain course. They stopped or tried to stop or didn't stop at a certain place, and thereafter accordion-pleated their bonnets. And that is exactly what happened. If a wheel came off or a hub cap went off, it actually fell off and ran so many feet.

That is a total non-emotional observation. This is exactly what happened. That is what happened. It – what happened is not how much its going to cost to repair the damage. What happened is not the respective property culpability of the participants in this favorite game of Western civilization today. That had nothing to do with what happened. The mental pressures involved could not even be estimated by the casual bystander, unless he were a Scientologist and had the person in session for many, many hours. And now you can get an idea with a 3D, of exactly why he had an accident. But short of that, it's all hazard. So we ask somebody to observe an automobile accident and, "Well, suh and suh and suhm." They never tell you that. They say, "Well, one fellow was coming down the road and there were a couple of girls on
the sidewalk, and they were horrified, and uh ...
"Well, their nameplates were in clear sight, but I didn't read them, see." They were plastered all over on one, "Ford", you see – it was all over one – and "Austin" was all over the other one, but he didn't notice that. That's part of the observation.

A Scientologist has to become – we have talked about this for years. We've called it "obnosis" and so forth – but a Scientologist has to become, as far as an E-Meter is concerned – at least some small section of his attention and his beingness, while he is operating as an auditor, must be of a pure observational character, uncolored by any other consideration. In other words he has to be able to look at a meter and say exactly what the needle is doing.

And that is first things first, and that is the first step in learning an E-Meter: is actually able to observe a single, simple action and say what happened. In a HPA/HCA class, it would be very amusing to go up to the board and take an eraser or something on the blackboard, and reverse it, and then step back and ask the class of new auditing students, "What did I do?"

And get, if there were 20 students, get 20 different replies. You went over to see if the board was dirty. Or you decided to give us an example and ... The fact of the matter is, he went across and picked up an eraser and turned it over. Now, what actually happened is that a person took several steps across the room, extended hand, picked up the eraser, and turned it over, put it down and then took several steps back across the room. And that is all that happened as far as the observer is concerned. Nothing else happened at all.

Now, why did he do it? Ah, well now, we've got the – now, we've got the Scientologist. Why did he do it? What was the purpose behind this? What was he trying to demonstrate? What effect did he have on us? Do you see? Now, we've got the cause and effect, the purpose and the this-a and that-a. And that had nothing to do with the observation of simply walking across the room and turning over an eraser.

And we've got mental attitudes, mental attitudes, mental attitudes and after a while you say to this fellow, "Wait a minute. Did you see what kind of cars they were?"

See, that's maybe only a tenth of his attention, but it still has to be a pure attention. It has to be very pure. Now, he says, "The needle is doing this because... The needle is doing this because..." You see? Now, that's the auditor in him talking. That isn't the observer. The observer has no "because," see. The needle just did that, that's all.

Now, if we take it from that simplicity and move it on forward, it all becomes very easily. And how many people are having difficulty reading a meter because they're trying to read the meter – read the mind before the meter acts, or trying to read the mind and the meter at the same action, and so forth. Frankly, it's perfectly all right to know what went on in the fellow's mind, and you should be able to know what went on in the fellow's mind, when you...
saw the reaction on a meter. But that's after the fact of an observer. That is an analysis of the observation based on your professional skill. That is another action. The fact of the thing is, is it went up here under the words – where the words "fall" are, and it did a little dance that was something like an eighth-of-an-inch wide, and it did it several times, immediately after certain words were uttered.

The words were uttered, "Are you – are you tired of a willow buck?" And the word "willow buck," after it's uttered, and we get this little dance occurring there and the fellow then says, "Well, that's still live." But note that his desire to know if "willow buck" was still alive was independent of this other action.

First, he desired to know if the willow buck was still alive, and then he said, "Are you tired of a willow buck?" See? At the moment there, his voice is the cause, the pc's bank is the effect and the meter is the reaction. All right, he's still a practitioner up to the moment he says, "willow buck," and then this other chain reaction takes place. Notice that this is another action. He's causing an action to occur there. All right. Having done that in something like a millionth of a second, he changes from the practitioner to simply the observer. He is just nothing now but a pure observer. What did the needle do? And for something on the order of eight-tenths of a second or something like that, he is an observer. What did the needle do? And for something on the order of 8 tenths of a second or something like that, he is an observer. And at that moment he is nothing else but an observer.

But for a split instant there, maybe something on the order of an – of a – well, let's say, .8 seconds is what I should have said, .8 seconds, he is an observer – or 1 second, he is an observer. He's purely an observer and he's nothing else in that 1 second but an observer. In other words he is a practitioner, he's a Scientologist, everything is fine and he's doing his job and then for a second he is an observer. And then right after that, he's a Scientologist and he's the cause and effect on the mind and all that sort of thing.

But you carry over cause and effect on the mind at the moment you're observing, and you're inevitably going to carry some hopefulness or some disappointment or some wishful thinkingness or something across that moment of observation.

You know, I have had to swallow an awful lot of bitter pills. I know what I'm talking about when I'm running a meter. I've had to swallow some mighty bitter pills.

Way back when, particularly, I would be absolutely sure, you see, that I knew exactly what was wrong and everything that was happening with regard to the preclear's mind. You see, I absolutely had it taped. I knew the exact thing that the pc was going to come up with next, and it all indicated to that, and all I had to do – I knew it was there, the only question mark was the pc going to have any reality on it, and was there going to be any release or action because of this enormous discovery?

You see, I figured it all out, see, up to this point and then I asked the pc – I asked the pc, and I say, "Well now, how do you feel about a family?" No action. "Family, smamily." Phss! It wasn't right. You see, all this skillful figure-figure all added up all of a sudden to nothing. No reaction of any kind.

"Oh, I feel fine about a family." Nyeh.
All right, but for a moment I never forgot how to be a pure observer. See. I did observe it, even though it was against my most fond hopes. And in the next moment be back again figuring it out, see. Thinking it over. All right. And then all of a sudden, "Oh, have you ever beaten a dog?" Oh well, I got a reaction that time, so it's all right – come on.

But on some pcs, in trying to figure it out, when you didn't know all you had to know on the subject and which way they were going, phew! You know, you'd get it pretty well taped and you know exactly where you're going and then – oh, you just know exactly now what will just blow the whole thing up and you say it, you know, and you put it to the test, and your hopefulness doesn't cause you to misread the meter.

And maybe that is where I excel where other fellows have fallen down. I am not so fond of my own ideas and theories that I must have them right. I can always get another theory.

Now, one of the things that's defeated research work is some people get so fond of some theory that they've had, one way or the other or they're trying to prove out. It looks so logical and looks so wonderful, and we know now fitted so well with their goal, modifier and opposition goal, this is all so handsome that they never let go of it. The weight of evidence can be delivered to them with large iron bars. It could be delivered to them in trucks; the evidence against this theory, you see. The whole countryside gets stacked up by built-up models to show them completely and conclusively that the thing never works and they haven't got a single model anyplace to show that any shadow of the theory has any truth in it of any kind whatsoever.

And they still hold on to the theory. In other words, all evidence has disproved it and they have no evidence that proves it in any way, shape or form. Long and arduous study on the subject has not borne out any part of it and they still hold on to it. Theories are so marvelous. After all, they're theirs. They're theirs, you see. The evidence there, well, it would be pretty unsafe, you see, to let go of one. Because we might never get another one.

Well, you know very well, in looking at a pc when he gives you a list of terminals, or something like that, which is eighty, ninety – oh, all right, one of them looks pretty good. But you'd be amazed. I usually find out that the one it actually is, is better than I hoped for. The right one – the right one is usually much better than I'd ever hoped it would be.

You know, I've got this guy totally taped and I get ideas as to what this thing ought to be as I look down the list and it help and sharpens my perception, but I never permit that to overthrow me as an observer. At the instant I observe a meter, I observe the meter. I don't observe it hopefully, I don't observe it pessimistically, I don't observe it any other way than I just open my wide blue eyes and let happen what happens at that moment.

More than anything else, and the fact that I very seldom go to sleep as an auditor, and very seldom fall out of my chair and drop ashtrays and that sort of thing – the capability of actually keeping my mind on what I am doing and being interested in actually auditing the pc and being able to observe purely as an observer at a split moment – I know now is what gets me my results as an auditor. And they're worth – they're worth reaching for, because they are very rapid results. But there is an instant there when there is nothing but absolutely pure observation.
And if that observation disproved to me completely that every theory I had stacked up was absolutely wrong, it was still an observation and I would – still would observe it. Oh, I might check it and observe it again, and I might check it and observe it again, but if it wasn't there it wasn't there, and that's it.

Now, that I recognize as – is a skill of sorts. It is – is a skill all by itself. It's to be able to suddenly become an observer for one second, and then cease to be an observer and become an auditor. That's what it takes, but that's what E-Metering takes: uncolored observation. What happened is what happened. No matter if it shatters our fondest hopes, what happens to the meter is what happens to the meter and that's what happens to the meter. And that's all we're observing and there's no alter-is connected with the observation, no alter-is of any kind whatsoever.

And you'll find consistently and continually, that where you have a bad assessment – where you have a bad assessment, it's hopefulness has entered in or pessimism has entered in. And neither hopefulness nor pessimism should ever enter into the moment of observation. You read right down the line, clank, that's what it is, that's what it is; that's what it isn't, that's what it isn't.

Oh, I have actually often suddenly grabbed a pc practically by the collar and steered him into the chair during a break, all of a sudden, you know, or something like this. Or out of session – well somebody I was auditing regularly. All of a sudden get ahold of them practically in the hall and say, "Come here a minute," you know. "Sit down," you know. And put them on the cans, you know.

And I've got – I've got what it exactly was, you know. I've got it perfectly, you know. And I know exactly what it was. It was elephants. That was what was missing in that engram. There must have been elephants in that damned engram. Got it all figured out, you know. Put him on: "All right. Good. You're all set now? All right. Now, just shut up and be quiet now. Good. All right. Elephants. ... [laughter] Thank you. Go ahead, get your coat now." [laughter]

It is simply, not actually the willingness to be overwhelmed by an E-Meter, but it's actually the willingness to put something to a pure, reliable test, and then abide by the decisions. The reason we have law courts – man can't do this very easily – the reason we have law courts is nobody ever abides by the evidence. That's what makes law profitable.

You have fifteen people see the accident. I remember practicing law here a century ago, up around Reigate and so forth. It was absolutely fantastic. But I was always taking cases on the absolute outside impossibility. Everybody would come along, but they'd say, "But – but – uh, the ship down in Portsmouth steamed right into the harbor, cut the other ship absolutely in half. It sank and the captain was at fault. The insurance company, everybody agreed! What do you mean, you're going to take this case? With your reputation, you're going to take a case like that? Ooh-ho, you're silly!"

"Oh no, no, no, no, no. I'll take the case. Yes, I'll defend that ship that came in, and cut the other ship in half. Yes. Happy to do so." The whole Royal Navy could have been lining the beaches and to find one reliable witness for the other party would have been nearly impossible.
I could shake any witness anybody else ever had for anything. They could stand right there in the wide-open corridor of a public building, seen the fellow, recognized him, and pulled out a knife, killed the other man dead. Take the case? Hell, yes. What's evidence got to do with cases?

We're dealing with human beings and they can't look. They never see. And furthermore, in court, they have opinions. The Lord Chief Justice sitting up there, impartial, wigged, and so forth. All the other fellows around there, of course, I'd been in that category myself a time or two. This is not a major line of mine. It's something I do when I'm broke. [laughter]

They were all of the opinion that justice was totally impartial and that he was impartial. Oh, no. He was a family man; he had kids, and so forth. And they've got this burglar – maybe I was the Crown Attorney or something – and they've got this burglar and he burgled into the home and he's took this and that, and they're going to let him go free to burgle into more homes, and so on. And impartiality finds absolutely no evidence of the fact – no absolute witnesses to the fact that he broke into the home. Of course he did, we all know he did, but we haven't got the exact legal formula that adds up to evidence.

No Crown Attorney in the world could have sent the guy up. Everybody is rather despairing. It's about the fifth time he's been arrested. I'd stand up in court and say, "Well, now when you climbed in this window, Blackfoot Joe, now when you climbed in this window here, did you stumble into the baby's crib in any way? Mmmm? Well, did the child wake up?"

He'd say, "No-no-no, never near the home, never near the home, never near it."

"Well, did the child wake up? Is that why the child had bruises on its face the next morning?"

The Lord Chief Justice says, "What is this? You mean the fellow broke into the home and beat up the children?" You see. "And tried to strangle the children?" And so forth.

"Well, I was never there, governor – never was, never was, honest, I was just never near the place. I was, as a matter of fact, was up at a pub in Piccadilly and we were just having a pint of beer, me and a couple of pals, and we were up there and I can bring them both. You've just heard them both in court. They said I was never near the place."

"Well, now, we're getting back to these things, now the toys. Now, the toys. Did you break any of the toys when you were climbing out of the window? Now, how would you go about silencing a child's screams that was terrified in the middle of the night by somebody coming in the window?"

About that time, why, Lord Chief Justice or the magistrate or something or other turns around to the jury and says, "Bring in a verdict of guilty or I'll have you all booked." [laughter, laughs]

The guy had a button, that's all! The great impartiality of justice on the magistrate's bench had buttons. He just couldn't stand the idea of children being terrified in the middle of the night, or being abused by burglars and you never tried the case. You tried the emotions of the justice. You never tried the case really on any line except you were fairly sure that nobody ever saw anything happen.
All of these factors entered into what they laughingly call "law." I very often take time out for a lifetime and just do a total relaxation – just like other people read comic books. So it's not at all surprising to find even the more intelligent people amongst the ranks of auditors – and auditors are a more intelligent people, that's for sure – falling from grace and failing to observe. Because it's the one thing the human race does worst.

Honest, you turn the – you turn the weathercock around three times on the top of the steeple, while you've got half the town marshalled up to make sure that they saw it, and ask them what happened on the top of the steeple. And some will tell you that the angel Gabriel flew in and out of the belfry, and they'll go on and on. But there'll be some honest carpenter out on the outskirts and he'll say, rather grumpily, "Well, he turned the weathercock around three times. That's what you did. And I'm not quite sure what you mean to accomplish by that, but we can tell you, it won't do any good." [laughs] He might have been able to observe, but he had to go and write script after the fact, see.

Now there's your point, not to belabor it, but there's the power of observation. The power of observation actually does not couple with knowledge of the subject of Scientology. These things are entirely different. Why it is happening has nothing to do with the fact that it is happening.

Why it is happening and what it indicates is the business of a Scientologist, but observing it is simply the business of an observer, who need know nothing about the mind or anything else. He merely need know that a needle wiggled. He merely need know that the tone arm was located there and the needle wiggled. He's got to be able to observe that fact. And if he can't observe that fact in that split instant, independent of all other actions, he will very often color his observation. So it's a learned skill and it's something you should learn how to do.

Just for an instant, just note what is happening That's easy – it's very easy. It's just – it's so easy you just keep missing it, see. It's just, "What happened in that instant?"

"Well, the thing theta bopped."

"Well, the thing theta bopped in that instant?"

"Well, the thing theta bopped and that meant so-and-so, he's got charge on the subject. See, that thing ..."

What happened in that instant is succeeded immediately by the observer, and he is the unseen silent person. He simply looks at the thing and he sees the needle go ... And then he becomes the auditor again and he says, "Well it theta bopped."

But for a moment there, he had to observe the thing acting, totally independent of all other action, totally independent of all other thinking, totally independent of all judgment. That's just it; he simply observed it.

It's actually a very easy trick, if you know that it is a sort of a trick. You should try it some time. Try to observe something purely without an opinion. And you're liable to set half the circuits in your bank going whiz, you know.
Now, all of your 3D comes up to – each part of it comes up to the final role. The final role in the thing, as far as the test of it is concerned, requires an observer to be present. The reason you have these things checked is you hope the checker will be – serve as an observer, that somebody will observe this thing from another quarter. But actually a pure observation could be done by anybody, couldn't it? Did the needle wiggle or didn't it? Did it fall or didn't it? Did it rise or didn't it? You see? That's all. That's all you have to know, at that particular point.

Now, in assessing this particular scale, you could foul up like fire drill, because it is almost totally an observational reading action – the running of this scale. You read the level and then see whether or not that level – not the attached associated words to the terminal or something – whether or not that level produced a reaction at that moment.

Now, you have to do this observational stuff rather fast. You're a reader and then you're an observer, and then you're a stenographer. You note down what happened. You're a recorder. A reader, an observer and a recorder; that's one, two, three. That is actually the exact actions which are undertaken at that moment.

You say to this person, "Would you have faith in a waterbuck?" And you have to know that the reaction didn't occur on "waterbuck" because of course the needle will always react on "waterbuck," as a charged subject. So you merely want "faith in," and you observe at the second "faith in," the observer comes in, observes what the needle does and then you say what it did as a recorder. And that is the action. And it's a very rapid action. It's a very rapid action.

Now, here and there you may have trouble with a pc who insists on talking while you're assessing. I'm going to talk to you about how to actually brightly, smartly do an assessment. And you may have a pc who is going, "Gab-gab-gab, walla-walla-walla-walla-walla-walla-walla." 

Well, I always handle that. I always handle that. I handle it diplomatically and I never get any ARC breaks either. I say, "Hold the cans quiet in your lap and shut up; I'm about to read the list." [laughter] That's just about the way it is, too. Do you realize why that isn't an ARC break? He's getting all of your attention, man. You're doing it all for him. He doesn't expect you to be polite while you're ministering to him.

Oh well, the way to produce an ARC break is give all your attention to the meter and say, "You know I had a meter last year that read much better than this meter." Well, that shows there's no attention on this fellow's case and you're not giving him his attention. You're violating what his goals terminal should have, which of course is attention.

But you can tell him almost anything within the perimeter of getting the job done and he'll take it. Well, if that's what it takes to get it done, well that's what it takes, and so on. You, by the way, are learning that rather well. I've heard a few cracks coming through doors, something on this effect, and so forth. "You want to find your terminal, don't you? All right, well stop wiggling around. Sit still."

This, this of course doesn't produce much of an ARC break. It doesn't produce any, as a matter of fact.
All right. Now, you want the pc silent. Now, he might not be as silent as he might – as a tomb, while you are assessing other lists. Oh, as he assesses his goal, every once in a while it makes him think of something and he asks you to put down another goal or something of the sort. Or he didn't understand or his attention is hung up; he's still thinking about something; he says something about it. You say, "Well all right, yeah?" He says something about it. And you say, "Did you want to add another goal on that, you want to modify that goal? You want to change it in some way?"

"Well, I think I ought to change it," and so on.

You say, "Well all right," and you just put it down at the bottom of the list. By the way, the best thing to do is to add it to the bottom of the list. Because it's kind of a Q-and-A to put it in afterwards and he gets the idea he's running the session, I've found out. So, you just add it in to the bottom of the list of goals, go over here, seven pages, wherever it is and put it down, write it down. That's the way it is. And you say, "All right; thank you," and carry right on.

However, you do tell the person, even in those assessments, "You do not have to speak while I am assessing this. As a matter of fact, we will get it done faster if you do not." That's it. But in assessing this Pre-Have 3D Scale, particularly, you haven't got time. Look-a-here, man! Look at the number of words that are in this scale!

You think you've got time, for heaven's sakes, to sit around and gab about how wonderful it would be if you were having absolutely no effect on waterbucks. Wouldn't that be interesting! And we could have just an old ladies' tea party going here, you know. "Well, would you have no effect on a waterbuck?"

"Well, now, I don't know whether I would have an effect on a waterbuck or not, because a waterbuck might have effect on us and it might not have effect on us. But waterbucks are what waterbucks are and actually my attention is sort of stuck on 'faith in.' "

"Well – oh, it is, huh?" [laughter] "Still stuck on 'faith in waterbucks.' Oh well, maybe I'd better repeat that, uh, the ..." What a dog's breakfast! And you're going to do this – it'll be two sessions for the assessment, five minutes for a run, two sessions for an assessment, five minutes for a run. You get the idea? Nonsense!

So you have to really start getting slick the moment you get down there to your – to your final runs and assessment on the Pre-Have in your 3D. You've got to be slippery. And at this time you can admit of no conversation. Now we get down to no conversation. Just let the person sit there in a total state of giddy irresponsibility. We don't care whether he's thinking about the levels or not thinks about the levels, or adds them up. We don't care if he hangs up on some level while we're going down to later levels. We do not care what he is doing at all, as long as he will sit there like a good boy and hold those E-Meter cans, amen.

That's all we want him to do. That's all that's expected of the pc. Once you start the assessment line, that is all he's supposed to do. And you make sure we do that.
Now, the pc says, "You know, I'm still rather hung up on – I'm still thinking hard about ..." You'll hear them say this; this is about what they say, "I'm still thinking hard about Disperse. I can't quite get my mind off Disperse."

You just say, "Well good. All right. Thank you." And go right on with your list. If they do say something, don't hit them; [laughter] but don't engage in any conversation with them either on the subject.

Now, the mechanics of it are these: It doesn't matter a bit, a bit, a bit, a bit, a bit whether they are thinking about it or not thinking about it. You are not reading this to the pc anyway; you're reading it to his reactive bank. And it doesn't matter whether his mind is hung up on the title or the date of the HCOB – you don't read that when you read the list, by the way – but we don't care whether his mind hung up on that or nothing.

Do you know, you are saved by this fact: No power on Earth could keep the E-Meter, practically, from registering on the exact level he's stuck in for that terminal. We don't care if his attention is analytically somewhere else or not. We're going to get a reaction, as long as he's sitting in the same room and the rudiments are reasonably in. We're going to get a reaction; that's all there is to it.

Now, pcs will try to fool it, you know and they try to hang up somehow or another, see. And they try to say, "Oh gee, you know, I know what should be run on this thing. Actually Faith is way overdue because I keep saying to myself, I caught myself last night at supper, and I was saying faith in this and faith in that. Obviously it's Faith that should be run."

So they sit there and they say, "Well, if I think hard on Faith," you see.

And you say, "Do you have faith in a waterbuck?" And you get a little action. Well, your final – your only action on it actually is just to make a mark. So you make a mark and it doesn't take you any time at all till you're off on the next level. That's just split seconds later that you're saying the next level. So they're still sitting there, Faith, Faith, Faith. So what?

You're down here. Probably their level at this particular thing is Withhold, or something. When you get to Withhold, they will no longer be thinking about Faith, I guarantee. "Withhold! Ooh, ooho, huh!" They shut up. [laughs, laughter]

Now, there may be many, many assessment systems brought out, but – I mean on a list assessment of this character – there may be many systems that could be followed; maybe some will work better than others. But they will all be based on this: is get the maximum number of levels for the minimum amount of time with the minimum restimulation of the pc. Maximum number of levels, minimum period of time, minimum restimulation for the pc. Now, that's what you're trying to accomplish in any assessment and you want to go off on a machine-gun basis b-r-r-r-r mit speed yet. It's got to be fast.

Now, let us take the type of assessment we were doing. It goes something like this: (And they tell the person we're going to assess and this – meter's set up and all that.) We say, "Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck cause things for you? Would you prevent a waterbuck from knowing?" Something like this. And you would catch those marks as you went by, actually, just about that fast. That is the type of assessments done. The reaction, if the level is going to be live, is going to hit as you say the level. You say the level, you
get the reaction and you're out of there, don't you see. You don't wait until you've said it and then wait for it to react. Because it's going to react when you say it anyhow and if it didn't react when you say it, well the hell with it. And of course if it does react, why, there you are. You mark it, that's all. That's your total action. You just mark it if it is – acted. And of course if you don't know whether it acted or not, you mark it. That's – you don't sit there and study it and read it three times and so forth.

Now, under the heading of "minimum restimulation of the pc," you don't keep repeating, repeating, repeating a level. You never run repeater technique on a level on a – on an assessment of the Pre-Have-type scale. Never run repeater technique. You just go down, one read – bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-wang – one read each – bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang. It read or it didn't read and that's all you'd want to know.

Now, as far as acknowledging the pc is concerned, oh yeah, fine. Say, now this is a good slow way to assess, probably a very thorough way and probably a way that would give you lots of certainty as to whether or not you had the list, was: "Would you have faith in a waterbuck? ... Thank you... Would you cause a waterbuck anything? ...Mm. Thank you. Ahhh, hmm. Thank you. Ah, How would you prevent knowing a waterbuck? ...I don't know. You know it seems to read on every level. You know every time I say 'waterbuck' it reads."

And now, perhaps, if you'd sort it out at that rate of speed – and maybe you'd have to go at that rate of speed if you didn't know quite what you were doing – you probably would wind up with something like an assessment at the end, perhaps. Take a session to assess, five minutes to run, session to assess, five minutes to run. You get the idea? All right.

Nobody's going to say speed up faster than you have certainty on what you are reading. See, nobody's ever going to tell you that. People are going to say, speed up, speed up, speed up, but included in that remark is, of course, have certainty on what you're doing.

Now, after you have read the whole list from bottom to top, you have marked each one that reacted. You have only read the level once and after that you marked it or you didn't mark it, and of course it's just not marked at all if it was null. You leave it alone. And if it did react in any way, shape or form, you put a mark after the level.

Now, that leaves you, when you finish up down to the end of it – you finish up down to the end, you have a number of levels which have marks on them. Now, you don't start in at the beginning again. You start in at the end, right where you finished up. And you go back only over those items which are now marked with the symbol of the assessment. You've put a mark there, so you only read the ones that you marked. On the first run down ten were marked, so on the back up one, you only read ten, and that is each one that is marked. All right. That's the second one.

Now, each one of those that fell on that particular reading, you take your pencil and you mark that it did or it – or if it didn't, you don't mark. If it fell or reacted in any way as you went back over these ten, you of course gave it an additional symbol, and it is the same symbol that you use coming down, but it's just a second symbol.
Now, you've got four left and you're now back up at the other end of the list, so you start through and only that four do you read, and each one of those that is still alive you add another symbol to it.

And now you've got two and these two now have three marks after each one. You read one of them and it says, "to own," and you've got a mark after that, and the other one is "to make amends"; so you read "own," and you and that it is null, and you read "make amends" and it is still alive. And that is all you do.

You now have "make amends," and that is it. And that is your level. You do not check it any further than that. You do not do anything more about it than that. That is it, period. You have done your assessment.

In other words, it's a sweep down, mark anything, one read each, mark anything that is productive of a needle action. When you get to the bottom of the list, all the way through to the end of the list, where you see my name, you stop and turn around and go back up and only read those that were live coming down. Only mark those that are now live on the second read. And then you come back the other way and you only mark those that are now alive and you'll wind up with the other.

Now, sometimes you'll get into a situation like this: This is perfectly acceptable. Approach. Get out of. All right, you've got four marks after Approach, you've got four marks after Get out of. Which is it? So you say, "Get out of. Would a waterbuck get out of things?" Mark it. "Would you approach a waterbuck?" Ha-ha. That's live, too. Now you got two of them.

So it's perfectly all right for you to say, because you are right on the pc level and it is very close to one or the other of these anyway, it is all right for you to say right after that, "What would a waterbuck get out of? What would you approach?" They're still both live so you go back over it again, and all of a sudden there is nothing on Approach. "Get out of" is live, you take it. That's it. And that's all the checking that you do on it.

Now, how about reading this. You get a variation. You read these things two ways in order to get a two-way flow. "Would a waterbuck have faith in you? Would you cause a waterbuck something?" Now, remember you are saying "you" and "waterbuck." Now, waterbuck is certainly charged as you go through the whole thing. It's charge, charge, charge; paragraph, paragraph after paragraph, level after level after level you're saying waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, water – water – waaa-waaa-waaa-waaa-waaa ...

That's an awful lot of talking, isn't it, for all this level. And what if you acknowledged the pc for every level. The pc doesn't talk, you see, you acknowledge his not-talkingness. There might be a better way to do it. You might say, "Would a waterbuck have faith in you, cause you, prevent you, have no effect on you, affect you? Thank you. Would you obsessively can't-have a waterbuck, make something of a waterbuck, create, think about, peculiar interest in, disperse a waterbuck? Thank you. Thank you. Would you intend not to communicate to a waterbuck? Badly control, betray, collect for, substitute for, withdraw from, duplicate, enter a waterbuck? Thank you." You get how you could eat up levels if you did something like that?
Well, it depends to a large degree on how your pc can be in-session. How consecutive their wits are. That's – is their attention on you? Because actually you're not blanging their attention every time in to the terminal, don't you see? They're only getting the terminal about every ten levels. And they still know what you're doing So it depends on your presence as the auditor and your ability to keep somebody in-session, whether you use one level every time and acknowledge it and say the level and read just that level and then reverse the flow for the next level like, "Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck cause you things?" See? "Thank you." And then go, "Would you prevent knowing a waterbuck? Would you have no effect on a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck have an effect on you?" See? It would depend on how you wandered back and forth. As long as you're keeping that flow going both ways. All right. You could take it one time.

You see, you got several variations here. You could read it twice and acknowledge once, so you get two levels with one acknowledgment. You could have one level, one acknowledgment. You could reverse the flow every other level. Or you could reverse the flow every two levels, but using a waterbuck each time, see.

"Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would you cause a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck prevent knowing you? Would a waterbuck have no effect on you?" See? "Thank you." Now you've read four levels and one acknowledgment. See, you could do it that way.

Or, if you really had presence and you thought the pc was in there and that you weren't going to miss anything, you could sail down five levels. "All right now." (Yeah, that was really depending on him.) "All right now. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would you have no effect on, effect, obsessively can't-have, make something up, create, think about, peculiar interest in, disperse a waterbuck?" He found a level, so we mark it.

All right, well, we had the flow going that way, didn't we, so we now – we're going to come back the other way. That isn't necessarily down to a mark, it's just so many.

All right. Now, "Would a waterbuck intend not to communicate with you, badly control you, betray you, collect for, substitute for, withdraw from, duplicate, enter, inhibit, disagree with you? Thank you." You get that?

It just depends on how good you are. It just depends on how much altitude you are as an auditor. Don't miss any levels, because it will fall on it. Person's attention is on a waterbuck. The person will be – his attention will be on a waterbuck. All you do is have to say somebody's terminal to them hard; all you do is have to say "willow wand" to somebody whose terminal is "willow wand," "willow wand," his attention will be on willow wand for some little time now, you see.

You know these wind-up toys, you know, that have these traction wheels, you know, and you get the wheel running real fast and you set it down and it runs. His attention will be on it for several levels before it's jarred in any way. Well, you take advantage of that fact.

Now, you could cover it that way. Now, I haven't and actually don't lay down a standardization because frankly some auditors would have an awful lot of trouble trying to keep
somebody's attention in that long. The pc's attention, sort of nervous and upset and his attention usually isn't on anything. You're liable to start just reading random levels.

Now, if you were covering the gross level in that particular character, if you were covering the gross chart in that particular character, you would still come back to the one read for the second run. You've only got ten left so what are you winning. You're winning nothing. See? The second – you got – you've covered the whole thing in that fashion, many five levels let us say, three levels without saying the terminal or getting a flow. And then you got three more going the other way and then three more going back again, you see, with the flows. Or five, as far as that's concerned, levels before you flip-flopped the flow or said the terminal again, or something. That's perfectly all right.

But on the one back, you've only got ten levels live, you would take every one of them on the basis of: "Have you failed to interest a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck fail to help you? Would you destroy a waterbuck? Would a waterbuck propitiate you? Would you survive a waterbuck?" See. You'd take every one on a cross-flow.

I'm just advancing these ideas to you for just this good reason, is this is an awful mouthful to assess on this Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scale and you've got to have some way of getting over it more rapidly, so study it over and see how you'll get over it. Actually you want maximal – you want accuracy, you want maximal speed and minimal restimulation to the pc.

The way to get maximal restimulation and minimal speed is to assess this way: "All right. Now, we're going to assess a waterbuck here. All right, you all ready? All right. Thinking about a waterbuck? Are you thinking about a waterbuck? All right. All right. Okay. Think, think about a waterbuck now. Uh, let's see. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? It's live. All right. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Would you have faith in a waterbuck? It's still alive, you know. Would you have faith in a waterbuck? Oh, it went null that time. All right, that's good.

"All right. Would a waterbuck cause you things? Oh, you know, that's null. Would a waterbuck cause you things? That's null, you know. Would a waterbuck cause, cause, cause, cause; would a waterbuck cause you things? Cause things to happen? Would a waterbuck cause, cause everything? Now I'm getting a fall. That's better." [laughter]

Do you know actually there was an – were some assessments done that way here back in July, before we caught it. They were erasing every level. Now, I don't think that would be possible with this kind of list. But sailing down the line on this, you should be able to get your assessment in and get it in fairly rapidly, and with you satisfied with the accuracy of the assessment.

Now, this Auxiliary 3D Scale, given the fact that you're reading a meter, getting in the fact that you're trying to get the level well and expertly and that you've got the thing right on the front burner anyway. It's got a lot of new beef in it. There's a lot of stuff in this that is raw meat.

The earlier Primary Scale was delivered up on an idea that wasn't too successful. It was supposed to move over into a Secondary Scale. Now, you have a scale which is an Auxiliary Scale which is all one in itself, and you have murder, kill, maim, tear to pieces, exhibit,
bury, pain, wound, antagonize, bore; you've got all kinds of words in it which are your major action words.

The formula of any such thing, by the way, is reach and withdraw. They are the words which reach and enter, and withdraw and leave. And that is your formula for putting together one of these scales. And there it must be all action words; they must all be doingness words and there must be no stop words because you cannot run a stop. You can try to stop. "What would you do to stop a..." Yes, you can run that. But you couldn't run "Now, get the idea of stopping a waterbuck. Thank you. Get the idea of stopping a waterbuck." Well, that's just dandy. After a while at the end of the session, the pc has nothing but waterbucks from his face to the wall. He did what you said.

But you'll find this scale is very useful. Now, this scale, of course, comes to us in the nitch of time because we are already starting these runs and we have one pc who doesn't look quite so good today, and I think it's because she didn't have the scale earlier for her session. You might have found something much hotter on the scale. But you'll find it tomorrow and it will be something like, "How would you sexually satisfy a waterbuck?" [laughter, laughs] I say it's a raw-meat scale.

Well, anyway, this scale, this scale could go on forever, and it might even get a few words longer, however, you'll notice there are quite a few words missing on the Pre-Have. That's because nobody ever fell on them. And by deletion we've lost a few words but we've added a tremendous more.

I will ask you that if you have somebody flat on this entire scale and it becomes necessary to you – either here or anywhere else – and it becomes necessary for you to look up in Hartrampff's Vocabularies or look up in a sheaf of the old Secondary Scales and find a new level or two that you don't have – if it becomes necessary for you to dream up a level for the pc because all these levels are run – would you please, please remember to send me the level you had to dream up. Okay?

And in that way, we will eventually, down the years, exactly crowd them all in, one way or the other; anything that any case would fall on. And if you will carefully, carefully, carefully preserve these Auxiliary Pre-Have 3D Scales, one for a pc. Put it in the pc's folder and use it for the pc, and use different symbols for each time you assess – different symbols, I don't care what they are there. You use a little half-circle, a half-circle open at the top, a half-circle open at the bottom, a half an X, a full X and there are several alphabets you haven't used for words; there's cuneiform – and if you'll preserve those and when it's all washed up, I will be able to lay my hands on some of these, we'll find out if there are any null levels in this thing. Are there any levels nobody has ever gotten run on? And then of course we can delete those and it will shorten the list.

It's in your interest to have the list as short as it can possibly be kept. Okay?

All right. Well, we got this out at the break of dawn; use it from here on. Don't use your old 3 – your old Routine 3 and earlier Prehave Scales. Just abandon those things because they're – they're not dangerous, they're just not complete. And you'd do much better with these.
I may be able to compartment this at tone levels. I may be able to get it into various tone levels so that you only have to – after you've gotten rid of a section of it, you don't have to reassess across that section again. You know, segment it somehow or another. Get rid of parts of it. I don't know quite how I'm going to do that. That's all in the future.

Right now you've got this and it does work, and you've got 3D and it does work. You've got E-Meters and they work. And your Instructors and me are going to make doggone sure that you work them. And as we used to say in innumerable wars down the last 200 trillion years: We'll be out of the trenches before Christmas.

Thank you.
HAVINGNESS

A lecture given on 28 November 1961

Okay. Well, amongst those present we have people who have from time to time heard me make this lecture. It always comes as a vast amazement that this particular item gets forgotten. Havingness. What's the date?

Audience: 28th.

All right. You're up in present time, thanks for bringing me up there. It's November 28, 1961 and this is a lecture on Havingness.

Now, I can see one or two or three or four or five who have all of a sudden have heard me over the past six or seven years all of a sudden say, "What! You mean you've forgotten Havingness?" It's because I have, of course. And then I bring it to your attention with a thud that Havingness has an enormous importance and that you must run enough Havingness on pcs and then we go into a big spurt on the subject of Havingness and then in very short order everybody forgets Havingness. I forget Havingness. You forget Havingness. They skip Havingness. And there we are.

Unfortunately, in the first Saint Hill, we allied Havingness to Confront. And the two have been together. Havingness and Confront have been together. They don't belong together. Havingness belongs all by itself when you're running something else because the something else is the confront.

Now, that's the first point that you should remember. If you're running a subjective process upon the pc, the objective process is Havingness. In other words, it isn't true that Confront is the only subjective process in the world.

Havingness is the adjunct to any subjective process and Havingness is itself. It is itself and it belongs hand in glove with all subjective processes.

Now, I've just glanced at somebody right now who hasn't had enough Havingness run and it's one of those jump conclusions. You all of a sudden say, "Now, let me see. Let me see. Let's see." And I figure out extraordinary solutions, you see. And we figure out what is it now. "Is it this, it's that," and so on.

And for many years, it has always come back to, "What? Havingness! Nobody's running Havingness. Uhhhh. What do you know?" And then things go along smoothly for another month or two. Until we forget it again.

Actually, we keep havingness in, I suppose, for about six months before it evaporates again. And then it usually stays evaporated for something on the order of about six months to a year before we bring it up again. It's quite interesting.
I wish to call it to your attention that havingness keeps going out in processing as well as on the pc. In the technology of processing, don't you see, we ourselves get so interested in the subjective difficulties of the pc that we run our own havingness down. That is to say technically as the auditor.

We sit there, you see, and we say, "Now, what is this modifier?"

"Oh, it couldn't possibly be, but here it is. Ho-ho-ho-ho."

And we're just getting in there, you see and we're very interested about the whole thing and everything's going along marvelously and the tone arm's pretty stuck, but that won't bother you much fixing that. Now, let's see now. All right. Now, let's get that G plus M. Ah, that's the thing. Let's get it there, you know. Boy, I don't know. Can't read the E-Meter, but otherwise everything's going along fine, see.

Why can't you read the E-Meter? Why is it stuck?

Well, there's two reasons it's stuck. ARC brrreaks can get so furious that they do not register on the meter. And thereafter, nothing registers on the meter. In other words, the auditor loses his command value over the pc.

All right. We take some – here's the example. Now, this is about havingness, but it's also got to be about ARC breaks because these are the two things that go hand in glove.

All right. We have two people standing there and we have a pc. Now, neither one of these two people is the pc's auditor, see. Neither one. One is the fellow who stole his wife. Ha-ha-ha. Years ago, you see. And stole his wife and busted up his marriage and he's always detested him ever since. That's one of these fellows, you see. And the other one is a good friend of his. Now, we have the third party on the E-Meter. And the fellow who stole his wife says to him, "Are you withholding anything?" And we get no registry.

And the fellow who's his best friend says, "Are you withholding anything?" and we'll get a registry.

The fellow who stole his wife says, "Have you told me any lies?" and we get no registry.

And the fellow who is his friend says, "Have you told me any lies?" Same tone of voice, see. And we get a registry. You see that?

Now, the pc who has a severe ARC break – a very severe ARC break – hasn't got a friend in the world including the MEST universe. Everything has gone out. And Havingness is a wonderful entrance point in for an ARC breaky pc because he's always in a games condition when he goes into this condition. He won't let anybody else have any command value over him of any kind whatsoever.

He is in a games condition. He has ceased to be part of the group. And the first and foremost part of a games condition is not permitting the other fellow to have anything. So frankly, all you would have to do, basically, to get an ARC situation mended up would be to run Havingness. Isn't that interesting?
Well, it's a – it's a wild mechanism because, frankly, if this fellow who stole his wife were to run Havingness on him for awhile, he might run it. And if he did run it, you'd get a registry on the meter of some sort or another. He might even come to the conclusion she was no good anyway. See? He might even come to an agreement.

But let's look at this again. Here we have the fellow who stole his wife. And here we have his best friend. And here we have the third party on the E-Meter. And the E-Meter will not register on the person who has no command value over the pc. You know, you could just roll on the floor with laughter at the thinking of all of these cops who have been training like mad up at the Keeler institute. The Keeley institute, you know, is the one where they cure drunks, you know. And the Keeler institute is the one where they teach lie detecting and make them.

A Keeler lie detector costs $18,000. It is 1/1,000th as good as your E-Meters. But they have thousands and thousands and thousands of graduates. And the lie detectors don't work. And courts have learned this. They've hanged enough people now and jailed enough people who didn't do it to find out that the lie detector in some hands is very unreliable. Horrible joke.

It won't tell any lies. It does nothing but tell lies. Who knows what it does. It frankly just doesn't register. There are two hundred cops in the United States operating – they are actually ID men, usually very, very highly paid specialists, who can operate one of these great big Keeler lie detectors. two hundred men. And they think it is a peculiar knack. It's a knack.

Well, the psychiatrists – you know, they – no psychiatrist will argue with you about the fact that I can probably process people – psychiatrize them. Because I have a knack.

I always argue about this thing called a knack. If anybody's got a knack, it has mechanics and it is understandable and it is acquirable. It's a good safe basis on which to travel and then you won't go around thinking about knacks. It means that two hundred cops have the ability to go into ARC with criminals. And that's all it means. And that, of course, becomes very understandable to you. Naturally, there are thousands and thousands of cops that can't go into ARC with anybody. And really, actually, it's a rare cop that could go into ARC with somebody. So naturally they only have two hundred, two hundred operators out of the tens of thousands they've graduated out of that institute. Becomes understandable, doesn't it? Because these fellows who can make it operate have a command value over the person they're testing.

In other words, somehow or another, they can get into ARC with them and they don't know how it's done. They know none of the mechanics of it. They don't know anything about the mind. They think it registers the brain and perspiration. And there it is. There's two hundred of them can make a lie detector operate and there are tens of thousands of them who can't.

Now, that tells you something about the E-Meter. The E-Meter has a hole in it. And the hole in the E-Meter is simply this: It will not operate in the presence of an operator who has no faintest command value over the person who is on the machine. That is it. And that is the hole.
You could come along to somebody that hated your guts, put him on the machine and
you could say to him, "Well, have you robbed any banks? Have you eaten any pork sausage
lately? Have you told me any lies? Do you dislike me?" Even that one. No reaction on the
machine. He's talking to a blank wall.

Every faculty which this person has is alertly in present time dedicated to just one
purpose: not being under the influence of. Got the idea? Only it's ridged and it's reactive. And
the reactive bank itself is just duuuu. And the analytical mind, duuuuu. You – don't you get
the idea? I mean it's raining in Siberia. So what? No, it just means that little to him that – the
fact that this operator would ask him a question who isn't in ARC with him. See, no ARC, no
operation. That's all. So that's the hole in the meter.

So when you ask somebody, "Do you have an ARC break?" you might as well be
whistling "Dixie." If the person has a very severe ARC break with you as an auditor, you
aren't going to get any registry at sensitivity 16. Why? The person has ceased to regard you as
having any command value over him of any kind whatsoever.

So what could you err in there? Ho-ho-ho. How could you err, huh? You could say,
"Well, it doesn't show on the meter, so he doesn't have one." You could even go so far as to
say, "Well, the meter is clean. You couldn't possibly have an ARC break with me." And
there's how the E-Meter gets invalidated for people.

If you've been over a rough course of auditing and have had a rough time with an audi-
tor, the possibility is that this might have happened to you. The person says, "There can't be
an ARC break because there's no reaction here," and proceeds as though there isn't one. When
you know doggone well there is one and the meter isn't registering it. And you're liable to turn
around and say, "Well, the meter's at fault." The meter isn't registering something that's there.
Well, that is one thing the meter won't register. An extremely severe ARC break is not regis-
terable on an E-Meter. That's what it boils down to. Bang, it's not there.

So at that moment, your humanness must take over. You have to be able to look at
somebody and tell whether or not they have an ARC break.

Now, if you're of a disposition that will not permit anybody to have an ARC break
when "you are doing a good job", you're never going to be able to assess a lot of people. I
mean it's just – a lot of people sit down and you just never get any assessment on them at all. I
mean you can read everything. You can read lists, you can do it all right. You can have your
little finger cocked in the right direction, your pencil at the proper angle, E-Meter set up prop-
erly, everything proper, only you just never come up with an item. Why? You don't have any
command value over the pc. Because the E-Meter wouldn't tell you he had an ARC break and
if your disposition is such that you're damned if this person's going to have an ARC break
around you. And if you're – well, actually, old Joe – the only thing that was really wrong with
this man's auditing, he went into an absolute panic. All somebody would have to do is just
shed one tear. It didn't even have to be a very moist tear. And he'd rabbit. You'd just see him
going down the track, man, with the greyhounds baying behind. He was out of that session
faster than any rabbit ever got out of the box. Actually panic. Just practically turn white.

Well, you'll probably run into this phenomena amongst some auditors maybe at one
time or another. They – the idea that the pc has an ARC break – this ohhhhh – "he'd better not
have a misemotional ARC break. No. No. No. No ARC break. Thank you very much. Now, we're going to go on with the session and keep it all calm." You get the attitude?

Now, if a person had that attitude he, of course, would never detect humanly the fact that the pc had an ARC break.

The pc is sitting there glowering, not confronting – these are some of the symptoms – won't confront the auditor. He knows a pc with an ARC break always looks somewhere else. Won't set any goals for a session. That is not an invariable test, by the way, but it's – it's something that you should investigate. Glum, gives very shorthanded answers. And is getting no tone arm action no matter what you run or just gets a climbing tone arm which sticks.

Now, that's a bad thing for me to say because all levels at an early run of 3D – on a 3D terminal – stick. But you would get this other phenomenon moving in on you also. Tone arm's at 5. It'll stay at 5. Why?

Well, the meter's inoperative, that's why. Meter's inoperative because the pc has an ARC break. So you get no tone arm action. You get no operation of the process, your rudiments are apparently all in because the meter isn't registering on any of them. If it won't register on an ARC break and there is one, then it won't register on present time problem, room, nothing. It'll register on nothing. You see? It just goes out.

So the humanness of the auditor is necessary to check on the point of whether or not the pc seems to be cheerfully in-session – is pc seen to be audited. That's why you're going to get a shift of rudiments on this particular line. Why it's coming right up. But that's a human detection point.

Now, if you've detected that point and resolved that point, then your E-Meter operates, see.

Now, a person can make another error. A lot of people, a lot of people have already gotten the idea that they know more than the E-Meter. They sort of feel that they know more than the E-Meter. They have an idea that they can tell better what the person's terminal is or something than the E-Meter. You understand?

There's a resistance in this particular line. Well, I'll tell you exactly where that resistance is born. They know that there is something they know better than the E-Meter knows. There's something they know that the E-Meter doesn't know and they have never rationalized it out to themselves. And there is something that they know better than the E-Meter knows. But if that is squared around – that is to say they know – they know better than the E-Meter; they know whether or not this human being that they are auditing has an ARC break or is feeling cloudy or is feeling upset or is willing to be audited or not willing to be audited, they can sense the atmosphere of the session, in other words, and they know it isn't right.

Now, these people have sometimes asked the pc for an ARC break and got no registry of any kind when they knew darn well the pc had an ARC break and that the session atmosphere wasn't right. You follow that?
And so the natural conclusion is they know more than the E-Meter. Absolutely correct. They know more than the E-Meter. On a human situation of that particular character, they know more than the E-Meter. Right there on that one point of ARC break.

Now, it'd be an error for an auditor then to suppose that the E-Meter knew more than he did about an ARC break. That would be an error. But it would be an equal error to say and a dangerous one, for the auditor to believe that he knew more about what was the right terminal than the E-Meter. See? The E-Meter is rightest in its sphere and the auditor is rightest in the other sphere. Got the idea?

And if you differentiate those two things, why, life will make more sense as an auditor. You see how that is? If you have no command value over the pc, of course, the E-Meter will not operate because the E-Meter depends for its operation on your impingement upon the pc. And if you can make an impingement on the pc and you have some command value on the pc, well, the thing operates, but if the pc doesn't know you exist, you get that nonconfront that you'll see during the middle of an ARC break. The pc will look away; will not look toward the auditor. He will look up, he will look down, he will avoid the auditor's glance. Have you ever seen this?

Well, the E-Meter's right there with him, looking up, looking down and avoiding the auditor's glance.

So this person who considered they were smarter than the E-Meter, absolutely right within that sphere; they're smarter than the E-Meter. They can detect an ARC break when it exists and the E-Meter very often cannot. But if they carry that over into thinking they know more about what is the right goal and terminal of the pc than that, we get a situation which I'm having posted on your bulletin board that recently happened in California. An auditor that always knows better than the E-Meter out there found a wrong goal and terminal on somebody who was – kicked up one awful ruckus. They were busy running the wrong goal and the wrong terminal and everybody was very happy about having the wrong goal and the wrong terminal. And it was just the pc's knuckleheadedness that made him upset.

Oh, there were no casualties involved beyond the pc was practically blowing his brains out and splashing stuff through the correspondence lines and was very, very upset and another auditor, St. Hiller, got ahold of him and straightened him out. And bing, that was all set and they straightened him out and he smoothed out and everything's going along fine now. But it was hell while it happened.

And I happen to know the auditor who did this always knows more than the meter. He chose the terminal and shoved it down the pc's throat. You got the idea? You know.

His list – "Looks to me like 'a goat' is your terminal. Is it goat? We're going to run goat." God help you if anybody ever did this to you.

I can tell you because I have actually been audited up to total levels alive on the Pre-hav Scale. There wasn't one level that wasn't kicking. They were all reacting on a wrong terminal, somewhat as a test. And I'm telling you I've got a very good subjective reality on it. Er-uhhh. You don't feel like you do in 3D. 3D, you feel, well, it's ghastly – as you get the runs
it's ghastly. But there is some possibility that if it – somehow or another if I don't die in the
process, I will come out the other side.

Well, in this one you don't feel like that. There is no explanation of why you feel that
way. You haven't got any faintest notion of how you feel that bad. It's just the roofs are going
in and you're dizzy and you're this and you're that and you're the other thing.

Well, every level alive on the Prehav Scale. No, thank you. We turned around on the
other one and cooled it off to 50 – down to 57, down to 22, just bang! Bang! And that was all
right then.

I went around like that for two or three days, by the way. Coo. It should happen. I'd
been noticing this along the line, you know and it had seemed to me to be a bum show to get
the wrong one, but I didn't know quite it could be that bad. It is very bad.

I don't wish to scare you about it. The way to be relaxed about it is simply do a good
job. But don't, for heaven's sakes, ever develop a careless attitude on that one subject. Or
you'll have somebody just climbing the wall. It's very hard to pull them back, too. You can,
bu to that point, that point, Level III auditing incorrectly done is very poor show. Class III
auditing has to be done by an expert. There's no doubt about that. The fellow really has to
know his business and then everything goes along pretty well. Not otherwise.

All right. Back on this ARC break. How could you do anything else in desperation but
get the wrong terminal and the wrong level on the pc if the meter wasn't operating well.

This final desperation. You just say, "Oh, well, to hell with it. He's a goat. Bang! Run
a goat. All right. We'll run a goat. Goal: to clobber the auditor. Okay. Who would clobber an
auditor and not – and bleat? That would be obviously a goat, so we'll just run a goat."

See, if you just took 7,642 hours to get an assessment, you would long before that, you
see, have gotten in the frame of mind, well, let's find something even if it's a false thing. I'm
one who can understand this quite easily.

So it has been – it's been an important step here to put together the mechanics of ex-
actly how things don't get found. And the way they don't get found is there's an ARC break,
the meter goes out of operation because the auditor has no command value over the pc. That
would be the piece of missing nomenclature, missing technology and missing bric-a-brac that
would stand between you and a rapid assessment. You haven't detected the degree of ARC
break.

Now, in the first place, you're dealing with Homo sap. And let me assure you that
Homo sap is a very ARC broke bloke. That's how he got here. You run into some bird and
he's nattering around about auditing "You talk about auditing all the time. Oh, you Scientolo-
gists make me sick. The idea – bla-bla-bla-bla-bla." He's just saying, "I got an ARC break. I
got ARC breaks. I got ARC breaks." What's he mean. "I can't talk to anybody about my case.
And you better not talk to me about – about my talking – talking to you about the case be-
cause I know I can't talk to anybody about my case. And I've never been able to talk to any-
body about my case. And I'm not about to listen to anybody else's case and therefore, I'm in
perfectly good shape. I have to be because I'd never be able to talk to anybody about it if I
weren't."
That's what you're listening to when somebody won't listen to auditing or Scientology. That's really the whole situation. He's simply saying, "I can't talk to you about my case. I can't listen to anybody about their cases. No difficulties must ever come my way and I'm not going to tell you about any of my difficulties."

The way he phrases this of course, is, "What is Scientology? Isn't that some kind of a racket? What are you trying to do?" You know.

You could shut off such a person. We every once in a while come up with pat shutoffs. But supposing you ran into somebody and he was saying, "Well, I can't talk to anybody. You people. You people, bunch of frauds," you know and so forth. What he's really saying is, "I can't talk to anybody about the case, you know. Oh, you people are a bunch of frauds. And what are you doing with this, I mean, trying and so on. Some kind of a racket isn't it?" and so forth.

And if you just suddenly say, "Why can't you talk to anybody about your difficulties," you'd sink him, you know, just like, just like a 16-inch shell salvo into the side of a small, unprotected and unarmored tramp. It'd just stop him. Try it some time.

Somebody starts sounding off and telling you all about how bad you are and how you shouldn't be asking him any such ridiculous thing about auditing – just ask them bluntly, "What can't you talk to anybody about your difficulties?" Make them answer the question. They go half crazy on you, you know. I mean, ahhhhhh, it never occurred to him before.

Of course, what is this, first step of auditing, he had the fellow in-session.

All right. Along with this, the ARC break realization about the meter, has come another rudiment lineup which simply asks the basic definition – this is old processing by definition – just ask the fellow bluntly if he's in-session, by saying what? "Could you talk to me about your case?" Of course, that's the package statement of definition of in-session. Definition of in-session is willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case, so you just combine them in the two questions. I thought I was pretty clever when I finally figured that one.

"Would you talk to me about your case?" You're just asking him those two things in one sentence. "Will you talk to me about your case?" Bang! If he's got an ARC break, that's the last question he will answer. He can't answer that. He won't answer that.

That is the one thing that he won't want anything much to do with.

Now, you've got along with this another process that if he doesn't answer this positively, you can run this other process and you're all set. In other words, this person will go into session and the meter will start functioning and that's it.

All right. You have to run all four questions. You can't run two. We ran two or three 2s and they were – they ran all right, they ran all right but not for a real long run.

All right. Now, that area you can consider pretty well taped. You see the sense of it and you'll get a reality on it and you'll see it start operating for you. And I'm sure you'll see something on this order. You'll get a pc and you'll say, "Well, do you have an ARC break?" and so forth and there's no registry. And you're going down an opposition terminals list.
They're dangerous, opposition terminals lists anyway, you know, to a session because you're quoting and chanting every enemy the fellow ever had in his life. Hold somebody in-session while you're doing this is quite heroic, anyway, you know. And you're saying – well, the fellow's a housewife and you're saying "tradesman" you see, "children." Anything you could think of, you see, that could get in the road of this sort of thing.

You sort of dimly might possibly appear sort of an enemy yourself after you've been chanting this list long enough. Particularly if you didn't find it on the first go.

You understand that finding anything – a Sec Check question, a 3D item – finding anything on a case is more easily done the more rapidly it's done. That's one of these things. They – as the error lengthens, the difficulty increases, you know. The length of time necessary, if it is increased, the difficulty is greatly increased.

Well, so you're noticing there that you're getting just little ticks. You know, just little ticks and so on, about the width of one of these "set" dots. You're getting one of these little ticks. It's going dut, you know. Dut. When you find a live item, you know, a good, hot, live item, you know. "Do you want to kill a policeman?" Dut – dut.

Straighten out their ARC breaks. Straighten them out with the ARC Break Process 1961. Go down the same list and watch the reads. The reads increase. Well, why do the reads increase? Well, the auditor now has command value over the pc's bank. So you get an increased read, of course. Simple as that. I think you can observe that and I think you will observe that.

Now, the reason we have to talk about Havingness, the reason we have to talk about Havingness is the greatest little chewer-upper of Havingness you ever heard of is the ARC Break Process. And the greatest chewer-upper of Havingness you ever saw in your life is 3D. Oh, this has no peers. Running levels on 3Ds for Havingness – chomp, chomp, chomp, chomp, chomp, man.

I saw a Walt Disney cartoon once of a goat that somebody had. He was a small goat and he ate up everything in sight. And he ate up the farm and he ate up the fields and he ate up the fences. And finally this farmer got real smart and he took him out and he put him on the railroad track – the railroad that went from his farm to San Francisco – and headed the goat in that direction, the goat eating up the railroad track as he went. And that's kind of the way it is as far as Havingness is concerned. Man, it really gets chomped up.

In the first place the fellow doesn't want this mass that he has. But it is mass and you know a thetan's motto is: anything is better than nothing. But this mass is an introversion mass and the more you run the mass the less he's got the physical universe, so even if the mass didn't increase or decrease, if the mass just stayed the same, it is introverting him. And the more a pc introverts the less universe he has. Simple, isn't it?

So he would get the feeling of losing havingness by simply contacting some introverting thing. Something that introverted him very badly would give him the feeling of no havingness. He wouldn't have had to have lost any mass. He is surrounded by the physical universe, he's got just as much bank as he had before. It's always been there kicking his teeth in. Every time he ever got sick, this mass that you're now running out, of course, was what
moved in on him. Anytime he got pneumonia, anytime he ran fevers, anytime he did this or that or went off the rails in some other direction, it was the mass which you are handling which did it to him.

Don't be too amazed if in running 3D or something like that, you put your hand on the hot brow of the pc or – why it would seem a little bit warm. Or if you put a thermometer in his mouth you'd find he's running a temperature of 102. Don't be amazed about this. The thing to do is to handle it smoothly. Because nothing is going to happen to the pc at all if it's even vaguely well handled. It doesn't have to be perfectly handled, you understand, it just has to be vaguely well handled. You'd have to do something like, he says, "Well, I'm stuck in all this mass."

And you'd have to get up and say, "Oh, to the hell with you. I'm tired of auditing you. That's the end of the intensive as far as I'm concerned." And hit him with the chair. It'd take something of that order of magnitude to completely wind it up. Or running him on the wrong items. Running him on the wrong items would really fix his clock.

So, introversion. Well, I'll give you an idea. The person's walking along saying, "What a beautiful day. What a beautiful day. Isn't it a lovely day." And he's looking around and here's all the birds and orioles and crows and airplanes singing in the sky. And you walk up to him and you say, "Uh – what are you worried about?" And he loses it, you know and he says, "Argh. What the hell do you mean what am I worried about? What's the matter with you?" You know, ror-ror-ror-ror-ror-ror.

Now, if you were – had some method of measuring his concept of his havingness – immediately before you asked the question and immediately afterwards – you'd find his havingness would have dropped. See, he's lost the beautiful day. Well, the beautiful day hadn't disappeared. It's just his idea on whether it's there or not or whether he can keep his attention on it.

Similarly, you find this fellow sitting on a park bench and he's worrying and he's just wallowing, you know, he's worrying and he's worrying and he's worrying and he's worrying. Walk up to him and say, "Look at the beautiful day." You get the same effect. Pc's havingness at the moment is his worries, see?

So all you had to do... The formula, the formula – which I think is employed here and there – is "Anything the fellow has at the moment, tell him he's got to have something else." Anything a person's attention is on, put his attention on something else. This is an educational activity. This is how – actually it's a much more effective method than brainwashing

It's a good thing no Russian wants anything much to – I know no communist in Russia wants much to do with Scientology. It's a good thing. Because they could really brainwash people, just on the theory – now, anything the fellow's thinking about, make him think of something else, see. You wind up brainwashing somebody. In other words, the person's attention is very contentedly on his bank, why, make him look at the wall, suddenly, see. Suddenly make him look at the wall. He gets zz-zz-zz-zz. See. Or if his attention is very contentedly on the wall, suddenly make him look at his bank. You got the idea? So a sudden shift here. Now, this is one of the defeating effects of Havingness.
But, when you're running a person's ARC break and he's all out of ARC with you, he wants to go out of the session. He's thinking about – well, at first he starts thinking about he isn't getting auditing and then the next thing he's thinking about – he sort of thinks he probably ought to put his attention on something else. And then the next thing he is thinking about, is actually, physically leaving session. He thinks he ought to just pull up himself by his coat collar and walk out.

If you could catch him at the point when he just thinks he ought to be thinking about something else, to run Havingness, you of course are complementing exactly what he is doing. He's looking around the room. Well, show it to him.

The second you did that, you would get command value on the meter and could therefore straighten out what's wrong with him.

I mean, he's already looking around the room thinking he ought to leave session. That's a very extreme case, you see. Well, if you ran Havingness at that particular time, you would heal the ARC break. That's a very smooth way to handle it because of course you've taken over the control of his attention and he moves right straight back into session very nicely because he actually runs out what you were doing.

Almost any pc run long enough on Havingness will get all of his rudiments in. Isn't that fascinating. The earliest rudiment process, by the way, at the time they're called rudiments was "Was it all right to audit in this room? Was it all right for me to audit you?" That was more or less the gist of it. That isn't the exact wording.

And we're right back there again. We've moved back all those years back to 15th Street in Washington. And just on that, what is a rudiment? Well, of course, we're not asking it with that degree of simplicity. But we are asking, "Well, is it all right – would you talk to me about your case?" and we're going to find out how his havingness is. See. Or we're going to find out how his havingness is and then going to say, "... talk to me about your case," you know. That probably is the proper order.

Person's attention is on the physical universe. Bring him from the physical universe down into the session, rather than flick it out of the session.

Now, what's this amount to? This amounts to this: that Havingness is that activity which is run when needed and when it will not violently deflect the pc's attention.

I'll give you an example of that. Pc's sitting there and saying, "Wow, you don't really suppose, you don't really suppose I – hey, you know, this is pretty bad. I thought I've been going down all through the years being a good boy and here I actually find – no, I don't know."

And, he's dealing with the possibility he might have shot somebody or murdered somebody at some time or another, you know. And he's just all intrigued with this and uh ...

You say, "All right. Look around here and find out something you could have. Thank you. Look around here and find out something you could have."

He says, "What? What?"

Too heavy a shock, flick of attention, see.

Similarly, the person is running, all of a sudden, very well on Havingness; they're just starting to find out that there is a room there and the mass is releasing and you say, "All right, now, let's get to the bank."

See, both of those are errors. Person is looking around and saying, "Well, I could have that piece of fluff. And I could have a corner of this piece of paper and I could have the end of my nose."

And you say, "Squeeze the cans," he does. Looser. You say, "All right, let's get back into session now. Let's – let's get going on this other thing."

And he had just at that moment begun to wonder if there was a room there, don't you see? And he never gets a chance to complete the thought of "Is there a room there?" He wouldn't have completed it for another three or four commands, at least, you see.

So observing these factors, Havingness can do some marvelous things, but neglecting them, it can really, really upset people. But of all processes – don't let me startle you about Havingness or say it's dangerous in any way – of all processes, the safest process to run on anybody, anyplace at any time is their right Havingness Process. And that is the – always the safest process to run.

You can always run the Havingness Process on the most ARC breaky and upset pc. You can always run a Havingness Process on somebody who was almost totally spun in. You can run a Havingness Process on somebody who was badly injured. You can run a Havingness Process on somebody who hasn't eaten, hasn't slept and is going psychotic right in front of your eyes. You could run a Havingness Process on anybody almost at any time. And it is the safest process to run.

It cannot be overrun. Don't ever be cautioned into believing that it can be. It cannot be overrun. I'll tell you what overrunning and underrunning a Havingness Process is in just a moment.

But let us take the situation of – the pc comes into session. He has bounteous and peculiar present time problems. They are all there, all ready to leap up on the meter and give you one God-awful mess of a time. His rudiments are wildly out when he comes into session. He has ARC breaks. He doesn't know whether he's going or went. And you're going to sit him down and you're going to go all the way through the rudiments. You're going to straighten out every single rudiment on its own merits. Wouldn't you love a better way to get this out of the road? Huh? Wouldn't you love a better way to get this out of the road? Or, so when you did hit them, they blew. Wouldn't that be nice?

Well, ask the room question first and your humanness – consult your humanness, not the meter. Ask the room question first. Aw, let him set some goals for the session or something like that, anything, you know. And at that moment decide whether or not this pc is in
any kind of shape to be audited. Decide that at the moment – decide that right now, you see, at that point. And if he's not in any kind of shape to be audited, by your adjudication, your humanness – you say, "Ah, set goals for session?"

"Ah, I guess so and so on."

"Would you like session goals for life and livingness?"

"Well, I guess no, I don't set goals for life and mmmmmmmmmmm..."

Or, "Do you want to set some goals for life and livingness?"

"Yes, I'd love to. If I could think of any." Or something like this, you know.

All right. That's your indicator to run Havingness. Not the ARC Break Process, Havingness. Clank. Why? How did it all get caved in on him anyway, huh? He's been going around thinking worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, interiorized, interiorized, introversion, introversion, introversion; of course he's got more, more and more and more PT problems, of course he's got more and more of them. He's been looking inside until he's cross-eyed. See, looking in and looking back under his ear and he's been looking under his right eyelid and been peering into the dark abysses and masses of it all and so forth. He's badly interiorized.

Well, the probability is he's interiorized on things that have nothing to do with what you want to have happen in the session. He is worried about his wife and his terminal is a riding master.

The opposition terminal of a riding master is a fox. And we're going to run wife on him, are we? Not smart. We have a present time problem? "Yes I have a present time problem. Yes, I was up all night arguing with my wife."

Now, we're going to say to him, "Well, all right, okay. How do you feel about it now?" Clank. Oh, Christ, here we go up in smoke. Why? It's his wrong terminal. It's his wrong everything. He's having an argument with the wrong terminal.

You say, "Now look, during this intensive, for God's sakes, please only get into fight with foxes." [laughter, laughs] "If you've got to beat somebody, beat a horse, so we can run it out. But knock off this beating your wife. Just for the duration of the intensive." I don't think you could do that. I don't think you could do that.

Anyway, no, a smart thing to do is never collide with this PT problem at all. See, just never collide with it, never pay any attention to it, at this time. Sets his goals, we decide, well, rudiments are out, we decide, our sensitivity, our swamishness, our ability to telepath across vast distances, all of these various things. That's – here we go. They're out, something tells me.

Or just for the hell of it or just because you were running a lot of introvertive stuff last session, see, doesn't have to be any very pat reason, but you just say, "Well, we're not going to go down the rest of all those rudiments and run into all these problems and straighten that out today. Today we're going to get something done." And the way we're going to get something done today is the moment the pc says, "Oh, well, goals for life or livingness, ohhhh, can you think of any for me?"
You say, "Well good, all right. Now, look around the room and see if you can have anything. All right. That's fine. All right."

And the pc's Havingness Process is "Throw – get the idea of throwing mud at that wall. Thank you," you know or whatever it is – first command right there, see. Didn't matter whether the meter reacted or didn't react. Because you're way in ahead of your ARC Break Process, you haven't even brought up the subject of ARC breaks. You just decided they were probably – they probably existed. They probably would exist, you decided your meter probably wouldn't operate well or you decided that the pc was getting too darned interiorized and you're tired of that tone arm going up and sticking that heavy every session. Anything you decided, it didn't matter what.

And you just run Havingness. And you go ahead and run Havingness. And that's what I want to tell you about in this lecture, with all these other things that have come up newly, I should tell you something "oldly," which you might very well have handsomely managed to park under the wrong brain cell, mislaid it.

Havingness ain't run against the can squeeze. It's run against a pc's ability to have large objects in the room. Havingness is tested on a can squeeze. You don't need a meter to run Havingness beyond testing to find out what is the pc's Havingness Process.

Now, once you can find the pc's Havingness Process, you're all set. It's whether or not the pc can have large objects in the room. And this again, we're up here in the human equation. You always run Havingness till pc can have a large object in the room or many large objects in the room.

And you don't stop running Havingness when the pc says, "Well, that little spot of paper there, I can have that. And I can have a corner, well, that's pretty big, I can't have that. I could have the shimmer on this screw here on the E-Meter. Uhh-ahh, I could have that sigh. I could have the back of my head. I could have sensation in my toe. That's about all. Oh, yeah, I think I could – yeah, I've got a slight toothache, I could have have that, have a toothache, yeah."

"Well, squeeze the cans. Good. Oh, that's looser now. All right, we'll go on."

You see, when you were running Confront – this is why I'm telling you Havingness got mixed up with Confront – when you were running Confront, that is all the Havingness you needed, to run Confront. Now, the old rules of Havingness have gone astray because of these Confront Processes. And when you're running Havingness independent of actual, the companion Confront Processes, you don't run it this way at all. You run it against the largest object in the room.

You want to find out if it's the right process and you want to check that every now and then. But by every now and then I mean once or twice or three times a week, let's check it somewhere in the session. Let's run a few commands of it and check it. "Oh well, his Havingness Process is still working." You got the idea? That's all you want to know.

Now, the workingness of the process, in actual handling of Havingness, is whether or not he can have large objects in the room. That's it. There is no other thing. That is then
enough Havingness. Now, you can leave the process. And don't leave the process until he can have large objects. And that's the rule of large objects on Havingness.

Now, when you're running it with regard to confront, you actually could practically, you could run large sections of case with the Have-Confront, you see. That Have-Confront system is a marvelous system; it's all by itself. It is a system. It – and havingness got loaned to it. Remember Havingness isn't residual in this system. Havingness is itself.

The old HCO Bulletin October 6, 1960 took these all together and put them together as Havingness and Confront. It still gives you all these Havingness Processes. But when I'm talking about running Havingness, I'm not talking about running Havingness and Confront. I'm talking about running Havingness, just itself, only. And yes, you've got to have the right Havingness Process for the pc. Yes, you've got to test – you've got to find it by can squeeze. It's got to loosen the needle on a can squeeze. If it's not, if it doesn't, why, it is the wrong Havingness Process and will wind up with him looking inside of his skull. It won't wind up with him looking out at the room. So you find it by can squeeze.

You don't find it by also testing the Confront. You just find the Havingness Process. Now, having found it and having used it a session or two, the smart thing to do is run three or four commands of it and test it again to find out if it's still working. But, you understand that running with this, only a few commands of it were necessary to get the individual to have the confront work again. This is a different system. That's a different system. This havingness is itself.

So, all right, we start the session, we "Look around the room, see if you can have anything?" The individual says – we don't care what the command was. We look at him, we find out he's sort of out of sorts, he doesn't look too good to us. He looks rather secondhand.

All right, what a wonderful thing to do right away is just don't even start a long series of questions about it. Set his goal for life or livingness, "Well, yes. Still be here at the end of the session." [laughter]

"That's your goal for life or livingness. Any goals for life or livingness?"

"Well, no, I guess not then."

Well, that would be a very extreme case. Your next action, smile brightly and say, "Well, now. All right." You got to know the pc's Havingness Process: "Throw mud at the wall. Thank you."

So you say, "All right, now. Going to run a little bit of Havingness here. All right. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you. Throw mud at the wall. Thank you."

Well now, running that process we can't tell very well whether he can have any large objects or not, unless we occasionally ask him, "How much wall are you hitting?" [laughter] And you'll find inevitably, he'd say, "Just a little piece."

And when he finally says "the whole wall," well, all right, that's fine. All right, that's fine. That's enough Havingness. Right then, that's enough Havingness.
Now, you can tell if a Havingness Process is working because the tone arm goes up on this type of havingness run and blows down. It goes up and then blows down. And that's the original where you got blowdown, where that -- where that term came from, is by running Havingness. You can always get a blowdown with Havingness, if it's the right process. Of course just before it blows down, sometimes, the pc feels like he's being killed slowly between two gigantic bricks, but it will blow down.

By running the Havingness, you know, the bank is sort of... Tension is coming off of things and things are changing and he feels very uncon -- and he "what wall" and he's fooling around and then all of a sudden, why, immediately he all of a sudden says, "Oh, well, yes, I could have the whole ceiling." Bang, it blows down. Pow! That is the behavior of a tone arm on a Havingness Process, if it's the right process. Quite valuable to know, isn't it.

Well, on some of these processes, how you are going to follow the rule of the large object is up to you, because I'm not going to sit here and give you a pat solution for every one of them. In the first place, you'd never remember them. But that isn't the real reason -- is I never would. I'd never remember the solutions I gave you here because I don't need them.

When I see a pc who doesn't have his havingness up, I don't have to consult any rules because he looks like somebody who doesn't have his havingness up. He behaves in that fashion. There's nothing very esoteric about it. He is picky and choosy. And a person who's havingness is up is bangy, see, all pow and pow and pow and pow and pow. And the person whose havingness is way down is -- cautious -- maybe -- I guess. There's a vast difference in the attitude. It is a wild difference. It's not hard to detect at all.

Individual gets a certain look in his eye when he starts looking around to have things. That's not the time to stop the process. But he starts sitting back and relaxing a little bit and he's not much worried about his case and so forth or anything and he feels he's in good hands. Along about that time -- that feeling generates the same time, "Well, I could have that bookshelf and I could have the fireplace, I could have the chimney, I could have the wall, I could have, have the room."

Well obviously, he could -- little, big, big, big, bigger, bigger, he could have quite big objects. All right, he can have a large object.

"Okay, is it all right with you if I give you two more commands and end this process?" Pang-pang-pang. He's happy to have you do it, there's no ARC breaks messed up in it.

Now, you should know a few of the facts of life -- is that havingness runs the bank. And the reason why you don't run havingness to any large quantity while running the thirty-six processes in the preessions, is because the confront was running the bank and you didn't want the havingness running the bank if the confront was going to run the bank. You understand?

This was senseless. The confront would run the bank much faster than the havingness would run the bank, you see. So it was silly to run very much havingness with it. You just ran enough havingness with it to keep his attention flexible and so forth and went back to the confront to get something done.
Well now, the havingness I'm talking to you about comes directly, intimately and immediately out of this list of thirty-six new preessions. It's the Havingness Processes and they are all by themselves. They are themselves. And they are in order of frequency on pcs.

The confront, scratch it out. You're not going to use it. You're not going to have anything to do with it. Why? What are you using for confront? You are using Sec Checking, using Problem Intensives. You're using 3D. For heaven's sakes, you're using all kinds of assessments that are reaching into his bank with red-hot pokers. Why do you want a confront? That's enough confront for anybody.

I'll tell you, the pc in the first throes of confronting his terminal goes between rage and extreme pleasure and horror and he vacillates, man. He's got enough there to confront without you saying, "What could you confront?"

He'd tell you every time. You've just got through assessing a ditch digger on him and he says, "Well, I could confront. I could confront a ditch. I could confront a digger. I could confront a ditch digger. I could confront a – a ditch, a ditch digger."

That would be about the way it is. But you're asking him to do all this and you're asking for all these Confront Processes anyway.

No. The depth of reach is accompanied by a reduction of havingness. That is, his awareness and so forth is being shifted so that it requires a rather heroic remedy. And it requires a real remedy. Just as it is extreme in the degree of what you're reaching in the reactive mind, so it requires an extreme remedy.

And that is you've got to run havingness just as it's supposed to be run. No, no hunt and punch. If you're going to start running havingness on the pc, run it to the rule of the largest objects.

There are large objects in view, when the pc can have those, why that's it. Well, how you are going to determine whether or not he can have it with some of these things, I don't know. But that's your problem. You think for a while. You've been wearing me out the last eighteen days, so – I'll just leave you that one. You can figure that one out yourself. How you can apply the rule of the largest object to "What beingness around here could you confront?" you know. Pretty tough. Actually that's not a very good Havingness Process unless you're auditing in a mass room – with masses of people or you're auditing it by a window or you're in the middle of a railroad station, there it's a good one. But sitting in a room all by yourself on a desert island, self-auditing it, it wouldn't be very workable.

All right. But it's enough havingness. Now, it's going to run the bank. Now, don't get upset about this, it's going to run the bank. The pc is going to go out of PT and back into PT. And this is signalized by what would seem to you to be dope off, but isn't. The pc can see, but not look, if you could imagine this.

You make mistakes with this just on this basis: the pc looks like he's a gone dog, so you stop the process. Pc's sitting there and the pc's going, "Btha-btha."

You say, "What wall could you confront?"

Pc says, "Btha-btha."
And then pretty soon the pc – you say, "What wall could you confront?"

Pc ... he looks like he's out cold.

You know, he'll get madder than hell at you if you stop the command. Because he's
doing it. He's doing it. He's doing every command.

You'll get some guy on the basis of what could he have, well he could have the hair on
the back of his head. He's answering, sort of. He gets so totally interiorized while doing the
process, don't you see, that he can't see even as far out as his eyeballs. And he can actually get
to a point of where he can have a sensation inside his neck. Or he can have a little something
inside of one temple. He can't have that wall. You're demanding too much of him.

So you just keep on running the process and the rule is, it's a very clean-cut rule, that
no matter what happens to the pc during a Havingness Process, you keep running the process
until he is back amongst us. You always continue to run a Havingness Process. That's the sec-
ond most important rule in it. One is the rule of the largest objects. Large objects of the room.
You've got to have the large objects. Pc has to be able to embrace them or see them, experi-
ce them, do what he's doing with them.

And the other one is, you must continue to give him the Havingness command at the
same rate that he has been answering it as before. But the rate is not as important as the fact
that you must continue to give him the Havingness command, whatever it is, no matter what
the pc does with his eyeballs.

Now, a pc can somewhat get into trouble, sometimes on havingness, by having things
he can't see with his eyes. He is facing in this direction and he keeps saying he can have
things in back of him with his eyes sort of glassy. Well, I don't quite know what to do about
this, to tell you the truth. Because I've had it happen, I've run that way and so forth. I've never
had anything very desperate happen. But if a pc looks too much without looking, you know,
he's having things he can't see, there's a possibility that he's having bank. And when he's hav-
ing bank, his havingness goes down, not up.

But it's a lesser chance. If it happens that the pc's havingness apparently is decreasing
while he is running the process it may be because he's simply having bank. He's having things
behind him – you can tell all the time what he's doing – or he's having things in the next room
or he's having things on Venus or he's having things in London and he is being audited in
Brighton. And, ware shoal. Don't necessarily stop the pc cold, but just become wary.

Because pcs do this: you won't believe it until you've seen it. The first time an individ-
ual runs into this one and knows it for sure, it's a shock. To know that a person can actually
have been going around in life, this whole lifetime, without ever having seen any part of the
physical universe. That is always a shock. When you get a – when you get an actual reality on
it and you know that that's really true. Pc never sees that shelf over there. He puts up a picture
of the shelf. Which is a varied shelf, by the way. And he sees the picture of the shelf and he
never sees the shelf.

It's a shock. It's a hard thing to believe. This fellow's been driving cars. The state has
issued him licenses to drive, everything else. He's never seen a road. He has always a picture
of the road under the wheels of the picture of wheels, you see, while he holds on to a picture
of a steering wheel, while he picturesquely picturizes down through the country lanes, at 90 miles an hour. It gives one to think.

It's worse than this though. Is how in the name of common sense has he ever had depth perception. Well the truth of the matter is, he hasn't. He hasn't. He's always reaching for the ashtray two inches short and then correcting himself. He sort of – you'll see by his actions. You'll see it, it's very often, very plainly marked. I turned on a person's sight one time who was blind. They were blind, but could get a hazy picture of things. And I turned on this person's sight so they could see quite well and it didn't take them but a few hours to get it off again. It was too unnerving. They could see a faint shadow of things and then they could see the thing. And it was much safer to see a faint shadow of it than to see it.

But it threw their depth perception all out and they didn't know which one to reach for because they were in different locations. There was the faint, faint shadow of it, you see. They were blind for all intents and purposes. But there was still this faint shadow. And they'd been very dependent on this faint shadow and it had been very, very safe. It had never fallen in and knocked their eyes out or anything of the sort. There it was, it was very safe, little tiny faint shadow.

All of a sudden why, see, the thetan, the person as a thetan, started seeing. And started seeing things actually and it scared them half to death. See, that wasn't safe. That was why they were blind, of course. And I didn't run out the reason why the person was blind, I simply turned on the person's sight. I've done it to two or three blind people. They, by the way, get their sight off within an hour, two hours. They'll see brilliantly they – what? and they're – you know, go around and then all of a sudden they'll decide that the wall is too white or the curtains are too red or they will decide something else about the whole thing and they pull the switch. So if you think there is – and they get real nasty about it afterwards, too.

There are no medals to be won in restoring sight unless you have restored first the willingness to see.

So, where the individual is running a Havingness Process, they sometimes discover this. And the reason you have different Havingness Processes is there are different degrees of perception. And I'm telling you just one of the bugs of perception. In other words, the wall is never there but a picture of the wall is there. They see the picture, they never see the wall.

All right, such a person obviously runs very poorly on a sight havingness, but would much – do much better with a tactile havingness. You know, feel the wall. You improve their havingness. "Look around here and find something you'd be willing to feel." And have them walk around and grab ahold of things. Repair their havingness.

But you could detect, now, something else about this, you could detect that if there are thirty-six of these things, there must be a lot more. Dick and Jan, after class, we were putting together peoples' Havingness Process and so on and they'd come in and I'd suggest Havingness Processes to them and they'd rehash them over and they'd remember old processes we had and something and I'd – we'd write them down and so forth and issue them and so on and test them out and they'd work on some and they wouldn't work on the others. And we had quite a ball.
And it was a very valuable piece of work that was done by that particular class. They've never really gotten the credit for it. But it was valuable. That was the 1st Saint Hill.

Now, if there are thirty-six of them, there are probably just as likely to be a hundred and thirty-six. We've not found it necessary, however, to use many of these. Do you know that there are quite a few of these on the end of the list that are simply on the end of the list because they have never been needed. There's hardly anybody doesn't find his Havingness Process before he gets to the end of the list. And we've never found it so. So as a result, why, there it is. I've forgotten where it starts, but it starts rather early. I think it's something on the order of twenty or twenty-two or something like that. And we've never used the rest of them to amount to anything, but because we never needed them.

But as you go down the list, by testing the various Havingness Processes on the pc, you will find something that will remedy the pc's havingness. Well, now the next time you test the pc – that Havingness Process goes out in use and we have to have another Havingness Process, well don't necessarily start at the point you left off or start at the beginning, just find a Havingness Process out of this list and if you ran to the unimaginably unimaginable thing you could dream up some sort of a Havingness Process that would still remedy havingness that had to do with the room and the environment and so forth, that would remedy the pc's havingness.

The easiest way to do it is to take this – an awful lot of research work went in on this particular thirty-six Havingness Processes and the easiest way to do is to go down the list and you test each one. And you only give the command about five times, something on that order, very few times. And you just get the person into session and – indifferently into session – and then you just say, "Well, we're just going to test Havingness Processes here," and you just have him squeeze the cans, hold the cans relaxedly in his lap.

Always make sure that the tests are made with the same can posture, because with these – with these small aluminium cylinders, a person's skin can be off of them and when they're tightened up, the crush-back of the skin on can be different every time you test and you'll go mad, you won't know which is which and so forth.

The American tin can has an advantage over these things, just in that respect only.

So, anyway, you go down the line and you just run it and of course the most obvious and the oldest one, "Look around here and find something you could have," is of course number one on the list. Not because it's – not because it's always going to be it for your pc, but because it would be so nice if that were it because it will stay in a long time and everything is fine.

So you just give that to him, "Look around here and find something you could have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you could have." You see, you've done a can squeeze, now you've run this five times, now, you ask him to put his hands in his lap and squeeze the cans again. And you've loosened the needle.

Well, if you've loosened the needle, why you've got it right there. You're all set. But you better run a check, better run a check. Let's run it twelve commands now and see if it still loosens the needle. Run a second check on the thing.
All right, you say, well that's dandy and we've got it and we've got it nailed. That's the pc's Havingness Process.

But if it tightened the needle, that is to say if you got less of a drop the second test, you of course would go on at once to the next one. Now, don't go lingering around waiting for it to tighten the thing up to a coiled spring. This again is most successfully done the most rapidly done. The faster you find it, the easier it is to find.

So you ask for a can squeeze, you give him five commands. You ask for a can squeeze. That's either it or it's not it. It's it if it loosened up the needle. That is to say, the needle dropped further the second test of can squeeze than it did the first time. That is all. The first time it dropped a fifth of a dial. Next time it dropped a half a dial. Oh, man, have you got it. That's the Havingness Process. That is all there is to it. Do a check out on the thing. Mark it down on the report. That's the pc's Havingness Process. You've got it right now.

All right. Can squeeze only gives a fifth-of-a-dial drop and you say, "Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you." Five times and you say, "All right. Squeeze the cans again." Eighth-of-a-dial drop. You say, "Thank you very much." No randomness here, see. Don't put any randomness in at that point. Particularly don't put any in. Because you're on dangerous ground. You just run his havingness down with the process.

So you say very rapidly, you say, "Well, thank you very much." You don't ask him for another can squeeze. You already know it's going to drop an eighth of a dial, see? You go right on. You say, "We're testing another one now. Point out something in this room you could confront. Thank you. Point out something in this room..." You go on and give him that. "All right. Squeeze the cans." Clang. Sixteenth-of-a-dial drop. You say, "Well, that's fine." Don't look dismayed at that point. We'll run you sometime on, "What dismay have you suppressed?" [laughter, laughs] "To whom could you show and exhibit dismay." A professional auditor process.

Now, you look at this next one and you say, "Well, hell, there's only us in the room. Skip it." You get the idea. And you get the next process and you just test it out like that, see, it's very rapid. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Process. Can squeeze. Ha – process, a-ha. Check. That's it. Now, we got it. Dandy, dandy, dandy. And we mark that thing down. And then the next time that we are confronted with any randomness of any kind whatsoever – such as loss of havingness toward the end of session or something of this sort – we got the process.

All right. But supposing you were checking for a Havingness Process and you found a Havingness Process and your p – and it checked out and everything is fine. What would be your next step in an actual session? Because you've got now time to burn in the session. This is a practical consideration. That is to say, you were going to do something else, too, in this session. Well, I would now get the session started. You know how I would start the session? I don't care whether you set goals before you did the havingness test or not. But if you've got the goals, you're going to run havingness. If you haven't got the goals, you're going to set goals and get the havingness. In other words, that's all. And you're going to run havingness.
And run it to the large object rule. You're going to get this pc's havingness right on up. Because if it was difficult to find his Havingness Process, then you can be sure that his havingness is shot to hell. And that the fastest, easiest thing you can do to get rudiments in across the board is to run his havingness.

All right. After you've got the pc's – in any session now – you've got the pc's havingness, anytime you get the session whizzing with the Havingness Process, you go in and go through the rest of your rudiments. And you say, "Well, could you talk to – do you feel you could talk to me about your case?" Or whatever the rudiments question is. "Good. Do you have any withholds? Do you have any present time problems? All right, this is what we are going to do." And the funny part of it is, you're going to find very few of them. You won't find any ARC breaks. It's no use asking for them, anyhow. Oh, you could ask for an ARC break. Don't forget it entirely.

But the point I'm making here is, you've minimized the number you are going to get. The pc is in a games condition with you because his havingness is down. That's simple. If his havingness is down, he's going to be in a games condition with you. Well, why should he be in a games condition with you? All you do is put his havingness in and he's not in a games condition with anything, so therefore his rudiments are in. This is a very fast, simple way of getting rudiments in. And now rudiments can be checked with care. Rudiments can be easily checked because your meter registers better.

Now, of course, if the pc said, "No, I can't talk to you about this case." You just remedied his havingness and so forth. I think it would be very rare. I just don't think it would happen, he would suddenly say to you, "No, I couldn't tell you anything about my case. It's very, very secret and it's very, very private and it's very, very this and it's very, very that." Well, of course, you've got your ARC Process.

Now, the ARC Process is very demanding of havingness. So when you see that the pc's tone arm is getting pretty confoundedly cotton-pickin' sticky, let him cycle into PT or let him have a good cognition and acknowledge hell out of it and run some havingness so that you run it at a point you won't give him a bad start.

See, don't put him way down the bank someplace with the ARC Process and then all of a sudden, "Hah! Here's a good chance to scare the hell out of him. Look at that wall!"

He'd be, "What? What? What wall? There's no wall here amongst us infantrymen."

No. Wait till he cycles up to PT. Wait till he has a cognition. He frees up a little bit on his attention. Or he's all of a sudden – appears to come out of something for a moment or he appears to be regarding you in some peculiar way that he hasn't before. Some change has occurred of some sort or another and you think it is safe to shift his attention off the bank to the room. Run some havingness and you'll get a blowdown of that tight tone arm and you can go on and make the ARC Process run much longer and much better and much faster.

This becomes important to you in 3D because you are going to be doing it while running terminals on Prehav levels. You are going to watch your havingness very carefully. And you are going to use it when necessary during, after, end of session, beginning of session and so on, you are going to watch your havingness carefully. You're practically going to blow
your pc out of the water, too. If you've run for quite a while without running any havingness, then all the somatics the pc has been accumulating will suddenly go zing! The pc is liable to go out colder than ice. And the only mistake you can make is not going on and running Havingness Process.

Of course, you feel kind of silly the first two or three times you do it. The pc's sitting there – the pc's sitting there, you know, dehh. Well, Mary Sue used to have a test for this. She said well when a pc started snoring, she knew he wasn't doing the process. That's the time to kick him in the feet and get him up. Get him around. But you can – you'll get so you can tell this.

And the – you'll finish up a half-an-hour run with the pc sitting there like this, you know or something like this. And going in and out and going u-h-h-h, like this. You go on and run the Havingness Process. Ask him at the end of the line, "Well, did you do all the commands?" "Well, I did all I heard. There was one time when you didn't give me one for quite a while and that upset me a little bit."

The pc has never even been able to signify that he's executed the command. And you must not expect the pc to tell you that he's executed the auditing command. It's no part of the auditing command, either. You'd have to add that. "Do the havingness command and execute it. Thank you. Here's the havingness command. Good. Now, execute it. Thank you."

Don't you think that sounds clumsy? So actually the pc does not have to tell you that he has executed the havingness command. He usually goes uhhhh, or nods his head anyhow in havingness. He's kind of – he never has much to say running a Havingness Process unless he gets a cognition and then God help you. But there you go. The pc will go on doing the thing with his eyes shut, out cold, as far as you can see and the only mistake you can make, the only way you can err, is not go on giving him the havingness command. Because you are now running havingness to a complete havingness remedy, objective. You are not running a limited pickup. Run for the largest object.

Now, when you've started the session, you've got the pc's Havingness Process, let us say and you've started the session, you've run liberal havingness, you're going to be amazed: some of the pcs you are auditing could have the head of the pin, providing it were not present. It has a lot to do with ARC breaks. I got ARC breaks pretty well taped. I got the meter taped. I found this hole in the meter. I've got that pretty well anchored down. We know about what it is and what it isn't and what we can do about it and we've got that solved. That's easy. Right along with it, just as an extra shovel full, we'll throw in this havingness proposition and we'll find out the pcs will have a much easier time of it.

Remember that havingness runs the bank. As you're having him look at the walls he's got pictures going by and he's got this and that and so forth and how intriguing it is for the auditor to take these all up. What process are you running? You're running some Confront Process, aren't you, suddenly, if you suddenly take up all these pictures the pc has and everything. No, let them fly by with wild abandon. Who cares what happened to these pictures.

He said, "Well, what do you know, what do you know there's – there's a – a picture of an albatross that just went by."
And you say, "Well, that's good." You don't say, "Could you ever have been the Ancient Mariner?" [laughter] No, you just say, "Fine" and give him the next havingness command. If anything, a little more rapidly than usual.

Now, it'll run bank. It'll run him anaten. It'll do all sorts of weird things and it'll give him wild somatics. Now, you don't have to run the somatics flat on a Havingness Process. But if a pc gets wild somatics on Havingness – the Havingness Processes that you're running or the process which you're running on him – it is simply indicative that the pc is on the goals-terminal chain of one character or another and it is disturbing the mass of the goals-terminal chain. That's the only importance that it has. And that you shift his attention, of course, causes the bank to shift which, of course, gives him awfully bad somatics. So what. That's fine.

It is not either really beneficial or unbeneﬁcial for him to have the somatics. This has nothing to do with it. He'll probably run into them again some other time or he may never run into them again. Who cares? Only thing it is, is actually you're replenishing his mass and the more you're replenishing his mass and the more ARC he can have and the more beef he can have on the situation, the better oriented he is and the better concept of havingness he is and the more he can run. And the more willing he is to give up a few of these ...

You know, a fellow who can only have a pinhead if it isn't there as his objective havingness, is not likely to give up a single scrap button of an old decayed picture that is in the bottom of a nonexistent crushed mass called a trunk. He wouldn't give it up if his havingness is down. You've got to get him in some kind of a state of realization that there is other havingness. Because the common denominator of all games terminals is games, all goals terminals are games and the common denominator of all games is can't-have. And that's for sure. Whatever else happens in a game, everybody's being sure that nobody else can have. You've got to keep that remedy or you're going to get a games condition.

So, here are a bunch of ways of keeping a pc on an even track. If you haven't got your pc's Havingness Process as you're running on down your assessment, no wonder you're having difficulty. Don't use your Confront Process along with the Havingness Process. Don't use that confront. Because what are you doing with 3D Assessments, Sec Checks, Problems Intensives, anything else that you're doing, you, of course, are doing a Confront Process. Much more violent a Confront Process, by the way, than any Confront Process listed here. Okay?

All right. Well, we got a lot of things solved and we got a lot of things squared around. Develop a sensitivity to know when a pc's Havingness Process is down. Develop a sensitivity to know whether or not your pc has an ARC break and you won't have very much trouble with pcs and your meters will work like startled deer. You can go down a list and the meter's banging there, banging a division, where before it banged an eighteen-thousandth of a micromillimeter. Which is very small. Very small. Large to a microbe but very small. Okay.

Well, I hope that helps you out. And thank you very much.
E-METER TIPS

A lecture given on 29 November 1961

Well, here we are. What's the date?

Audience: 29th.

Twenty-ninth of November, AD 11.

Year drawing to a close, drawing to a close.

Well, the process of going Clear is a new technical term. It has to do with after you find the terminal and you are feeling fine and so forth, then you go the rest of the way and that is a process known as being pushed through the knothole. [laughter, laughs] And, frankly, it's pretty ghastly, pretty ghastly.

Well, we're really not going to talk about that tonight. I'm going to talk about E-Meters. Your particular tool of the trade. This is not a comprehensive or broad review of the E-Meter. This is a bits and pieces, "How can you be that stupid?" sort of lecture, you see.

I have just learned why there aren't any Clears over in America. I received a cable and you know the old American meter that was – the old blue meter that was made prior to '58 – that's all right. But they haven't been since. They haven't been since. None of them give an instant read. Meters made in '59, '60 and '61, not under my supervision, give a sporadically noninstant read. They've got a delaying, damping action in them that sometimes operates to do weird things. That's very interesting, isn't it? So sometimes it happens at once and sometimes it doesn't. But basically what happens is, is that you don't get an instant read. There's a delay and it's different apparently from meter to meter.

So I think that's all very interesting and that's why I cancelled out that particular type of meter construction. And we're using this Mark IV.

Now, actually I've got lots of Mark IVs coming up the line. So it won't be too bad. They'll be easy to get hold of. They're cheaper than an American meter. But basically the thing will read and that I can guarantee. It will read. And that's all we require of an E-Meter, is that it read. We don't require that it has hot and cold running water. We simply require that it reads.

Now, where you get a lot of squirrel meters around or a lot of oddball meters or a lot of non supervised meters and that sort of thing, you apparently can guarantee nothing. This has been quite a shock to me. I just received it by cable. I have now handled it. I was getting a checkup on this. Actually I didn't ask him for a checkup, but he sent me one gratuitously. And it means that America, where we had floods of offball meters and where we had this more modern American meter which wouldn't read – we haven't got any Clear in that area – don't have nobody, see? So that's a weird one. Oddly enough the last Clears, for what it's worth – it
may not even be a well-coordinated fact – were made with the original meter which Breeding
and Wallace and so on and myself were sweating the midnight oil over and I was keeping
Breeding from changing it and Breeding was keeping Wallace from changing it [laughter] and
so forth.

And that was the last batch of meters. Actually we got a stack of those still back in the
FCDC – should still have them. Well, those are very reliable E-Meters and apparently every-
thing since that time hasn't been on that same order which is quite interesting.

And in England here, we have, frankly, hardly any standard meters of any kind what-
soever. We got an old potentiometer that somebody got off of a Spitfire and it's connected up
to a couple of radial props and it stirs up the pc from behind or something of the sort. And it's
sold at a cut price but of course you...

Reminds me of a story, you know, of the old pitchman who was selling watches down
in New Orleans. And was a perfectly good watch, a beautiful case, beautiful case. And you
hold this watch up to your ear and you could hear it tick and it had a marvelous solid gold
case and it had hands and everything was fine. And he was just selling these things like hot-
cakes, you see. But the trouble is the things ran down after a few days because the cricket he
put in them died. [laughter]

So that's kind of the way it is, you know. This Mark IV has this liability. If it is
shipped to you by air with its batteries in it, in these new stratospheric jet planes, your bag-
gage goes through a hot-cold cycle. Every time it lands it's hot, you see, because of the vari-
ous air routes usually, particularly the Commonwealth areas. And then it goes straight back
upstairs, you know, and drops to 30, 40 degrees below zero in the baggage compartment be-
cause it's not warmed like the passenger cabins. And the batteries burst – which as I've told
you before in a lecture are just a liability of that. So, if you're going to ship it in your suitcase,
for heaven's sakes take the batteries out of it and put them in your pocket and put them back
in when you get at the other end. Nothing else is going to happen to it, just the batteries are
going to burst. And it'll be unworkable at the other end, possibly, for that reason – unless
somebody put it up against a container of uranium being shipped to the Atomic Energy
Commission's advance headquarters in Australia or something, why, you've had it, you see.
Of course, you've had it then, too, because at the other end it's radioactive. [laughter]

But we've now got these things down so that they have a simple battery which is eve-
rywhere procurable and it's very easy to put the battery in an E-Meter.

There's a – the newest issue of these Mark IVs are supposed to have a design under-
neath the little lid. And you lift it open with a... If you don't have electronic equipment, why,
go to your wife and get her nail file or pick out your own nail file or buy one for a change and
unscrew the top plate on the little battery compartment which is right underneath the can
compartment. But if you get those batteries in backwards it won't operate. And it's a very
complex way the batteries go in. They had to be plus-minus, minus-plus, and I've never been
able to do it myself. I always send it back to the factory when I... [laughs, laughter]

But I'm trying to get the battery design doing it. So if you have to open up one of these
meters to change its battery, why, when you take that wooden plate off of the thing, sketch the
pluses and minuses. See, just sketch it, don't touch the batteries, just sketch exactly where
they lie in it. Draw a picture and show even where the dial is so that you won't turn the picture upside down and put the batteries in reverse end to. You got the idea?

So draw this little picture and when you put the batteries back in, fold up the piece of paper and shove it in underneath the cover and you'll always have it. And you'll be able to get the thing straight. It's very easy to change batteries in one.

The way you test for batteries in the thing is a switch over here and it says "Test." And if your E-Meter is functioning, your Test brings it right straight over to the pin. See? All you do is turn this thing over to Test and it goes over to the pin. Now when that needle on Test – you turn the meter on and you swing its other button over to Test. And when you do that sometime and you find that this needle here is not in this little last test range – you see there are two lines here in the last test range. See those? All right, when it's not inside those your meter won't function. It hasn't got enough juice left in it to drive the pc. Something's got to drive the pc so make sure that that needle is well within the test. And frankly, when it gets to about "T" on Test you ought to be going down to the drugstore and investing four or five six-pences or some vast sum or forty cents or something and buying yourself some new batteries for the thing and throwing them in; because it's not going to read well after that. And when it's completely outside those two bars, well, it just hasn't been operating for some time and that was why you didn't do much for the last pc you were auditing.

But you can suddenly look up with a start and wonder what's happened to your E-Meter and in view of the fact that the batteries are changed so seldom – that's one of the difficulties of this Mark IV, you almost never change the batteries in it, you see – that you get out of the habit of testing for it and then you one day swing the thing, "I haven't been having good luck lately. Pcs have been blowing, you know." And you find out when somebody else gets one of your pcs that them rudiments were all out and the pc had many missed withholds. Well, that's about the time that you took this little black button down here to the right of the Sensitivity knob and turned it over to Test. Because probably it'll come up to Set. And the battery – the thing will appear to be operating, you know, but it just doesn't operate. There just isn't enough juice in it.

Now, there's no reason to put a red light on it to show that it's always charged up, because it would consume more juice than the whole meter. So there is no way to put an additional indicator on it except this test switch.

Now when you carry this meter around, put it over here on Transit. And actually at the end of session, if you really want to take care of your meter, turn your meter off and turn your Set over to Transit. In other words, vertical knob. In other words, you have to do those two actions to turn an E-Meter off. Mainly just turn it off and then turn it over to Transit. And that keeps your meter from being jumped up and the needle banging around and so forth, that's all that does. But it's easier on the meter doing that. Actually you should do it at the end of session even carrying a meter downstairs; E-Meter will last longer.

All right. Now, another tip on this meter is setting the meter to exact Clear read. Now, this one, quite by accident, since you saw me fiddle with the knob a moment ago, is sitting here very nicely at Set. You turn this to number 2 sensitivity dead-on and you turn it to number 2 on the tone arm dead-on, exact. And then, you take this little knob down here at the bot-
tom and this thing is called the Trim knob and you bring the needle to Set. And you bring that needle right to Set. And that is with the cans unplugged. You actually can have the pc on the cans and set up your meter. But in order to do that you have to pop out this meter connector just halfway. It can still remain in the socket.

In other words, if you want to test this thing suddenly, all you have to do – you're sitting there, the pc is on the cans.

Don't ever fool around with the meter or set it up after you've got a session started, by the way. Just leave it alone! Thing busts, why, sit there interestedly and finish the session. You really need the data of the meter to finish the session – which you normally do – then just run end rudiments paying close attention to a busted meter and end the session. And during the break get another E-Meter, borrow or something, or bang it against the radiator or something and make it work. But don't go fooling with a meter. So a can leads breaks during a session. Well, that's just rough. Just leave the pc sitting there holding a broken can. Never even make a gesture toward repairing it, fixing it up, nothing. Because it is a serious error when a pc particularly is running a process or he's deeply interiorized – he's very much in-session – all of a sudden the auditor's interest is on the meter. And the second the auditor's interest is visibly on the meter, the pc knows that the auditor's interest is not on him; the auditor's attention is no longer helping the pc plow through his bank and it yanks the pc straight out of session.

I don't care how the pc said he didn't "mind" it. Look at your tone arm reads, if you could. Or fooling around with a busted meter, suddenly shaking it, you know, and saying, "Oh well, what the hell is so-on-and-so-on," you've had it. Your pc is – you've just laid in a nice juicy interruption of session. It can be far more important than you realize. So when your meter busts, your cans break, anything of this sort of thing happens, if you can carry on the rest of the session without an E-Meter, why, just do so, come to a normal conclusion of the thing, run your end rudiments with your eye on the pc and – you know, keep an eye on him, glance at your meter if you want to, don't make a fake out of yourself. And bring your session to a close. If you can do anything about the meter, why, do it during the break, see? Don't monkey with the meter during session ever. That is just a hallmark of a nervous auditor who just doesn't know his business, because smack, the pc's attention comes off, blang, the bank goes in on the pc, boom! And it's a cruel thing to do.

Now, when you're testing for Set, then, the pc could have been given the cans. But you couldn't possibly have started the session yet. Well, the least commotion you can make, if you notice the jack that goes into the side of Mark IV, here, is quite long. Well, all you have to do is pull the jack out just to that degree that it isn't connecting. You see? That's very short in, see? Just – it's just not connecting. There's only maybe a half an inch of jack shaft showing. And that is plenty in order to set your Trim knob. In other words, you just pull that out till you feel it unsnap. That's all you have to do. And bring it over here to 2, and then bring your Trim knob down here and snap that jack in and it's functioning right this minute. Got the idea? So to test, you just feel that thing unsnap. Don't take it out just when you test the thing. Just feel it unsnap. And now you can set the thing to Set. Now snap it back in. It's a very fast action that you can take there. It doesn't take very long.
Now, these Mark IVs are the first meter that doesn't have drift. This is the first meter that doesn't have drift. The Mark III, the Mark I in the progress of a session would go off as many as four or five dial marks. It would drift. Those Mark Is would drift that far off. This isn't important of course, unless you're testing for Clear. But you've got to have some kind of idea of it. If you're auditing somebody who's getting blowdowns and that sort of thing, you've got to have some idea of what that thing is, accurately, session by session. Otherwise, your tone arm reads are all different. Session by session your tone arm reads are different. But in the course of an hour or two, the 1957 American meter by warming up and – there is some slight warmth that goes into the transistors in spite of this. But the American meter, of course, burns much more juice than this Mark IV, enormously. This thing will run for a year or so without any battery shift and that other one, actually, if it's used – if you happen to leave it on accidentally overnight, why you've probably had it.

Anyway, to get back to what I was talking about – when you set this thing up, it will stay that way. Because the Mark IV is the first meter which has got a counterbalance. Now there's a way to set this up so that it will never drift. But this is sort of taking a micrometer caliper, you know, to measuring a lady's dress. You just don't need that – quite that much accuracy. There are two separate components which set up the trim on this. It's a very tricky little arrangement on the thing. And I knocked out the first one. I would not okay the first arrangement. It would have driven you mad, because you turned on one knob and set it and then waited for a minute and then trimmed it with another knob. And it had two trim knobs. Well, that for sure never, never would have drifted. It was there with a clank. But it's just like measuring a lady's dress with a micrometer caliper. It's just too much precision.

This one has solved that situation by putting both of these components into the same trim knob. In the first few seconds that your meter is on, you're going to get drift because your current is adjusting through the transistors. That's just the first, very short period that the meter is on you will sometimes see a bit of drift. You'll see it expressed by the tone arm. It has to be shifted. You put the pc on the cans – are ice-cold and it's really the pc gets the cans warm, more than it is the meter. But the moment that these aluminum cans adjust to his hand temperature and the transistors got that first surge of juice through them, the Set then remains.

Now, even up to the Mark III you had a condition occasionally where the meter audited itself. And it would develop a rock slam all by its lonesome, without any slightest assistance from pc, auditor or anybody else – which I think was pretty smart. But it was anticipating things a little bit and so on.

Well now, what that's all about is dust in the pot. Now, these terms are not my terms. They are terms from that unlikely race called electronics men. And this unlikely crew managed to name things F2-4Rs. If you ever have any complaints about Scientologese and its nomenclature and so forth, get into electronics sometime. That's really a ball. Listen to a couple of hams burning up vast amounts of electricity talking to each other from Canada to Panama. And one may be talking with an English accent, and one may be talking with a Spanish accent, but inevitably it will be, "Well, I've fixed this rig with an F4R now and it condenses far more better, but there's a leak going through the six-seven." I listen to it by the hour because it's sort of – there's a wonderful fascination to listening to total gobbledygook. [laughter]
There's no end of these terms. I thought, well, after you've been a ham for a while, you see, why, you could run off maybe fifty, sixty of these terms, you know. And you just had it cold and you could lean casually up against the set and say, "Well, ya know, I've just transferred the F4R and the six-seven is operating very smoothly." I thought you could do that. But holy cats, there's six-sixes, six-eights, and six-nine-and-a-halves, but there is no six-nine. You know, I mean it's…

They sure have a good time. I mean, you can turn them on here if you can get them on the air on your portable radio. And you can listen to them sawin' away about their six-sevens and F4Rs. It's all they ever talk about. The whole area could be burning down, in total flood, and thousands of people dying, you see, for lack of communication, and they'd sit there and say, well, their six-sevens did not adjust now well with their F4Rs. It's marvelous.

I've had a battle, by the way, in progress with an electronics operator on my end, as my talker to combat craft that were in action. And all they could ever talk about was, "I am hearing you, Sail One. How – how am I coming through? Have you adjusted your six-seven?" [laughter] and so forth.

And I'm trying to tell him, "Listen, are you talking to that guy at all?"

"Well, my 4R is at…"

"Listen. Are you talking to him at all? Can you hear him at all?"

"Oh, oh, yeah, yeah. Well, not very good. We haven't got it tuned in."

"Can you hear him at all? Can he hear you?"

"Oh, well, yes, yes."

"Well, goddamn it! Tell him 'right standard rudder' and get out of there! He's about to be sunk!"

"Oh, well, okay. Well now, my six-sevens are…" [laughter] Poor coxswain on the other craft. He doesn't even know anybody's trying to get in touch with him.

Now, I've had a time with this sort of thing. Undoubtedly developed overts in one lifetime or another on this subject.

So anyway, I always consider that a bit out of my province. I've had enough overts on it so I've kind of backed out of it if I was ever in it.

But anyhow, the thing is called a pot which sits underneath this tone arm. And this is a pot. And they have carbon pots and wirewound pots. And carbon pots wear out. And God help you if you've got some squirrel meter with a carbon pot. It's very hard to get wirewound pots. They have to be specially made, and they're very specially made for these Mark IVs. They're wirewound so that the component parts of the thing don't wear and loosen. On earlier American meters, as I understand it – and anybody should forgive my ignorance in this particular line, because I just designed the thing, I didn't make it. I didn't really design it either. I just made sure that whoever designed it followed his first ideas. You know, that sort of thing, and then made sure that he redesigned it so that it worked, too. I did the sjambok work on it.
Anyway, the pot here can – on a carbon pot, which you get on a cheap meter – is wearable. It wears. Then dust gets in it. And one little, tiny particle of dust in that pot, which is the pivot and set capacity here on this sunk-in area – one little particle of dust in there, and it won't connect straight. It has interference in its own lines so you busily set it up here and you get wobble, wobble, wobble, wobble, wobble, wobble on your meter. See, you got interference into the pot. Furthermore, the dust gets into it – as I understand it – because of the wear. If they're ordinary carbon and nothing but carbon, the wear factor is great enough to permit dust to get into them. And if they're wirewound you don't get that much wear and you don't get this same dust interference. In other words, that "audits itself," apparently comes out of this pot.

Now, there is a way to take an old meter and stop it from auditing itself. You take some lighter fluid and squirt it down here on the pivot, underneath this tone arm, and work the tone arm rapidly. But sometimes in session if it started auditing itself – one of the old-type meters – if you simply shiver the tone arm this way, it'll stop rock slamming. And sometimes won't. But some lighter fluid squirted in there on that sudden rock slam – there it is. Now the way... would fix it up.

But the way to find out if a meter is working is not to leave it hooked in. Don't leave the meter hooked in and so forth, on the leads. If you want to find out what's happening with the meter – if it's the meter's fault – just snap that lead out.

I'm not recommending you do this while you're auditing a pc. This is during the break. You just snap that – just unsnap that thing and then set the thing over here to Set. And if it's doing something weird and if the meter itself is off and is wrong, why, of course the pc isn't connected to it now and if it goes on rock slamming or goes on doing something peculiar it must be the meter because there is nobody else on it. It's a gremlin in it that's being audited. So that's your first action if you want to find out if your meter's auditing itself or something of that sort or if it was the pc. Just disconnect this thing over here. Just disconnect it. Disconnect it and you then have your pc off of it and if the meter is doing something, why, there it is.

Now, the first thing you want to know about an E-Meter and this is a serious – this is actually such a simple piece of stupidity that you wouldn't think anybody could ever do it. But I've done it, and for sure you can do it. Every once in a while you will – because the more reliable a meter gets, the less attention you pay to the actual meter. And every once in a while you pick up a meter and you put the pc on it and you won't realize that you're auditing the pc on a broken meter and just nothing happens and the last thing you look at is the meter because it doesn't happen very often, you see. So you want to know first and foremost, at the beginning of every session, if the pc is reading on the meter. Do you have the pc hooked to the meter? That's what you want to know. And that's about the end of the test.

See, is your meter sitting there quietly with no pc on it? Well, you learn that when you put the Trim knob to Set. Until you set it up here with sensitivity 2, tone arm 2, bring it over here to Set with the Trim knob – bang, bang, bang. One, two, three, see? And of course if you had your Transit in the proper place, you turn your Transit to Set, click the meter on, on the Sensitivity knob, put it to 2, put the other one to 2 and then trimmed it over here to Set. All right.
Now you can understand that's not hooked into the pc. See, you haven't got that lead snapped in. So if the meter is dancing or the meter is wildly swinging or you're getting a marked rise, or something else is going on on the meter, well, it must be in the meter because the pc isn't hooked to it. See, that's your first adjudication. So if that's just part of your drill, why, one, you find out the meter's all right. It is sitting there quietly. If you wanted to make doubly sure – except it isn't worth testing except very infrequently – you just swing it over here to Test. Bang! and it goes way up.

By the way, you know, I made a mistake in the original drill-out on this when I was testing this. I gave the manufacturers of this thing – they've been in conference after conference – they consider me a very trying fellow and so on. And then one day I got one of them on the meter and I showed him reactions on the meter and I audited a black area he was stuck in and moved him with a tremendous sensation of speed. That is to say he had this fantastic sensations and they've been very respectful of the meter ever since – that they do a good job now. But they consider I'm pretty picky, picky, petty. I want leads that don't come off the cans all the time and other petty things, you know – hardly worth it. The last wire they offered me for testing before we went into the present production run, by the way, smelled just like a hospital. [laughter] You could smell it all over the room. It was some new kind of plastic. Wouldn't that have been lovely to audit anybody with and so on. You no more than break out your E-Meter, he goes into the engram of the operation. [laughter] I don't know where they got that plastic wire. I made them knock it off. They did so, but it was very petty of me. Who'd mind an odor like that?

Anyway, they're good fellows. They got this thing into a state of steadiness and somnolence and all of that sort of thing. And I tested it out and then accidentally left the meter on, because it was just a test meter and I wasn't doing anything with it. Didn't mean to really test it, and left it on for a day or two or three, and all of a sudden its – well, I'll show you what it is. Can't make this one do it. They fouled me up. I can't make this one do it. No, they – this one's too live. The original model of a Mark I – they gave it to me – and after the thing was over here at Set, you could turn the Trim knob and bring it down off the Test area. If your Trim knob was totally out, in other words, the meter would test as though its batteries were flat. Got the idea? You could shift the Trim knob so that you'd get a zero battery charge. You had no battery in it. Obviously, the batteries were run down. So I said, "What the devil! How much stuff is this thing consuming?" You know, and big ruckus, you know, about it. Peter handling the correspondence on it, you know, and calling up on the phone calls. And back and forth, and so forth.

"Meter is wearing out," you know. "Batteries wear out in this thing in twenty-four hours. It's no good – pile of junk, you know, that's why. We got to cut down its battery consumption." Well sometimes, of course, you'd turn it on and it would show full charge; but then because you could vary the Set position with the Trim knob, of course, your Test over here could be varied, too. And I notice now on the Mark IV, they've disconnected it so we can't make that mistake.

Anyway, so they left one on for weeks and weeks and weeks and they couldn't get it to run down. So we were having a terrible argument. I was sure the thing was running down and they were sure that the thing was lasting for weeks. And then we finally found out what was
going on: The meter was being set up in a certain fashion that its Trim knob could vary its Test over here.

Wonder if there's any way under the sun I can make that do that now. By George, you know? Ha! Pretty smart fellows. They fixed that up so it wouldn't do it. They said, "Well, if the old man can do it we better do something about that." And they did, by golly! It won't make that mistake.

Anyway, just to get on with this, you'd snap it over here onto Test, see if it landed, for a full battery charge. See, make sure your batteries were charged by the needle going on over and being in the proper area. Bring it back over here to Set, adjust that Sensitivity knob to 2, adjust the other one to 2, bring your Set up here on your Trim knob to Set, and then – that's halfway out theoretically – snap it in and then tell the pc to squeeze the cans. He thinks that's for him. That isn't. It's for you. You want to see how much he's dropping, you set him with a third-of-a-dial drop. Well, if this meter is out of operation and it isn't connected to the pc, you're not going to get any needle behaviour when he squeezes the cans and you'll never make the horrible error of running a pc on a dead meter. See, you'd never make that mistake. It isn't likely to happen with these new meters, but it sure was likely to happen with the old ones and it could happen again.

Now, there you are cheerfully sitting there being an auditor left and right and center and somehow or another the pc is – seems to be over here around – he seems to be – he uh – hmmm… Huh-huh. Where is he at? Or the pc gets no reaction and no tone arm action so the process must be flat. Process must be flat. I mean, there it is. See, that could be disconnected. Just look-a-here. But supposing you just sat there and you audited something on this order. And you just went on auditing. You just went on auditing. You just went on auditing. You just went on auditing. Yeah, I know the can isn't plugged in.

Female voice: What if you've got your jack partially plugged in?

Well, you see, you'd even get some motion occasionally. [laughter]

See what you could do. And it wouldn't have anything to do with the price of fish, you know. You'd say, "Well, I don't know. I'd never get that down. Oh, yeah. Actually getting very live." [laughter] "There we are." You go nuts, you know.

So frankly, if you were going to make a thorough drill that would never get you in any kind of trouble of any kind whatsoever [laughter] – what you do, you see, is just plug it in. You just take it up to Set here very nicely. True, true, true. Then snap it in and tell your pc, tell your pc to squeeze the cans.

What's the matter with this meter? Hmmm! Meter's off – it isn't reading at 3 with me on it. Anyhow, I must have been working hard today.

But anyhow – no, it isn't off. The first action is, is the meter working? And the second action, is it working on the pc? And if you keep those two things in order and always keep them in mind, you won't make some silly mistakes occasionally as almost any auditor sooner or later has made. One, is the meter working? Well, of course, that's easily told because you set it up here for Set, 2, and so on.
Now, just look at it a moment, don't you see? And say, "Well, I don't know. Is it doing anything peculiar? See, is it racking around? Is it doing anything peculiar?" No. It's just sitting there being a good meter. Furthermore, battery test. If you wanted to do something like that, that would tell you even further that it was charged up. Except I assure you, it's not going to run down but about once a year, if that. You know you can leave this thing on day and night in the box? It burns up just about the same amount of current on that it does off. That's one of the most fantastic things. I wouldn't have believed it. I wouldn't advise you doing this because it – cans might be shorted or something out, you know? If you did this, I'm sure it would burn more current.

Supposing we had this, see? That's great. Now, you got your cans together, that's a dead short. Well, of course, that's going to consume more current. But with your cans apart, as far as it goes, with the cans apart and your lead unplugged, the thing will just sit there. Actually, with the cans connected to that degree, the thing will just sit there endlessly. It won't burn any more current on than off, which is a remarkable fact. Then you'd make sure your meter was okay, and then you turn it over to the pc here. You put the pc on the cans and you'd say to the pc – it's off the same way – and you say, "Squeeze the cans," see? And all right, to the degree that he squeezes the cans – you got the idea, see – to the degree that he squeezes the cans coordinates with the meter. In other words, you see the meter act when he squeezes the cans. You know, you see him squeeze the cans and you see the meter act. Well now, you are absolutely certain that the meter is reading the pc. And that's for your own assurance. Now you say, "Fine," see? Do something like adjust the pc's chair and get the rudiments in. But that is the end of your meter worry. Now, you don't worry about that meter from there on. And if the meter suddenly does something weird, goes utterly flat, one of two things can be wrong The meter can read at 7, between 6 and 1; 7 is located between 6 and 1. Because of the construction of the meter itself, it won't go to 7.

Actually, a person can read at a Clear read of about 2 and be a totally dead thetan – get your E-Meter Essentials – and when the case starts to improve, he improves by going down to 1.5, 1, 7, 6.5 and you occasionally, in running people, will have a meter which has to be caught between 1 and 6 and 1 and 6 and all of a sudden the pc isn't on it anyplace and you think the meter's busted. It'd be very rare, probably won't stay there more than half a session or something like that – blah-da-de-bleh-zzh – where is he? In order to keep the meter at all you were probably going like this already, see? And then all of a sudden, uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh, pc cannot be found on the meter. The pc is at 7. He might stay there for a while. He might stay there only for a few minutes. He might stay there for a while, but it's apparently a very rare position. It's very difficult to maintain. That much density is very hard to master. And it's almost an intolerable position, so he won't be there very long.

I think it's happened on this course once, hasn't it, Suzie?

Female voice: Yes.

Yes, and an auditor was sitting there going batty. Who was that? Somebody – they were sitting – she was sitting there going mad because she thought her meter was out. You see, that's a one chance in years of auditing it happens, because it's a very hard position to maintain. I don't know how – people can evidently maintain a 1.5 on the sensitivity – on a
tone arm. They can maintain 1.5 and just sit there. They can get to 1.2 and that's all right and get down here to 1 or a little bit below, and it becomes very unstable. They become unstable. That is to say there's too much density. They can't tolerate it, and their next stopping ground is about 6. But they can, very, very rarely get hung up on 7. You'll think your meter isn't operating.

If you want to check your meter, just check it as a meter. Unsnap your jack over here and is your meter operating? See? Meter's operating. And all of sudden, you put him on, you won't be able to get him on the dial with the tone arm, see? But he shouldn't stay there very long. It'll happen to you very rarely.

If your meter's gone out of operation, you're usually aware of it from other sources and causes. The thing is still on in some fashion and so on and just isn't operating. But the chances of the meter going out in the middle of a session are quite rare. The meter is usually knocked out, not by sessioning. A meter is knocked out by being dropped, sat on and used to eat ice cream with. And somebody pours a quart of wine into the thing because they haven't got a cup, or to oil up the works during a drunken New Year's Eve party, or something. Of course you'd have to run it as an overt afterwards.

You've got a bad situation with the meter normally when it's out of use. And the meter is usually in far more danger out of use than it is in use.

Very seldom does a meter get beaten up very badly in a session. But just casually you put your meter back with your baggage in the back end of a car. You don't know what that meter's doing during that trip. That meter might be shifting away from the suitcase and it might be going up against the spare tire and maybe it's sort of hitting the edge of the spare tire and bouncing onto the rim and off, you know, during the whole trip. And you get at the other end, your meter isn't operating. Well, you'll catch that before the session begins.

The other thing is, is they don't half break. A meter never half breaks. It either – it's a kind of a yea or nay, it works or it doesn't work. Well, there's no reason to hold your head in your hands over whether – is the meter working? And don’t develop any big anxiety because I think I've only run one session in my life where a meter started doing something weird and that was with an old American meter with a carbon pot and about the middle of the session the pc started to rock slam and rock slammed continuously no matter what I did and I finally got smart enough to realize there was something wrong with the meter, turned the meter off and finished the session. And that was when I first learned about lighter fluid. And that fixed up the dust in the thing and it operated all right afterwards.

Now, in other repairs – in other repair factors or detection factors on a meter, you've got this, this to consider. Once in a blue moon you will see any meter drift. It starts drifting. Now, all of the old meters drift, and you just can't do a thing about it. In other words, with the cans unplugged here, and with the thing on Set properly, you'll see that needle start to depart in a reverse rise. It'll start to go away from Set toward Fall. It's unplugged, see, and you haven't got anything plugged in and it'll just start going in the direction of Fall. It looks something like this. Oh, much slower than this. And it's very even. It just starts drifting up very evenly in the direction of fall, the word fall there. Just evenly drifting. And it'll just go on drifting. It's all unplugged and so forth. That's because its transistors and so forth aren't well equalized and
it won't settle itself down. Maybe it stops it after a couple of minutes, at which time that's all right. In other words, the old meters – the old Mark Is, Mark IIs, Mark IIIs and the old American meter and Lord knows what the last three years worth of meters – American meters – do or don't do. But here is – this thing will always drift.

You turn them on, the cans are not plugged in, the jack isn't in and it'll drift. Well, don't worry about it. Don't worry about it because that's just normal to the meter and it's going to drift for two, three, five minutes. And if you want to do a Clear checkout you've got to reset them, and if they haven't got any reset on the thing, well, the best thing to do is to get a 5,000 ohm and a 12,500-ohm resistor and plug it across the cans and find out how much your meter is off and re-mark it with a piece of sticky plaster. That's all you can do. You can find out what is the resistance across the two cans – 12,500 ohms, you just plug it. Plug a resistor across and then set the tone arm here exactly where it's supposed to go and then 5,000 ohms across the two cans and set the tone arm where it's supposed to go. Mark it in those two positions and it will give you the Clear read for that particular meter. You can get these resistors. They look like a little piece of lead or something with a couple of clips on the end of them. You can buy those things. They cost you practically nothing at an electrical shop. They have resistors like mad. Electronics men deal mainly with resistors. And so you got lots of them.

Anyway, you can set one of those old meters. But it's going to drift. Don't think that it won't. It's going to drift. That isn't serious. Well, now listen. When one of these British meters starts drifting, when a Mark IV starts drifting, get it to somebody to fix it because there's something wrong with the meter. There's something wrong with the meter. You dropped it or it's got a transistor shaken loose or there's something gone wrong in the meter. You notice as I sit here this thing is not drifting. You can turn it off, cool it, that is, it goes totally cold. Turn it back on again, it'll be right there, bang. But my own personal meter, which you can imagine gets some of the roughest of use as far as auditing is concerned, was a Mark III and that was pretty well adjusted. And a few weeks ago I looked at it and it was drifting. I sent it back to the manufacturer and had it fixed up. And well, it's just – it had aged. It had aged. It had lived a long and active life and it is no longer keeping its Set mark. But there was something wrong with it. There was a disconnection inside of it.

Now, how do you get a missed – one of these things repaired? Well frankly, we've had to send them to the Commonwealth areas so often, that we have, pretty well, a full set of specification of what gets wrong with them, because the Commonwealth areas have had to make these up. And Joburg, for instance, has a whole rundown on what gets wrong with this meter. They know far more about what gets wrong with all the old Mark Is, Mark IIs and Mark IIIs than the manufacturers did, because they had to take them down there, and whenever they'd repair them, why one of the instrument people in the immediate area, they gradually assembled this information. They got its circuits from the manufacturer. They checked it out and they finally got so they could snap a meter back into action faster than scat.

But I'm just trying to tell you that repair manuals for an electronics man someplace or another will be in existence and at the moment are obtainable.
Your easiest method of getting one fixed – usually you send it to Central Organization. They've already got somebody all contacted to fix up the E-Meter with a snap. Or HCO WW, we send it to Fowler and Allen with a sneer. There's always a sneer enclosed with the return. You send it to us, we put the sneer in, and send it back to Fowler and Allen, you see? And they can fix them up. They're good boys.

It's taken them quite a while to get this meter so it can be shipped, so it can be dropped, so it can be kicked and booted around and arrive at other ends of things.

One of the major things that happened to the Mark I, II and III, for your own interest, is the little transistors in the things became disconnected in shipment. Actually, extreme heat or cold or something – it had something to do with the solder they were using or something. But actually it popped out. They'd arrive at the other end with a disconnected transistor or a break. But they were not in proper packing at the time. And they now come to you in a very sleek latex or cardboard, pressboard, form fit cover, when they're shipped airmail.

Your first action on receipt of one of these things, of course, is to put the batteries in it and so on or get some batteries and put them in. We, of course – HCO WW will always put batteries in your meter for you free of charge. We couldn't care less. That is the wildest manufacturer's guarantee you ever heard of. Not that we're manufacturers, we're not. But you could always make this kind of a claim. Because you put in maybe one shilling worth of batteries every couple of years. That doesn't seem to be much of an action. We said that early when we were putting in an odd kind of battery. But these new kinds of battery are very stable.

But I'm just giving you some odds and ends of background. Maybe it's interesting to you. Maybe it isn't. But it has been quite a fight trying to get a meter and trying to get it stable and trying to get it so it can be shipped and trying to get it so it can stand up to some of the pcs that look at them. And you need something that's quite close to indestructible. And this meter takes quite a beating. And we've gradually worked those bugs out of the thing just in time, too, because apparently we'll have to replace nearly all of the meters in Central Organizations in the United States, here in England and so forth. We've got to get rid of the rest of these meters. The old ones, because they won't clear anybody and they apparently don't operate sufficiently accurately on a Sec Check.

Well, you ask somebody, "Have you ever murdered your wife?" He's just got through with it – the grave dirt is all over his shoes, you see – and it falls by the time the next question is asked, you know? "Have you ever powdered your nose?" That's an exaggeration and a dirty crack, but you can see that your instant read law doesn't apply to them.

Well now, the use of the meter depends mainly on the operator. This particular meter cannot be influenced by looking at it or putting pieces of energy into it. I do have a meter, however, that is right here. I think we have a meter, the beep meter. And I'll have to break that out and show you all about how you can influence a meter, because you really can influence a meter. You can't influence this meter to make it read or to do something peculiar, but don't think you cannot influence another person's body with energy. That is – once you get the knack of doing it.
By the way, a non-Scientologist just can't do it. You can give them all of the understanding they possibly can have; you can make them do it all right. They can follow all the directions, but they just don't have enough horsepower. And it's called a beep meter, and you put it up against somebody's cheek – it detects pain. Chiropractors used it. And you can put it around and where a fellow has a pain – or on his spine or something, you know, old piece of beer bottle's lodged in the spine – I don't know quite what theory they go on. But anyway they have pain, and you put this beep meter over the area of pain, and – if it's tuned right – and the exact area where the pain is – the patient is feeling pain – you put the meter on it, and the meter says, "Beeeep." And you take it off the area of pain and the meter ceases to beep. Fascinating. It's an interesting piece of electronic mumbo-jumbo.

Well, that's fascinating because the first time I started playing around with one of these things – back in Phoenix a long time ago, I took a look at one of these things – and I wondered what made it do that, you know. And I absentmindedly – it was against somebody's cheek – and I just absent-mindedly said, "Well, that ought to be well connected, you see," and it went "Beeeep." Well, I went around for several days, you know, thinking I was the only one who wore ostrich plumes, you know? And I showed some of the boys around the place all about this and so on. And they got very interested. And they'd grunt a few times and grit their teeth a little bit, and all of a sudden "BEEP." They could turn it on on anybody else. In other words they take this electrode, and Mr. Doakes, having nothing to do with the person who was performing it, puts this little button against his cheek. He could feel a tingle of electricity in it, but the meter's dead null. Now, the operator is over there several feet away and at will can make the meter turn on by connecting this to Mr. Doakes's thetan. Get the idea? And he'd connect this up and make a current go through it. You know, he's several feet away and he can look at him and just go errr, hmm, click, you know?

Actually, what you do is turn any black area you see white. You know, you (quote) "see" the black area or "see" the barrier, (quote) (unquote). And you just see it and then just turn it white, you know. And you make it connect, see. And the meter will go "Beeeep." And you can turn it off and then turn it on and turn it off and turn it on and finally even you realize you're doing it. The first moment that you realize you're doing this it makes you quite nervous because you're not even near the meter and you're not even near the person who is holding it and you're not in him at the moment. And yet you can turn that thing on and off, on and off, on and off.

So since then, subsequently, I have shoved this beep meter at a lot of people who were not Scientologists. I've tried to show them, you know, I'd turn it on at will, you know. I'd have to move my hand, you know, saying, "Well – " I make the thing beep along with my hand and so they realized what was doing it, and they couldn't – "What?" you know. And I'd say, "Well, you go ahead and do it. All you do is look, you see. And you just connect the thing through, you know. It's an easy trick. You just connect the electrodes through to the person, you see?" They'd say, "Yeah. All right." And they'd grit their teeth, you know, and they would grunt and ohhh. The beep meter sits there quiet as a mouse. Won't do a thing. Just won't do a thing. It's quite interesting.

I also ran into this on testing corn, on testing the liveness of plants and that sort of thing.
Newspaper reporter can actually come along and take the leaf of the plant and crush it in his hand, bap it, touch it, so forth, and nothing happens to the meter that's connected to the plant. I walk by the plant and the meter goes boom! Just touch one leaf with my little finger, you know, just "tchk," and it goes "zmmm," See? The meter reacts. And you could do it. I suddenly realized that this was something Scientologists could do and people couldn't.

That was my first detection that we must be of a different crew. But people actually cannot turn this beep meter on unless they themselves are in fairly good shape. It's not that they're into a trained skill, they just have less horsepower. They can see these things. Yes, you can show them to them. Yes, they can see them and they grunt and they grit their teeth to get it to connect, to get it to connect and the meter sits there.

You come along, you glance at the electrode, it goes beep! Master's voice. [laughs] We have that meter. I'll have to bring it out and set it up for you. Practically electrocutes you. It's a Mathison. If you want to – that's not a dirty crack necessarily. That's a hallmark of all of these mains meters. Not only do they vibrate as well to the elevator going up and down as they do to the pc, but they also vibrate very splendidly, very gorgeously to any slightest interference inside the meter itself. And they make the pc very nervous because they throw – I don't know, 340 or I'd think it's about 240 volts go through the electrodes. You can really tell they're on. And the more you're processed – the more you're aware of things in general as your awareness goes up – of course, these things become almost intolerable. I hate to hold them myself. It's all right.

I was holding 240 volts the other night. I had a dryer in the darkroom on some pictures I was making, and it decided to short out, and it – 240 volts. I didn't mind anything but the force involved with the thing. It's quite an amount of force in that much dead short. But some pcs, it actually feels that bad to them on some of these mains-connected meters. And this thing – you get a burning sensation off of the electrode. There's just too much juice going through it. We never were able to cure the manufacturer of pouring the juice into the pc, not into the valves. So, probably could be sued for libel for saying so, but I would prove it in court. No, he wouldn't dare sue me for libel. I'd put him on one of his own meters. [laughs] And say, "Is it actually true that you have an overt against us?" you see? "Now, whom have you shocked with electricity?" And of course he'd get the – just restimulate the motivator because he wouldn't ever give me the withhold, you see? And then he'd multiply the amount – say, that's a pretty good idea, you know? Any one of these days I'll go back to practicing law. Anyway, it's an easy life. You never, never really have to do anything.

Anyway, not just to tire you out on the subject, the meter itself is uninfluenceable from a standpoint of looking at it from the back and sitting there and making it read like an E-Meter should read. You understand? Making it read like an E-Meter should read. Therefore, you've got to do body motion drills, and you've got to know what an E-Meter looks like when it's reading on a pc. You understand? It's a – requires that kind of view.

Now, Ray made a film several months ago, and I finally reviewed the thing, which is a training film on E-Meters. Just an experimental film. He didn't intend anything more than that for it. I learned quite a bit from the technical manufacture of the film – what we'll have to do in order to square it up and make it read. One of the things I learned that we don't dare use: a
faked read. We don't dare use animation, in other words, to get our E-Meter reads in the train-
ing film. They look like what they are – body motions. And if you learn to read a body mo-
tion – if anybody were doing this which is quite unlikely I assure you, but if anybody were
doing this – they've got the back of the meter to them, so it's very difficult for them to find the
needle. There's no sense in going into the guts of the thing and pushing currents around in the
guts of it. That's silly. When, really, the way you can influence it and make it read, you can as
a thetan knock the needle with a beam. And it looks just exactly like a body motion. And
you – see, I'm using my finger to show you – but you actually get this thing in some kind of a
state and you just knock the thing back and forth.

No more force and you can actually make it tick. But it's a jerky tick. You know, it is
you, not your body, but it is you and you can actually put a beam on the side of the needle and
slap it. You can make it go click, click. And I've practiced on it quite a bit. I can never make it
look like anything but a body motion. I can't even make it look like a good, healthy rock slam.
It'd never fool an auditor. It might fool somebody who doesn't know much about E-Metering,
but it would never fool an auditor.

First place, I wouldn't use it to fool anybody. I'm just trying to find out about moving
around objects. And one of the easiest objects to move around is the E-Meter needle if you
stand back looking at the dial and make it go \textit{ting, ting, ting}, don't you see? That's an easy
thing to do. But it should never fool you as an auditor because it looks like just what it is
which is a mechanically influenced motion.

Now as far as influencing the E-Meter is concerned, you don't have to worry about the
pc influencing the meter if you put in end rudiments, "Have you influenced the E-Meter?"
That should take that off of your mind. Now factually, for any read that you're going to get
consistently on the thing, for somebody throwing the E-Meter so that an experienced auditor
couldn't tell it, he'd have to be pretty smooth because he has to get to the same speed of reac-
tion of the reactive mind which is instantaneous. And you always get latent reads on an influ-
enced meter. So you never pay any attention to them anyhow. The fellow has to hear "willow
wand" then he has to think, "Oh yes, that's the terminal I want. Oh, all right now, I will wiggle
my toes." And the way it looks to the auditor, of course, is "willow wand" ... click, see? "Wil-
low wand" ... click, "willow wand" ... "oh, that was the one," – click. And it doesn't look like
an instant read. And furthermore, it always looks like a body motion.

Now, I saw a very experienced auditor fooled with a body motion one time, fooled
with a body motion. You talk about influencing the meter. Actually, pc said, "I cannot keep
my hand from trembling when you say that word," and was flickering their little finger on and
off the can, see? Knowingly, see, flickering their finger on and off the can, you know? \textit{Dah-di-
dah-dahdah}. And you'd say, "willow wand" or "waterbuck" or whatever it was and you'd say,
"Willow wand" and, "Well, there's – there it is. You know, I just can't keep my hand from
trembling."

When the auditor finally detected it, "Your hand's trembling when I say that?" "Well,
yes, I just can't keep it from trembling." And do you know that the auditor actually told me,
"You know, it's a funny thing that she can't keep her hand from trembling whenever I say
that." Three or four or five sessions later, when additional assessment had been made on this
pc, it all of a sudden came up as a withhold. They had knowingly been trembling their finger on and off of the can while "their hand couldn't be controlled." Get the idea?

But you will get a latent read because they can't hear it and put the thing into action as fast as the reactive mind hears it and puts it into action, you see? And it's always a bit late. Therefore you shouldn't ever monkey around with a meter with latent reads.

Now there's a damping action put into most offball, offbeat meters. No meter I have ever okayed has ever had a damper in it. I've found a lot of meters that had dampers in them. The old green and gold English meter had a damper in it so that it was guaranteed to read one and one-half seconds late. And before an ACC got going I had a poor electronics man around there with a pair of snippers taking these dampers off of them. And, man, there was wire lying all over the floor when they finally got loose, but those green and gold meters always afterwards, providing I had – they had gone under my notice at all, had no dampers in them. And they would read instantly. But there are many meters that this has not happened with – there are many offball meters, and nearly all of them have dampers in them. So you say, "Waterbuck." ... Read. "Have you ever burned down a house?" ... Read. Maybe. All right. Now, the latent read would be, "Have you ever burned down a house?" ...... Read.

You just haven't got that much time. In other words, you couldn't even assess with one. You could go down an assessment list and by the time you would hit the second read, you would get the first read. See, you would say, "Waterbuck," "Waterbuck," and you'd get a read. Only it's the read for the first waterbuck you said. Got the idea? So you wouldn't know what it is.

Now let's look at the additional complication. You would say, "Has a waterbuck shot you?" You know, that's your test question. All right. "Has a waterbuck shot (read) you?" Oh, it was "waterbuck" that read. If "shot" was alive, it would have come in well after "you." So you would have had, "Has a waterbuck shot" – read – "you" – read. See? And all of a sudden you don't know what's reading.

And if you notice in your Prehav assessing you have to carefully say – and if you hadn't realized this, you realize that your terminal is active and that the activeness of your terminal interferes with the Prehav level read. You notice that? So you've got to have an instant reading meter and you've got to have the Prehav level distinctly read different than the terminal. So you say, "Has a waterbuck" – let the read get out of the road, you see – "shot you?" Well, you actually don't have to pause after "shot" because "you" is not charged usually. So you say, "Has a waterbuck – shot you?" Well, that lets waterbuck's read get out of the road before we run into "shot" you see? And when you're assessing like that, you have to pay attention to that because you get a sporadically reading terminal that you say – you test it out in the first place – say "waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck," and you'll see that it reads, see? All right. That's a constant read. That's fine. You could always tell that, but "waterbuck" read, "waterbuck" no read, "waterbuck" read and of course your terminal is getting weak at this time and it's fading out and it's not reading well and you're trying to assess for the thing. So you wouldn't quite know what was lagging and what wasn't lagging or if it wasn't or isn't, so you just put in the pause anyhow and you have to have an instant reading meter.
You cannot assess on the Prehav Scale – and nobody has ever been able to assess on the Prehav Scale – in the absence of an instant reading meter. Now do you see why I say American clearing, English clearing, could very well have gone up the spout just on these factors? You could never have assessed the Prehav Scale. "Has a waterbuck shot you?" Read. "Oh, well, 'shot' is alive." Oh, no, hell, it was waterbuck that read way over there. And you never could have disentangled them so that you always would have been running the wrong Prehav level; the least that would have been happening on the pc.

As far as Security Checking is concerned, they just don't security check. I've already tried to security check on an offbeat meter and have laid an egg and made one of the most serious errors I think I ever made in auditing, trying to do some kind of a Security Check to get rudiments in and get the pc in communication and I just missed like mad. Why, I had every reason to – I was using one of these old, wooden potentiometer pieces of junk, a DC Decca voltmeter, practically nothing more than soldered leads into both sides of a potentiometer, you see. And I didn't know that in that particular one the electronics man had built in a damper. Not only was it a lousy meter, but he had also built in a damper so that you would ask your question and you say, "Well, has a waterbuck shot you?" ... read. And it read like that on all of these questions and I couldn't sort out the read on the thing – I didn't quite know what was the matter with it – but I couldn't sort out a withhold. And not having sorted out the withhold, I muffed on that pc. I just couldn't get the withhold, couldn't get it straight, I couldn't get what the pc was all about because sometimes it was damping and sometimes it wasn't damping. It was never instant reading but sometimes the damp was sufficient to take all the read off the question so I would think it was clear, you see. And it would ride like that for four, five questions at which time I was perfectly happy to let go of it, see?

Subject comes up again in another five minutes, I ask the question and it's still live on a lag read. And I finally got wise to the fact that the confounded thing – it isn't that the pc is reading sporadically on this at all, the pc is reading wildly accurately on this – but what the hell it is I can't find out because the meter is only registering the pc now and then. Ooooh, that was a nightmare! I never did get the pc straightened out or in-sesison.

Anyway, I'm just giving you a little background music and a little data on this thing and try to take the pressure off your brains at the present moment because the pressure on your brain must be considerable. Some of you are running terminals which are going up to 8, and it isn't even on the tone arm dial so that must be very rough indeed.

But where your handling of an E-Meter is nervous, I can tell you just as a summary here, it's because you're not familiar with the thing. You're not familiar with it. You haven't slept with it. And you haven't eaten with it. And you're still handling it as though it's a strange cat. And just reach and withdraw from the meter, I mean that, just reach and withdraw from the meter for a while. Just say, "What is this thing" and all of a sudden it will seem more like an old friend.

The next thing is, is you're not sure it's registering the pc. Well, all right. Be assured of that by making the pc squeeze the cans and then you'll find out that at least it's registering his body motion so the probability is it will register something else. At least assure yourself of that. Does it read the pc? And if you're nervous – ever get nervous about meters, it's because
you have never reassured yourself that the meter is just sitting there idle; that it doesn't do anything itself when it's not hooked into the pc.

So if you take your drill and on the basis you pick up the meter – I don't care if you give the pc the cans or not; he hasn't got anything to do and he'd rather you be handing him the cans than him be sitting there while you fiddle with the meter, see? And just don't plug it in, just put it in a little bit, into the jack and then, if you want to be very thorough, click it over here to Set, click to Test, click it back to Set, turn the thing on here, up to 2 – set it right on 2 – turn this over, set it right on 2, come on down here, set it there and sit there for just an instant and look at the meter. Is it sitting there quietly? All right. Now, squeeze it in and tell the pc, "All right. Would you please squeeze the cans?" And then have him squeeze the cans enough time for you to be absolutely sure you've got a third-of-a-dial drop or a dial drop – whatever you're fishing for that time.

Now, you know that the meter reads null with the pc on it and you know now that the pc registers on the meter. You know the meter is set up right and at that moment you can forget any nervousness about the meter and just go on about the business of reading the meter and that's all there is to that. You just simply go on about the business of reading your meter and if your meter goes out and it all of a sudden wildly rock slams and you can't explain it and you can't get the rock slam off or something like that, you can always surreptitiously disconnect that thing halfway and throw the tone arm over here casually while carrying right on the session, distracting the pc not at all. And if that thing is disconnected and your meter is rock slamming – it'll only be doing this on some old meter – but if your meter is still rock slamming, just slide it back in casually and forget about it. That is your safest action.

You can, however, on some of the old meters, jiggle this tone arm two or three times here, but now you're liable to be distracting the pc. If you jiggle it two or three times and your meter now doesn't rock slam, don't be at all sanguine that it won't start in another three or four minutes, you see. So the safest thing to do with the thing, you slip that thing out, smiling sweetly at the pc the meanwhile and you look at the thing and while it's disconnected from the pc set it over here so that it's near Set with the tone arm. It's rock slamming, heh, heh, heh, heh. It's rock slamming. Just slide the thing back in, go on, carry on your session. If you're assessing, well, God help you. Say, "Well, that's fine now. Well, we made pretty good progress on this list. We got three level, we got – well, we got three items straightened out." "All right. That's – that's fine. Now we're going to run – now we're going to run some Havingness. Now we're going to run some Havingness. And here we go." We run some Havingness. "Now we're going to run end rudiments and some more Havingness." Well, guess you got through the last forty-five minutes that you had left of that particular session.

But don't get through the last forty-five minutes by shutting it off suddenly, and just say, "Well, just a moment, I'm not going to end the session now because this isn't going to take very, very long. I wonder what's the matter with this thing? I've never – " and so forth, and go rushing down into the other office, you see, and so forth. "Joe, have you – have – do you know what's wrong with this meter?" and so forth. Skip it. That one action – that one action has cost more pcs their aplomb than anything else I can think of.
Now, another thing is we've tried to get these cans fixed up so that pcs can direct orchestras with them. [laughter] But by George, it's a hard thing to do. You notice on the old ones, however, that the lead can be split further than they ever split them. Have you noticed that? You can always pull that lead a little bit further apart when the two wires are lying close together. But on new ones with a solid cord all the way, you can't do this and sometimes they're too close on. So you have to split them, somehow, some way, split your wire down. Get it far apart. This meter, by the way – this particular set of cords – if I were using this meter and making it my own instead of just the lecture meter down here... There we are. Now, you notice here that I have that that far apart. Do you realize that is not far enough apart because a pc... [laughter] see, he gestures out with one hand with the other one in his lap, and he can't make a full gesture.

The width you want this thing apart is enough to make a full gesture, you know. And it's exactly right. It's exactly the right width, if with one can in the pc's lap, the other can can be held at arm's length by the pc – and now you're not going to get into any trouble. But if the pc ever goes like this [shows arm position], you're not quite there again. So if you've got a pc who commonly stretches with the cans or something like that, split the thing a little further. You might not notice that it is the shortness of the wire from the V split that gives you all the trouble of the can coming off of the end. The cans will never come off the end if there is enough wire on each independent can. You understand? That's the only real trouble you have with that. I've recently made the wire quite malleable in these particular leads so that it's not a brittle wire.

Also, the original British electrode was soldered. And that was no good because I could see my pretty girl auditors every once in a while getting this thing torn out and not having a soldering iron in their pocket like some of the male auditors had. [laughter] So these things, these little – on the electrodes here – this screw you find on the electrodes of the Mark IV and the little nut that you see inside is not a crude manufactured item. It is practically over the dead body of Fowler and Allen. They don't want to put them on like that. They want a nice, neat, electronic job. And I want a job so that when the pc yawns – a six-foot, eight-inch pc yawns, you see, and tears the thing apart – at least you've got a session break at which time all you have to do is take your nail file – notice the width of that screw? That's nail file width. You can take a nail file, you can open that thing up, you can skin down the wire very easily, put a new coil of wire around the nut, holding the nut inside with your index finger, screw it up again with a nail file and you have done a fast repair job which is quite a permanent repair job. So those things I insist on. I insist that you be able to reconnect your own cans because if this thing is going to break down, well, let's have a point of repair where it's going to break.

Some of the old meters and cheap meters have malleable wire which is – pardon me, nonmalleable wire. It's brittle wire inside these insulation areas. And the friction of the wire, you know, friction of the leads, will sometimes make it break inside the wire. And your leads won't connect to the E-Meter or connect sporadically and so on. And it's just lousy wire, that is all, it's just bad wire in the E-Meter leads so we insist on that being nice, soft wire.

But remember that can still happen. Somebody can come down on that with the heel of his shoe exactly right against a concrete floor or something like that and manage to practically sever one of these wires or sever one, and you would never notice it, you would just never
notice it because the insulation is still sound and whole, but the wire inside the insulation is broken.

So if you got to a desperate state as to why the meter didn't register on the pc – if it sits quietly all by itself and the lead, it's – when plugged in, won't do a third-of-a-dial drop, it's in these leads. You very often just grab yourself off another set of leads, plug it into the same meter and you're off to the races. But, remember, because I insisted on repair, do-it-yourself repair is possible on these electrodes, you can always – because this is a very simple jack here – you notice how simple that jack is? You can always get yourself another piece of ordinary house-wiring wire, preferably soft copper, preferably covered with plastic which won't go brittle on you right away and you can fix up one of these jacks and one of these leads very easily no matter where you are. You can always get a piece of wire. If you're in a hotel room someplace, why, just reach into the molding, you know, and get some of the telephone wire and snip it off and so forth. Might even tell the management about it when you leave.

Anyway, that is – these are nonsense points that don't have very much to do with anything and you possibly haven't learned very much today, but I just wanted to talk to you about the gimmicks and nonsense of the E-Meter and give you a few tips.

By the way, I will say, before I close the lecture, there is something I am sure some of you do not know. This is the older model, isn't it? These things – when these leads get loose, you can always tighten them up and you should. Or you can also get little lock washers and put on these things, little tiny lock washers and so on. I love British manufacturers. It's marvelous. The only place it ever falls down is lock washers and gasoline lines. They don't like lock washers and gasoline lines. I always have to take a whole car apart and put lock washers in everyplace and put in a new gas line. I'm joking now. I never take them apart. I have somebody else do it. [laughter]

But you might not know that this meter is a self-propping meter. It's just a chance that you might not know it. These things come down and go over this pin. It's never been done with this one so therefore it's all completely haywire. Did you see that? Did you know that a meter did this?

Well, the meter makes a little tent all by itself. I'm sure you knew that, but also I'm also sure that someplace or another somebody doesn't know it. That's a little invention. That's one of these inventions I do by the process of telling people to do it in a very firm tone of voice. You know, "Fix it up so it will stand all by itself for an auditor." And they say, "But how?" I say, "That's your job. After all, I can't have a total monopoly on all the thinkingness in the world."

So anyway, somebody else dreamed this thing up and I think it's a pretty nice rig. These meters stand up better than any other meters I've seen. And sometimes these little hooks get off. You can buy those hooks at any hardware store or dime store where you can buy these nuts and bolts and put them back together again if somebody treats your meter too rough. Okay?

Well, those are the nonsense parts of the E-Meter and if you ever get stranded in the middle of the Gobi Desert without an E-Meter, don't try to clear anybody.
Thank you very much.
PARTS OF 3D

A lecture given on 30 November 1961

Thank you.

Now, this is the 30th of Nov. This Russian month is about to end. The month of "Nov." And we are about to let you in on some of the secrets of life, unraveling the case that has been run on Routine 3 and is being run on 3D and cases which will be run on 3D by you and the data which I am about to give you, you may not see anything of again, so you'd better unplug and tune in and get off the wavelength of Arcturus and onto the wavelength around here and I'll give you some dope, okay?

Now, not that you don't but, I mean, this is very serious, what I'm telling you. I'm very serious about this. You are going to be unraveling cases. Now, I don't care whether the case was run on Routine 3 or has been run on Khrushchev or somebody on 3D, you understand – I couldn't care less what case it is – you're going to be in the business of unraveling cases that have been misrun on existing procedures.

So you must know how to take apart a case and run a case that you get right straight off the street – the Glutz case – and in comes Miss Glutz. And Miss Glutz is seated in the auditing chair in the HGC and the auditor goes down the line popeta-popeta-popeta-popeta, bangety-bangety-bangety-bang, and he gets all the 3D items rather easily.

Now, you may very well be the one who is called upon to verify these items. And there's certain data which you have to know in order to verify items; not just sitting down and looking pretty and seeing if it falls on the E-Meter. You have to use your noggin on it. It – 3D goes together like a jigsaw puzzle. Tell you more about that in a moment. But that's one case. That's one case. That's the easy thing for you to do. That's a pipe; there's nothing to it. You can learn that. You can learn that. You can learn to do that standing on your head.

All right. Now we get the other thing. It wouldn't matter whether these are – techniques are released now or ten years from now, there'll always be some boob in upper Keokuk who will have got hold of them and while holding the E-Meter balanced on the tip of his nose, will have knocked the pc eighteen ways from the middle with the process.

Now, the very process that you're to use to clear the person has been abused on the pc. How are you going to unsnarl it and unravel it? Pretty interesting. Now you're getting into very, very interesting mental gymnastics.

All right. Let's take the least of these cases. Somebody comes in, says, "Well – uh, well uh – uh – uh – uh – an auditor up in – in Alaska found my goal and terminal for me about three years ago. And he ran it for quite a while, but uh – because I got sick, we couldn't continue the processing and so on."

You say, "Well, where's your goals list?"
"Oh, well, I don't know. We – goals list? Oh, that – that thing he had me write down up there. I don't know. Oh, I don't know where that went."

"Well, has there been a subsequent goal list?"

"Well, there's only that one that was done by an auditor down in Mexico when I was down there."

"Well, what happened to that goals list?"

"Well, I don't know."

"What was the auditor's name?"

"Well, I don't know. His name started with an H. He kept putting his thumb in pie. He – he said he was – couldn't get back into the United States anymore, but we don't have any goals list from that."

"Well, all right. Okay. Well, we'll start from scratch."

Now, it's horrible, you see, because the case in a nonrestimulated category can give you a fairly straight list of goals that got lots of tags on them, but after they've been run criss-cross for a little while, the tags disappear.

And you should understand what a goals list is. Between us girls, a goals list has nothing to do with the ambitions of a pc. We ask for the ambitions of a pc, we ask for their desires and they give them to us quite earnestly and honestly and they think these are their desires and that is all very wonderful. But that isn't what we have asked for and that isn't what we get. We have asked for: one small, little, red flag fluttering in the breeze, telling us the route into the Goals Problem Mass. That's what we've asked for. We've asked for the biggest chunk of case that is visible and available at the first glance. That's what we've asked for and for some reason or other, the pc goes around waving this one, although it leads straight into hell's deepest inferno.

All right. So it's – it's merely a signal. That's all we care about. Of course, everybody loves this. They think this is wonderful. They say, "What did I want to do in life?" Well, we sure want to know what they wanted to do in life, too, but we get all kinds of misnomers.

Well, the fellow who wants to make cars: "Always wanted to make cars. Yes, I've always wanted to make cars. Everything's wonderful and I've always wanted to make cars. As a matter of fact, I was up in Detroit, studied automotive engineering. So I worked in Detroit for a very long time and so forth. But just never made a go of it, you understand, but I've always wanted to make cars and so forth," and this checks out to be his goal.

Well, by the time we get down to it, we find the modifier is "crash." Who is the opponent of him making cars? Well, for some peculiar reason, the opponent to him making cars are – are horse drivers or something. We don't care what and their opposition goal, you see, is to – it wouldn't be to wreck cars – but their opposition goals is to keep cars off the road. Well, this gets very interesting because if the opposition goal is to keep cars off the road and his object is to make cars crash, he's got an awful lot of agreement, hasn't he, with his opposition? You'll find this is always the case. There's a tremendous amount of agreement sub rosa with the opposition. What's this mean?
Well, it means that our pc is going to dramatize at times the opposition goal and they always do. A pc will always dramatize to some degree, sometimes, the opposition goal. So it's part of his makeup and personality. He'll dramatize the opposition goal.

Now, the chances of his giving you the opposition goal as his goal in the first place is quite rare, unless it is something he suddenly thought of as he woke up in the morning because it was written on the wall.

Hence, we have this proviso: "Is it something you really wanted to do in your lifetime?" We for sure must ask him that. Otherwise, he will give us the opposition goal which is stacked up and we'll assess out the opposition goal. And of course, the opposition goal will assess out as neatly as anybody else. There have been some examples of that. We have to ask the pc – there have been none in this unit. We have to ask the pc, then, "Did he himself ever want to do this thing in his lifetime?" That is how we make sure it's the pc's goal.

"Oh, well, yes," he says, "I wanted to do this. I just wanted to do this. Uh, yes, I wanted to make cars. I went up to Detroit. As a matter of fact, one time took a correspondence course in automotive engineering. Never finished it, but I took it and so forth and I worked up in Detroit until I embezzled some f... I mean, until I got fired and uh ..." He'll get all kinds of oddball things, but he wanted to do it.

Now, the opposition goal is something that occurred to him suddenly. He sort of, however, at times has done it. You get the difference? At times he has done this. He never really wanted to do it, but he has done it. You follow this out? He's done it. He didn't want to do it. He didn't have any actual ambition to do this thing. He didn't have a desire to do this thing, but he did find himself doing it occasionally, after he thought of it. See, this has never really occurred consciously to him at all. He's thought of it.

I'll give you an example of that. "To find." Here's an example: He's thought of finding things. He's thought of going and finding things. Occasionally, he's found himself finding things, don't you see. But actually, he gets mad every time he tries to find anything. So you'd ask this person, you'd say ... Well, he comes in and he tells you, "Well, I just got up in the morning and there were these letters across – you know, across the front of my mind and it was 'to find.' And that's – I know that's my goal. I know that's my goal." Sell, sell, sell, sell, sell, sell, see.

You say, "Well, did you ever have a desire to do this?"
"Oh, well, yes, I've done it many times."
"No. Did you ever plan to do this thing?"
"Oh, well, no."
"Well, what happens when you do that thing? How do you feel when you are finding things?"
"Oh, mad as hell."
You say, "Fine. That's good." You can write down in a little side note, "Probable opposition goal, 'to find.'"
"Now, all right. Now, what have you wanted to do?" You go on with your listing. You go on with your listing. You go on with your listing. Oh, put "to find" in there if you want to get yourself in trouble, that's all right, but remember to use your head. The analytical tag of the reactive bank is that goal that the pc himself has wanted to do and remember there are many other tags and there are many other terminals and there's many other everything else in the reactive mind that can pop up and hit you in the face and can register and all that sort of thing. You understand? There's lots of things. But something that the pc really wanted to do.

It's more simple than it looks. It's just that after you have listed everything the pc said he wanted to do, let's make absolutely sure when we're checking the thing out, that it's something he at some time or another has planned to do, has actively done and how he felt about doing it. Because if he were emotional about doing it, that is to say if he were just screamingly angry every time he tried to find something – doesn't sound like much of a goal to us, does it? The fellow who wants to make cars was never screamingly angry when he went to Detroit, when he went into the shop. Maybe he couldn't make cars. But oh, he thought that was nice. He thought that was nice. You understand? That was nice. You understand? That was good. That was a nice thing to do and that would please everybody. You get the conditions under which the goal is? Why? You want a high-toned attitude toward his goal, if you possibly can get it.

Now, I'll show you. A Prehav terminal comes in, pardon me, a 3D terminal or an old 3 terminal comes in high on the Prehav Scale, the old numbered scale. Serene, marvelous, wonderful, beautiful, see. The terminal comes in. It's "a dirty skunk" is the terminal, see and it's – "dirty skunk" is serene. It's quite fantastic.

He's in marvelous communication. He has interest. You see? Well, that just shows you the overwhumpingness of the terminal, don't you see? The higher toned the terminal is, the lower toned is the pc. The pc himself, although he – this – he's a combination of all these things, he's practically out of sight. And there he is, stuck underneath all of this beautiful, high-toned beauty and serenity. You see this even on your graphs. The thetie-weetie case: Everything is lovely. You kick this person in the teeth, this person will say, "Thank you. Isn't that sweet."

You've got to watch this pc on an ARC break because you practically never know they have one. It operates the same mechanically because down deep the thetan knows he's got an ARC break. But the dramatization after you have said, "What the hell are you doing sitting down there in the chair? I told you to stand up. No, I mean stand – I mean sit down, stand up, uh, uh – don't sit down. Uh – uh – . Well, you don't have to pay much attention to that because it's just because you have a lousy temper this morning." [laughter]

Anyway, the upshot of this thing is, is the pc has an ARC break. But you ask the pc, "Do you have an ARC break?" and the pc says, "Oh no, of course not. Forgive and forget, I always say." And yet you run ARC Straightwire or an ARC Process 1961 on this pc and he goes all over the dial. "Uhhhhhh, wow, wow, horrible, horrible, horrible," don't you see. I mean, they run it and run it and run it. You find they can't really talk to anybody, but it's all nice anyway.

Now, when you start running the terminal that lies at the other end of this goal, you'll find out that terminal comes down the Tone Scale and the pc, if you could assess the pc, just
assess "you" on the Tone Scale – you never do this – you'd find out that the pc wasn't even there at the beginning of the assessment and then came up the Tone Scale little by little by little by little by little and eventually appeared. And this terminal is going down scale, down, down, down, down, down, down.

So, all right. The terminal declines on the Tone Scale, the pc rises on the Tone Scale. At the point where they cross, the pc and the dramatization of the terminal is a chromium-plated bitch. And the terminal, you see, is a bitch and the pc is a bitch and everything is messed up and they are very unhappy, and everybody is cross with everybody. You got the idea? It's some kind of blaaaaaa. "How horrible life is!" you know. Because they've always been dependent on the beautiful serenity of being kicked in the teeth to bolster them up and that isn't there anymore. They have to make up their mind about what it is to get kicked in the teeth. Very well.

You've got this mechanism. The pc as a valence comes down scale and the pc as a being goes up scale – the actual pc, the thetan. Well, that occurs in terminals and so, therefore, it must occur in goal tone. And this fellow says, "Oh, I've always wanted to make cars. Isn't that interesting, making cars." Interest? You know where interest is?

"Oh, yes, I'm very interested in making cars. I'm always talking to everybody about making cars. Cars, cars, cars, cars. Oh, yes, yes, very nice. That's a lovely goal." That is a worthwhile thing to do and you'll find when you've got a real goal by the teeth that you can depend on and set your sextant by from there on out – which is what you're doing in 3D – that it is a fairly high-toned attitude toward that goal.

Now, when you have a low-toned attitude toward the goal, it'll come along with the fact, "Did you ever want to do this, really?" and the person says, "No, I just do it." Well, haven't you asked for a prima facie dramatization? Has he ever wanted to do this? Is this ever something he wanted to be, to have, or to do? And then this is capped by the question, "How do you feel when you do that?"

"Oh," he says, "I feel good when I do that." You're all set.

Now, he says, "Well, as a matter of fact, whenever I – I don't know. 'To find things'? How do I feel about it? Well, I try to find things – try to find things. I don't know. Find things, some way. You know, it's a hell of a nuisance having to find things! You know they get lost? People purposely misplace them on you? And you know every morning I try to get my cuff links and somebody has purposely misplaced them and so forth? I almost go out of my mind trying to find that sort of thing. And people shouldn't ..." It sounds awfully motivatorish, doesn't it, and so on.

Well, you can take – that is a nice final check on whether you've got the person's goal. Is it something they had an ambition for or is it something they have done, "Damn it!" See the difference? Because the one they've done, "Damn it!" is probably the opposition goal and they will both check out. They will check out gorgeously.

Fortunately for you, you almost never get – it's very rare that you will get the opposition goal on the pc's goal list if you simply ask for "things which you have wanted to do,"
"ambitions you've had," "things which you have desired," "secret ambitions you've had," that sort of thing. Oh, that's fine. That goes right along, and you get the list.

But if you were to ask generally, "What ideas have you obeyed?" you see, you'd also get all the opposition terminal goals. "What ideas have you obeyed?" That isn't what you're asking him, so the very questions which get you the goals list weed out this thing and the probability of your getting an opposition goal is very small, but is not impossible. You must remember that: that it's not impossible to get the opposition goal.

Now, when you get the opposition goal, your 3D is all upside down, of course. You look at the 3D form, you look at the items on it – well, you're trying to assess the opposition and the pc won't assess worth shucks. In other words, you can get the opposition goal, put it down as the pc's goal and then of course you're going to get as the pc's terminal, the opposition terminal.

Then what are you going to have to get as the pc's terminal? You wind up, of course, in trying to get the pc's terminal ... Well, you've got it! It's the opposition terminal for the goal you've got and you see the thing is all backwards, isn't it. But it can still be worked out. And this is all I want to teach you in this lecture about 3D. It doesn't matter how upside down and backwards the thing finally comes. Certain errors or difficulties that you encounter in assessment serve as diagnostic points for you.

So we – the first test, as I say, is it something the pc wanted to do, wanted to be or wanted to have? Was there a desire back of this? And if there was no desire back of it and if the pc's attitude toward it is very suspicious and very upset – oh, yes, you've assessed something. Yes, yes, yes, you've assessed something and actually could work out a full 3D from it. You've assessed the opposition goal. Remember, it'll fall equally with the pc's goal.

Why will it fall equally? Well, get the idea of two tractors meeting head-on in a field. One is driven by the opposition goal – the idea is the driver there – and it's the opposition tractor and the other one, idea, is driven by the (quote) "pc's idea" and it is the pc's tractor. And in trying to pull these two tractors apart, if you don't pull the pc's tractor off, the pc will practically blow away in the resulting winds of bluuuuuhh. You see? In other words, the opposition tractor has the quality of spraying with poison gas the pc's tractor. You got the idea? But the pc's tractor doesn't have the same thing because the pc won't suffer.

You can do almost anything you want to to an opposition terminal except treat it as the pc's and when you treat it as the pc's, the pc will look like he's getting his head blown off. He actually will. His face will press in, the wind will go across his face and to give you a subjective reality, after you've got a 3D formed sometime, don't get it run, but ask your auditor, "All right. I'm game for anything. Assess my opposition terminal on the Prehav Scale please." And that single action, if you get somebody to do it for you – won't hurt you any; leave you upset for an hour or so; it doesn't matter – you'll learn from that the terrific sensation you get off one of these opposition – working constantly with the opposition terminal-l-l-l-zzz. You're being blown away all the time. Honest, it's like some kind of a little electronic windstorm going on. There is something happening. If you've really go – if that's the proper opposition terminal, somebody assesses this thing on the Prehav Scale for you, just the constant repetition of it and trying to find its level and putting the action in it will give you the same sensation a
pc would get if he were being run on it accidentally. It almost blows him away. It's something on the order of having a big electric fan in front of him, going at about a thousand foot-pounds of thrust. It's sort of something that doesn't want him there.

Now, if you've got the pc's tractor in this smash, you can pull that tractor away and take it to the garage. But the opposition tractor, you have really no control over at all. So it is necessary to get the pc's goal and the pc's terminal and run it as the pc's goal and the pc's terminal. It is necessary to have the opposition goal and it is necessary also to have the opposition terminal. But remember, that one can't be towed away. It isn't the pc's.

If you're going to take the problem apart, in other words, the half that is called "opposition" doesn't audit well. You audit it a little bit to keep it restimulated. Otherwise, you won't keep the pc located at the goals-mass point. See, well, every once in a while you say, "Hey, start up the engine of that other tractor." Brooooom, brooooom, brooooom. "That's enough. That's enough. That's enough." [laughs]

Now, you can start up its engine so thoroughly that if you have the same number of commands containing opposition terminal as you have pc's terminal, you'll lock the pc up right there. It makes for terribly fast, very uncomfortable run. Brrrrr! Both tractors are in gear, going forward, both accelerators are on the floorboard.

Now, if you want to really have a mess, run a five-way, ordinary, run-of-the-mill, garden-variety bracket. If you really want to have a mess, run some old command that was perfectly easily run on some Dynamic Assessment terminal and didn't do too much. Try to clear up a 3D Goals Problem Mass with some old process of that kind. And use the opposition terminal in it to the same degree that you use the pc's terminal and you will see exactly what I am talking about.

Both engines are in full, but all wheels are skidding But the amount of friction which is coming out of the bumper-to-bumper situation would make people deafen for miles around, because they won't move it. Nothing will move. Actually, you could probably audit it for years on one of the old-type things, and you would never get anyplace. Tone arm would simply go up to about 5.5 and stick and eventually all you'd have to do is say to somebody either his opposition terminal or his goals terminal, either one, and the tone arm would promptly fly to the stick point. Pang! It'd stay – it might stay there an hour; it might stay there two hours; it might stay there two weeks, but it would go right up to that stick point. Bang! Because you've got a head-on crash and that head-on crash is what keeps the reactive bank reactive and what keeps it there and which keeps it poised in time. And that's what makes it a reactive bank. And that's how come it can stay with the pc. And that's how come the pc dramatizes it and all the other things that we've been studying for years are contained in this Goals Problem Mass. They're right there. You don't have to run engrams. Run these two masses; you've got it all set.

Because the pc has this overwhelming ambition – modified slightly – and the opposition has an equally overwhelming ambition – modified not at all and these two things are head-on.

All right. Now, in sorting this out, the North Star, your Polaris, in the navigation of this particular problem, is the goal. So please get the goal. Whatever else you do, get the goal.
Now, if you get something from a goals list, which assesses out beautifully and continues to fall – just routine assessment. Assessment is not hard. You'd think, to some auditors, it was terrible, but it is not hard. But assessment becomes as hard as you're knuckleheaded about what you're trying to assess.

We've got the pc's terminal over as the opposition terminal – I'll give you an idea, see – we've got the pc's terminal over as the opposition terminal and now we're trying to find the pc's terminal. How long do you think we could go on?

We've already got it on the 3D sheet. Nothing else is going to fall on the 3D sheet, but we keep asking him for sweetness-and-light terminals to put down as his own terminal.

Well, this opposition terminal is a dirty dog, see and he isn't going to ever admit to being a dirty dog, but he is one. It's his terminal. That's quite interesting. How long do you think we could assess for this terminal which is already down under the heading, "opposition terminal." It's already there. And we're going to keep on assessing for it to put it down as the – we're trying to find the pc's terminal. Well, we found it. It's overlisted under the opposition terminal. That's where it is. And what have we got as the pc's goal? We've got the opposition goal, that's what we've got. So we've just got two sections misfilled in. You got the idea?

From that point on, everything becomes unworkable. So that's why the lodestar of the goal has to be so clearly defined as something the pc wanted to do. We want a high-toned, beautifully serene, "Wouldn't it be lovely," "Everybody would love us desperately," "This would heal all the problems of Earth, that is for sure" – that's what we want. He won't put it that strong ordinarily, but you say, "Well, did you ever want to make cars?"

"Oh, yes, yes, I'd never thought about it before, but you know, I do. I've always – yes, yes."

"Well, how do you feel when you start making cars?"

"Well, I get very interested, and so forth and very nice, and so on."

"Well, you ever talked to people about making them?"

"Oh, yes, yes. Talk all the time about making cars," and so on.

Oh, hell, you've got his goal, man. I mean, there's nothing to that. It's high-toned. You must have his goal. There it is.

All right. Now, we get something else. We say to this pc ... All right. We go down the list and we got this goal "to find things." And we say to the pc, "All right, now ..." We checked it out. We got it. We know it falls, we know it's perfect. See, you realize that all five first parts and actually the Prehav level, all six parts of a 3D fall equally. And they stay in equally. And they're assessable equally. You've just got to find out which one is which. That's all.

And we say to this fellow, "All right. Now, how about 'finding things,' now, we've got this goal here." That's – we didn't find any other goal; we just found this one goal. "To find things." And we'd write this down and we've assessed everything off and we finally wind up with the thing, "to find things."
And we say, "Well, where did this come from, now? Did you ever wanted to find things?" is what you really ask the pc.

"I've gone a lot of places to look for things."

Well, you say, "Good. Good. Have you ever wanted to find things?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, I have. I – I – I – I've studied an awful lot of – of – of ways and means of locating."

"So, have you ever wanted to find anything?"

"Well, it goes without saying. Of course. Naturally."

"Well, how do you feel when you're looking for something?"

"Oh, well, how do I feel – how does anybody feel? You feel like hell when you're looking for things, of course."

Well, you've got a piece of 3D. Don't kick that out. You've got a piece of 3D; that's for sure. But please recognize that it's probably the opposition goal.

Now, if you were – if you were the person standing between the bumpers of these two tractors, you might not know which tractor you were. They're sort of grinding and champing, don't you see? And there's a lot of shouting and swearing going on between the drivers and you might get disoriented at this point and you might not really know which was the wrong tractor. And you might appropriate equally both tractors; they'll both assess. The Fordson tractor will assess equally with – as far as it's concerned – just another Fordson tractor. They're all Fordsons, aren't they? It's this kind of an assessment as far as the E-Meter is concerned.

So you look over into this situation and you put it down. You have assessed something. You don't invalidate it. You don't tell the pc what it is or anything else, but you know where to put it, and you don't put it down as the pc's goal, if you please. You leave it in abeyance. And then we try to find the opposition goal to it. Smart, huh? Try to find the opposition goal to this thing.

You get a whole new list and the pc somehow or another ... And if we very carefully – if we've suspected it this far, we don't say, "Your goal of," because that's an evaluation. We just say "the goal of." See, "What would oppose the goal of finding things? What would oppose that goal?"

We get a whole new goals list. The pc's goal will appear on it. And we finally, just by assessment, we get one of these items and there it is, bang. There it is.

And we say, "All right, have you ever wanted to do this thing?" And it's "to get lost." Well, obviously, the noble thing to do is to find things. And the ignoble thing to do is to get lost. Everybody agrees on this.

And the pc says to you, "Oh, yes, I'm always trying to get lost. It's so interesting."

"Well, have you ever talked to anybody about getting lost?"
"Well, yes, as a matter of fact, I wrote a book on the subject one time." Very high-toned. Oh, yes, everybody would be interested in getting lost. See? Bang.

So we've got, "to find things" on one side and the opposition terminal, of course, is "to get lost." The opposition goal is "to get lost," as far as he's concerned or we were concerned – unless we know what part we're looking for. We found the pc's goal backwards. Simple. He's low-toned about the opposition goal and he's high-toned about his own goal. That's what – that's a rule of thumb.

When the opposition goal is chanted to him, he kind of feels a little bit overwhelmed and he starts sort of leaning backwards and he wonders if the high winds of space haven't started to blow. And you start chanting at him his own goal and he says, "Isn't that wonderful?" He feels so relaxed about it. Of course, it's the source of his ulcers, but he feels it's real nice. It's real nice. This whole thing is real nice. Made him feel better.

And you say "to get lost," "to get lost," "to get lost," "to get lost," "to get lost." And this winds of space idea of blowing his head off or something of the sort just diminishes and lessens and goes away.

So we could just watch the pc. We're going to get the same reaction on the E-Meter. The E-Meter does not know friend from foe. It doesn't. It doesn't know which side it's reading And we couldn't care less. Just as long as it'll read and tell us that it's in the fight. That's all we want to know.

The E-Meter will tell us it's part of the fight. Aaaagh-guuu. We could actually go ahead and almost blindly find the parts of 3D and jigsaw them together, see. We could find a goal, and then we could find a goal that opposed that goal, and then we could find a terminal for one of the goals and a terminal for another one of the goals. And just by gradual lessening and discussion with the pc, we would eventually – the pc would all of a sudden say, "Hey, that's me. And that other one, that's them." And man, I don't mean – mind telling you, he won't change his mind after that.

Yeah, he knows which side of the fence he's on. It's somehow or another with a little abashment sometimes, hell tell you, "Well, actually – headwaiter – an uptown swell. I've never been an uptown swell. I've just been a headwaiter. And my goal is 'headwaiter.'"

Well, you can check it out easily enough. You don't have to bother with too much guesswork on the part of the pc because he's, of course, mixed up. He's not a reliable judge of this situation. You just sit there and say, "Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell." The pc's head's going back and "th-th-th-th. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell."


He'll never do that with "uptown swell." You'll never see him pat his top hat on his head. You'll just see him lean backwards. He cannot dramatize successfully the opposition terminal and has never been able to.

He's tried. Every once in a while, he'll try. I guess a guy caught between the bumpers of two tractors with unlimited horsepower, each one driving at each other, I suppose he – he can't quite make up his mind what to try. But that's about the way the pc is.

All right. Let's look at this then. You've got, now, an opposition terminal and an opposition goal and a pc's terminal and a pc's goal and then we've got a modifier. And we're not going to bother to modify – the only goal we're going to modify, of course, is the pc's goal.

We could also modify the opposition goal. We can find modifiers for it, too. We can go on and bat our brains out, but after we've found the modifiers for it, so what? Maybe someday we'll find some use for it and I will tell you, "You know that lecture I made back there on the 30th of November on the subject of never find the modifier for the opposition goal? Well, as a matter of fact, we need it. Process Zed is absolutely vital that we have this." So take a rain check on it, if that's the case. But right now we have no particular use to find it.

All right. This thing is going to make a picture. It's going to make a picture and the pc knows. The pc is never really going to argue seriously about his own terminal. But the pc'll be awful queasy about an opposition terminal when it's handed to him as his own terminal. He doesn't think that's quite right. Because every time he thinks about that being his terminal, the winds of space start going.

"I don't know if that could quite be my terminal."

He thinks about his own terminal, and all he gets is a horrendous, horrible headache. That's much preferable to being blown off the cliff, see. You get the difference between these two things?

All right. Jigsawing these things together has got to make a story and it's absolutely vital that it make a story. It's got to make sense – to you.

Now, never suggest anything to the pc. But when you've got the elements, what they are, you will have to sort out. And if they have all checked out nicely and you know there are all parts of it, before you run this pc, you make up your mind if it makes a story to you.

For instance, does the opposition goal really belong to the opposition or is it the pc? And that's an easy test. "What have you really wanted to do?" chanted at the pc – it blows his head off, it's the opposition goal. Fine. He – he really wanted to do it. It's his goal. He – he gets mad when he tries to do it, why, that's the opposition goal. You got the idea? So that – that's easy to sort out, that one is.

All right. Opposition terminal. Now, this requires a little more sense. The opposition terminal must be somebody who would have a goal of that type who would actually be opposed to the pc's goal. It mustn't be "a kangaroo catcher in southern Andalusia." The pc's terminal has gotten to be an uptown swell, you see. "Uptown swell and a kangaroo catcher and ... Doesn't sound – there's something wrong here someplace."
The way you straighten it out is by thorough checking again. Just check it out again. See? Just – just make sure it's right at that point. Just check it out quietly. Because you're going to find that it's got to look like a fight. For instance, what locks a problem together? What locks a problem together? "To find things," "to lose things."

They must be opposing ideas, and the ideas must be quite clearly opposing. And if they're not clearly opposing, you do a recapitulation and if you don't do your recapitulation of the thing, you're in trouble, because you'll be running something that is off beam.

Now, it can happen that it doesn't sound that way to you, but it makes sense to the pc. Well, I buy that right up to the point it doesn't make sense to me.

Oh, come on, wake up, don't be so serious. It's all right for the pc to say that it makes perfect sense to him to have, "the uptown swell" and "a kangaroo catcher in southern Andalusia." Perfectly makes sense and for the opposition goal to be "to catch kangaroos" and the pc's goal to be, "to light cigars." This is fine. He says, well, it all makes sense to him and I take that, I buy that, I say that's just fine, right up to the point where I can't understand it. If it doesn't look like it to me and if it wouldn't sound like it to a screenwriter and if it wouldn't be understood by the general public if put in a short story and a bunch of other things like that, I have now learned by experience that it won't stand up on a run.

I've learned this by experience, because pc after pc now, on 3D, has said, "It makes sense to me" and it didn't make any sense to me – not to me, it didn't make any sense. And every one of them – you can ask Suzie – I've said to Suzie, "That isn't it. Nah-uh! Somebody's skidding their wheels someplace. That isn't it."

And sure enough, on checkouts and runs they haven't made sense. It wasn't because I think they've got to be redone. If we didn't redo them, somebody'd get killed in the process of being audited. That's all. Do you see what I mean? And it's just coincidental that they – the right ones when now relocated make sense! The terminal agrees with the – with the guy I know that the pc is, see? It agrees with his past and background and he does these things. Yeah, we know this. And he has these goals, and yeah, boy, does he hate this other item like mad, you know. He wouldn't have anything to do with that. That's obvious.

And that other item wouldn't have anything to do with the pc's item. And, yes, this goal does confront the other goal. Oh, yeah, that's fine. And the modifier – yeah, we'd suspect something like that about this pc. It all makes sense and you say, "Now we know!" See? And if the auditor can't say, "Now we know," he'd better keep fumbling with pieces of paper. That's all I've got to say.

He never suggests anything to the pc. It's up to him to find more items and to try to straighten this out until it makes sense and suddenly, like a crash of lightning, he's liable to get something on the basis of – from the pc – "Oh, well, yes, I ... Hu-hu-hu-hu. Oh, yes, I don't see why I ever tried to sell you the idea that I was a Canadian Mounted Policeman. I – I don't see why I ever tried to sell you that idea. Yes, it's absolutely true. It's absolutely true. I was a sausage maker in Vienna. That's right. I always have been. I always wanted to make sausages. Yeah, that's right. I don't think I ever told you this before, but as a matter of fact ..."

And what are we getting? We're getting the upper strata of the Tone Scale. We're getting a pc talking. We're getting a pc talking about it, a pc interested in it. We're getting the whole upper
Tone Scale about all this and worse than that, it fits. Makes sense. Makes sense. There's been a pc or two around where nothing made sense, you know?

Sometimes it doesn't make sense until you get all of the pieces and all of a sudden you'd say, "Of course. Naturally! Well yes, all right!" Up to that time, you only had four items. They didn't make any sense.

Maybe one was "a juggler," and the other and the goal of the thing was "to shoot clay pipes," and just all the buttuh and all of a sudden you get the fifth item, you know? You know, like the pc's terminal and it'll all of a sudden will go, clank! You know? All goes into place very nicely. You say, "Yep, that's the pc. Yep, that's this and that's that, and that's the goal, and that's it – boom, boom, boom."

You never argue with the pc on this subject. You just either test it out, get more items, check it out, look it over, know what's gone before and all of that. That – that's what you do. That's how you handle the situation basically. You know what's gone before. That is your best bet.

And it makes sense to you finally and until it makes sense to you, keep assessing, keep moving things around and don't get so confoundedly set – just because you wrote at the top of the piece of paper that these were opposition terminals – don't get so fixated on the idea that they absolutely become opposition terminals. They might not at all. It can check out 100 percent and appear as the pc's terminal. Just because you've assessed for the opposition terminal and found something is no reason that you've found the opposition terminal, at all. But given any couple of parts of 3D, you can always straighten it out. You can always ask a cross question that gives you the other parts, which is quite interesting.

Let's say we knew this pc was assessed at some time or another and somebody found a goal on him and it had been run and evidently fairly successful. And we had the terminal on the thing and it appeared to be his terminal and so on. And that was all very well. And it did check out and as a matter of fact still bangs. And we can still get a bang on this thing on the meter. Well, just because he said it was his terminal, is no reason it's his – isn't his opposition terminal. See, you've got a piece of the puzzle and now I'm talking about putting cases together, see?

Well, the easiest way to put a piece – a case together, of anybody ever run on Routine 3 – the easiest thing in the world to do is just take "What goal?" "What terminal?" and then conditionally put the goal down as the pc's goal and conditionally put the terminal down as the pc's terminal.

Now, find quite noncommittally, an opposition goal – ha-ha! – and then find an opposition terminal and check those things out on their list, which now leaves you with four items. You're not committed yet. One or the other of the goals you have found is the pc's goal. One or the other of them is the opposition goal. See, you've assessed it out and the assessment checked.

One or the other of the terminals is the opposition terminal and the other one is the pc's terminal. Well, you're – this is pretty easy now, by this time. Your test is – all you have to
do is chant it at him; if it blows his head off, it's the opposition. I mean, simple. I mean, you can even subject it to actual mechanical tests. It doesn't have to be by your opinion.

Now, the opposition terminal, goal; opposition anything, opposition level – these things all start the winds of space. They start blowing the pc's head off and that's for sure. This you can count on – starts blowing the pc's head off

It isn't that things get more solid. Don't use that as a test, for God sakes. They'd better get more solid, but you've got that. You actually get a current. It's actually a current starts going. I mean, you're talking about winds. You're not talking about mass.

You chant the opposition, you can start up a sort of a mass wind. You start up a wind and you start up the – the pc's goal or terminal and it just kind of gets more solid and he feels happier and he feels kind of less there and foggier. He doesn't feel good, you understand, but it's fine. It's fine. It's interesting, it's at a high communication state, it's fine. And the other isn't. The other is misemotional.

After you've assessed and run, now you really start getting the dope. You start running the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal and you promptly have an awful mess on your hands.

Now, here's about what happens: The pc comes in low on the Prehav Scale. That is to say that your first levels that the pc gets alive will be relatively low levels. That's – gives you a probability of opposition terminal. You're running his opposition terminal by mistake.

The pc runs kind of – doesn't know anything about what's going on; knows nothing about what is going on and can't tell you anything about what is happening and cannot do it very well and so forth. Well, it's not necessarily the opposition terminal. It's just probably the wrong terminal. I can tell you how you'll find it's the wrong terminal, in any time and case. It's very simple. It runs this lifetime and runs everything the pc has run into before in processing. Isn't that nice?

It runs mainly this lifetime and it never goes into any past lives or any nasty things like that and it runs all of the things the pc has already had run. See, the pc's had this and that and the other thing run on their case down through the years and that's what the pc contacts again.

You have found a lock. The terminal you have found is just a lock on the actual terminal and checked out sporadically and was detectable from the first. It was just – actually, a bad piece of assessing and checking. That you can count on.

So when a pc starts to run and they give you the answers... They're pretty hard to answer the auditing commands. That's about the first thing you run into. Oh, there's something wrong with the auditing commands here, but can't really answer any of the auditing commands. It's always difficult to answer anyhow, but, you know, just can't quite answer any of the auditing commands. They don't really apply somehow or another. And the incidents they get – well, they get last week and they get tomorrow and they get their childhood and they get their family home life and they get the garage they worked at and they get their childhood and they get the class and they get eating dinner today and... You better make up your mind.
You're just running a lock. You're not running any terminal that's ever going to do the pc any good, because you haven't contacted the Goals Problem Mass.

There aren't any clear pictures in a Goals Problem Mass for a nickel and a collar button. After you've run it for just a few levels of pictures – picturesmictures – there's a little fragment of this and you get a far impression that over there someplace there might be ... And it's all sort of dark down here, but you get the idea of a fragment of a toy on the floor, you see.

And then that's – that's pictures. Well, what kind of pictures would you get if you put an art gallery between two bulldozers? Well, that's the kind of pictures you'd get, that's all.

You don't get nice, clear – this is on early runs, of course – you don't get beautiful 3-D pictures. You – the pc's terminal is a waterbuck and we get – we think it is – you see. And we get this beautiful stream and it's all in 3-D and the tone arm stays down and the tone arm just stays down and the tone arm never goes anyplace and nothing ever happens. But you get these beautiful pictures of these 3-D situations. It's a nice picture, too. It's sweet. There's nothing happening in them.

No, they're not stuck. And that actually will be the characteristic of some lock terminal. You'll find the terminal. It's probably on the original list. When you find the terminal eventually, you will be able to connect it to the terminal you were running. So you're running a late terminal, that's all. It never goes anyplace. And of course it's got pictures. What do these pictures depend on? They depend on the Goals Problem Mass like the – a ship depends on an anchor, you see? And you've got – after that, you've got pictures on the subject.

No, it's like running head-on into a brick wall. Clearing, actually, is not nice. And if you're looking for some nice, sweet procedure, why you know, be an art critic and don't get audited. Spend all your time in the galleries where it's quiet and serene and nothing ever happens.

No, you start running an actual terminal, on its proper Prehav level, against its proper opposition terminal. And you run it properly with the pc with his own terminal and the opposition terminal being that one over there, not running the pc on the opposition terminal with his own terminal over there, you see. That's even worse; and it's just a dog's breakfast anyhow from there on out. And don't think because there's something happening and the arm – tone arm is sticking up, that you must have done something wrong. No, it's quite the reverse. If the tone arm stays down and nothing happens, you've done something wrong. That's all.

But even if you're running the pc on the opposition terminal, something's going to happen. The pc eventually gets a part in his hair, eventually gets a hole through his forehead. He's running straight into the currents of the – of the actual magnetic fields that surround this confounded thing. It's quite fascinating.

All right. Patching them up after they've been run is something you'd better be cognizant with, because frankly, there have been four people in this unit assessed and run on Routine 3 who were run on their opposition terminals as their own terminal. And you go back and look. That's why Suzie is scolding – we really had – I was really looking over – over early auditing reports, and it says, "He squiggled kabub. Ran rrrr-mmmm." "Process. Process." Next auditing report, "Process." Next auditing report, "Process." You go back earlier. "Process," it
says. So what process? Let's go back three or four more days. Were they running the terminal at this time? "Process." Go back three or four more days. Blank.

And you finally find over in a corner someplace, it says, "Hmph-phll-hmm-hmm." And you say, "What in the name of God was that? Where is that? Where is that?" And you break out – actually did – break out magnifying glasses and so forth and try to read the damn thing. Finally found most of it, too.

Because if it was the pc's terminal – now this is a rule – if it was the pc's terminal, it must be run from the first level it was assessed, onward. You must pick up the first level it was ever run on. And you mustn't skimp one. And if you've skimped one, you've had it, Henry!

I found a nice one last night. I found somebody that was being run on their right terminal clear back in September and who just would have done gorgeously, but the auditor never ran the terminal the pc was clearly assessed upon, but ran something else as a terminal and that pc has hung up ever since.

I was sitting down here in the training office at 4:30 A.M. this morning. And I was tearing through the records and that is what I found. You talk about a flub. The pc would probably be Clear by this time because we had the right terminal, it was all running okay and the auditor just assessed the first level and then said, "It must be something else." The pc even said – the pc is terribly interested in this level – and ran something else from there on. And the first level found on the Prehav Scale on this pc has not even been run to this day! I trust the pc did or will run it today, much to the surprise of the auditor, who is probably...

There are three of – several auditors here today opened their folder – pc's folder with great confidence and aplomb, thinking they were going to get on with the show and were suddenly confronted with running a terminal and had the level already in front of them to run now on the pc and probably expressed their consternation by not running them.

Anyway, they were all set up. We needed the rest of the thing. You actually needed the rest of the picture. You had to have the rest of the picture or otherwise you would never have gotten any part of it.

The original terminal on which a pc was run, was not however, necessarily the right terminal. It was not necessarily the opposition terminal, you see? It was not necessarily any of these things. But it's whether or not it checks out and makes sense, whether or not originally it did run, whether or not it fits it, whether – you know, all of these other considerations were there.

For instance, I'll just give you a quick flash through here now. Talking about patching him up.

Let me say one final word about putting together a 3D. It's a jigsaw puzzle. It fits together and it makes a perfect picture after you've got it finished, that's it. That's the way it works and so forth. And it tests out and checks out and that's the way it looks to the pc and that's the way it is.
Now, you needn't be terribly worried about having done a reversewise assessment and all of a sudden run the pc on the opposition terminal. The pc is going to feel very bad and you're going to feel – everything's going to feel very upset, but of course the pc's going to feel bad and upset anyhow on an early run. So that's not a test. It's whether or not you suddenly wake up to the fact that this pc has been sitting there with a high wind going across the front of their face for the last session. It's about time to say, "Well, wait a minute, is this the opposition terminal or isn't it?" And you suddenly look into the folder and say, "Does this make sense? Well, hell, this has never made sense. This just has never made sense. Well now, how would it make sense?"

And all of a sudden we move it around, we swap the terminals or swap the goals or we swap any of them or we find "Well, gee-whiz, last year you were assessed on – you were assessed on 'a buggerboo.' You never told me that."

"Oh, well yes, I had 175 hours of run on a buggerboo. Didn't I ever tell you that? I never did."

You have been running as the opposition terminal, "a boss." "A boss." "A boss" is the opposition terminal. And the only terminal you could find on the pc was "a little fairy." And then we find out that last year he was assessed as "a carpenter." Of course, that's his terminal! Checks out now. "The boss," "the carpenter." Yes, what is the goal of a carpenter? You get the idea? It was – had to be a Routine 3 goals terminal type of run and check. Yes, yes. It ran. And everything was fine, but just somehow the pc is not interested anymore and he neglected to mention it. That's the kind of things you'll sometimes run into. You have to be alert to this kind of thing in patching them up.

Now, in view of the fact that people who have been run on Routine 3 have been badly assessed or well assessed, you've got to reprove-out the whole situation. But if they can remember their goal and if they can remember their terminal, for any given run you can work out the rest of the 3D like scat and then try and make sure that the goal wasn't an oppgoal and that the terminal wasn't the oppterminal. You got the idea? Find the rest of the items of the 3D and you've got the person set up for a run. Fill him into your commands of 30 November and commands of 28 November.

There have been three sets of commands: 27 November, 28 November and 30 November. Thirty November can – is your best issue because it gives you a choice of whether or not you're going to run straight on into the tractor or you're going to fool around a little bit before the head-on collision.

I could explain more to that later. You don't particularly need the data at the moment. But you can so write up the sixteen-way bracket so that it's a head-on collision. How? By putting more oppterminals in it. You put the oppterminal into more commands. When you put the opposition terminals – the more opposition terminals you're going to put into more commands, the more the pc is going to run on, head-on into it, the more difficulty the pc is going to have, the more headache the pc is going to have, the faster they go Clear.

So you just pays your money and you say, "Well, how fast are we going to get this fellow Clear or how slow are we going to get this fellow Clear? How much fooling around are we going to do before we walk in to the middle of the bullpen?" And, of course, you can just
take and throw him into the middle of the bullpen. All you have to do is run it the way it is issued here on 30 November. "Tell me a problem, oppterm." is number thirteen. And number fifteen, "Tell me a problem you might have had with an oppterm." Of course, that's you versus the oppterm, ha-ha; you versus the oppterm, ho-ho-ho. Zzuhh. Of course, you've never been really versus the oppterm except as the term, and huwwoooooo. The winds of space will start to turn on at that moment and then you catch it the next command. And you're right back there – terminal, terminal. But there's more terminals here than there are oppterms. On 27 November you'll find there's the same number of opposition terminals in the command bracket as there are terminals. I will state to you in passing that it took me a couple of weeks to finally settle on this and discover irrevocably that we have never had a command big enough, beefy enough and tough enough to run a Goals Problem Mass. We had never had one. Except this and this is big enough and beefy enough and tough enough. And if it won't run and the pc can't do it, it's just because you, knucklehead, haven't clarified the level with the pc or gotten the intensity of the level, knucklehead. So that's all there is to that.

Let me catch you running. "How might 'failed pinch' have been a solution to the problem?" The pc at the time you first brought this up was saying, "Failed pinch. Failed pinch? Failed pinch. How do you fail a pinch?"

And you've said, "All right. Now, we got to clear the rudiments and here's the first command."

And the pc says, "It was failed pinch, failed pinch, failed to pinch. I'm finding it difficult to answer."

Well, one of the reasons they find it difficult to answer is when it's not their terminal. When it – when it's the opposition terminal, they also find it difficult to answer. When it's the wrong terminal, it's always difficult to answer. If it's the wrong Prehav levels, it's difficult to answer and when it's the wrong intensity – this is a whole new subject on the Prehav – the wrong intensity.

How might slapping have been a solution to that problem? You're all set, see? "Slapping" is what the Prehav level is. There isn't such a level, but you say, "Slapping. That's what we assessed, you see. Slapping." So we say, "Well, all right." We go on and run the command. It doesn't run.

And you say, "Well, all right. Now let's get smart on this thing and let's get the intensity of it. Slapping, hitting, beating, smashing, slugging, crushing. Crushing, there it is, heh-heh-heh-heh, crushing." Or we got "crush" on the Prehav Scale, but we try to run the thing and it's "tapping".

"Tapping. Yes, tapping would be a solution to the problem. But crushing; no. Too brutal." You get – you get the whole thing. The pc will have the level all right, but the intensity of it is wrong.

I'll give you an idea. We get "dislike." And for some reason or other, "dislike" falls out of the hamper. And we try to run "dislike." We never clear it with the pc or ask him what the intensity of the – the word is. He says, "dislike."
"Dislike a man," she – this girl says. "Dislike a man. Well, yes, I suppose so. Dislike a man."

"How would dislikes" – and you ask them, "How would dislikes solve a problem about a man?"

"How would dislikes solve a problem about a man? Hate. Hate. Hate. Yeah, oh, yeah. Hate. Ha-hah, yeah."

Just put the two side by side. "Dislike," "Hate." "Dislike" promptly disappears as a read and "hate" is right there as the Prehav read. Oh, yeah. Well now, that'll solve all the problems about the man for the pc. You get how – what I mean? Intensity? We've got "timid," "fear" and "terror." See, that's just intensity of the same thing – timidity, fear and terror.

You can clear those across sideways. You don't change the sense of the thing, you see; it's just the intensity of it. "To tap," "to slap," "to slug," "to jolly well smash his 'ead in." You got the idea? But you wouldn't use all those words.


Well, how – he thinks – any problem he thinks of, this is the automatic answer. If you've got the right intensity and it's cleared with the pc, it's actually almost a silly question, because you've had – you've told him the answer.

All you're trying to do is get him to look at the answer he used in the solving of that problem, because you're actually running out backtrack problems.

This is based entirely on this one basis. The Prehav Scale are the things the pc has used to solve problems and that is the definition of the Prehav Scale and that is why only this command series works.

You can knock problems out by taking the times the pc has solved them and racking those up or by taking the prior confusion. And after I've seen some of your skulls becoming absolutely flat and I've seen you look like frying pans through this crush, you see, of it all – now we're going to find the prior confusion and just blow it all, are we? Heh-heh-heh. The hell we are.

I can do it by taking a bit of the problem and dating it and a bit of the problem and dating and a bit of the problem and dating it. I can get the problem you've had and then date it and get a problem you've had and then date it and get a problem you've had and date it and gradually dissipate the mass. It can be taken apart that way. You don't know how to date. You never have been able to. Never saw such knuckleheaded dating in my life. That sounds more severe than it is. But you get all mixed up – one gets all mixed up in A.D. and B.C. and years ago and that goes into the middle of implants. So it's a pretty slippery job. If you want to learn how to date, fine. I'm not going to demand, however, that you know how to date. But you can take a Goals Problem Mass to pieces by dating.
And you say, "Tell me a problem you've had with a female. Cheers. All right. When might that have been? Do you suppose that ever had any real location in time?"

"No."

"All right. Well, was it a hundred thousand years ago? Was it a hundred million years ago? Was it a hundred billion years ago? And so on. Oh, all right. Well, is it less than a hundred trillion years ago? Well, is it ninety-nine trillion years ago? Was it less than fifty trillion years ago? Ah. Is it more than fifty trillion years ago? Is it less than fifty trillion years ago? Ah. Is it twenty-eight trillion years ago? Is it more than twenty-eight trillion years ago? Is it less than twenty-eight trillion years ago? Oh, it's more than twenty-eight trillion years ago. All right. Is it more than thirty million years ago? Less than thirty million years ago? More. Was it more than forty million years ago? Less than forty trillion years ago? Was it less than forty trillion years ago? Oh, all right. It was less than forty trillion years ago? It was more than thirty trillion years ago?" Guess what? It must lie between thirty and forty trillion, mustn't it? "All right. Is it more than thirty-five trillion years ago? Is it less than thirty-five trillion years ago?" This is dating.

And you finally nail it down and nail it down and nail it down and all of a sudden it goes *splayng-splayng* and it gets more and more solid and the pc kind of undercuts it and maybe sticks with it and maybe it blows. But you've got a piece of the Goals Problem Mass in your hands.

You could ask somebody casually, "What – tell me the prior confusion to your Goals Problem Mass." You see? And you get a basket and pick up the pieces. Honest, if you ever want to knock anybody's head off, why, just start ferreting in and driving home that question, you know.

You say, "Well, let's see. It was quite a long time ago. What – what – what do you suppose – how come, you suppose, you ever got in trouble between a streetcar passenger and a streetcar conductor? Now, between a passenger and a conductor – now, what do you suppose might have happened before that whole thing became a terrific mess to you? You know, I'm talking about all the times, all the times this ever became a mess to you. What do you suppose you were doing in life that got you in that kind of a ... ?" *Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha.*

Honest, you'll get some somatics you never heard of before. Not even the medicos have ever heard of before. It probably could be done. Probably the pc would come up right on the other side of it. It's quite amazing. But you could certainly take bits of it and date it.

But if you don't do those two operations, one or the other of those, you've got these – this command series here of 30 November to carry you through. And it's a bitch. It's frankly a bitch. If the pc does not run into the Goals Problem Mass head-on, if the tone arm does not go up and stick, if the pc does not begin to feel mass, if the pc does not begin to feel very uncomfortable, if the pc just sits there comfortably saying, "Well, yes, I remember my childhood," and so forth.

"What are you looking at there?"
"Well, there is a big picture of our living room at home. And yes, yes, yes, and there's my first job and so forth and so on." And the tone arm goes down and goes up a little bit. And it goes down and it goes up a little bit. It goes down, it goes up a little bit. And there it is in it's nice quiet range and we're all having a wonderful time.

Something is wrong. Now, if that condition exists, it's simply the wrong terminal, that's all. Bang! It's just the wrong terminal. It's not even that you've got the opposition terminal or anything like that. It's just the wrong terminal. You just run some kind of a lock on the actual terminal, that's all.

All right. Another condition: The thing goes up, sticks up and the devil himself couldn't get it down and the pc is sitting back here and feels like he's about to be driven through the wall, and doesn't feel any mass where he is. The mass seems to be out there someplace, but isn't quite where he is and it all seems sort of difficult. The possibility is you have the opposition terminal and you were running the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal.

Now, the other factor is the pc is sitting there and the pc is getting popeyed, because you push anybody hard enough in the chest or push – take a battering ram and put it against their stomach and then lean on it hard, their eyes kind of get popped, you know. The eyes will pop out eventually. Even a frog's eyes will and they get more and more solid and everything is getting more and more solid. And they're interested, but they're a little bit suspicious of the auditor and they're suspicious of what's happening and suspicious of the case and they're waiting to see something. But it's just getting all black and mucky and it's all kind of dirty nyaaaah out there and there's nothing much anyhow going on. It's all just difficult somehow and the somatics are against their back or against their forehead or in their noses or they've got headaches and they're aware of an increasing mass which is very uncomfortable and they don't like it. You're right. You're right. Beware, beware, beware, if the pc throughout all the sessions never says to you sort of bravely, "Well, I guess we'll get through it somehow." If a pc never says that to you, there's something wrong.

Now, that's the least that would happen. A more average happening is, "Oh, my God, we're not going to run that again, are we? Well, we're not – that's pretty -. Well, all right, I'm - I'm game for it. Huh-huh-huh-huh, I'm game - go ahead. We'll have the session. Will you tell me where the tone arm goes?"

"All right. Okay."

"You know, all these somatics I'm getting are all brand-new. I mean, I've never had these somatics before."

"Well, all right. Okay, well here it is." And you see a sort of a grim gritting of the teeth on the part of the pc. It's just as though he's going to have a dental operation of magnitude or something of the sort, and you utter the first command.

The weird part of it is if you've got it all right, the pc will work at it till hell freezes over and actually will – will be happier to overrun it usually, than to underrun it. The pc will keep on running it. It's a sort of a masochistic sort of an attitude. It's like the fellow – the fellow cutting his fingers off, one slice at a time, you know.
So don't expect that what we expect out of a 3D run is the pc sits there and every
command looks brighter and cheerful and the E-Meter frees up and he's just getting clearer
and clearer and the needle is floating better and better and everything is all looking better in a
gradient scale, from the first moment you start it till the end. You see, you've been – you've
led the pc to expect something better than he is now getting.

The pc felt wonderful when you first got his first item. And then he felt awfully good
when you got his second item and he was very nice and happy about the third item and then
you got his modifier and he didn't feel so good. But that's all right. Somehow or another he'd
certainly like to find his terminal. That will explain a great deal to him. So he finds his termi-
nal and well, that's him all right. That's good. He feels very happy about that in a sort of a

But, it's all fine, you see. He knows this is all right, and it's just because it's – it's be-
cause he didn't take any aspirin. Because he's being audited, of course, he didn't want any as-
pirin. And it's all right. It'll work out. Everything is fine. And then you assess the first run in
the Prehav Scale and the pc is all full of hope and looking very alert. And then you start this,
and the pc feels good; these things kind of run off automatically and everything goes along
fine. It's very easy to think of these problems for some reason or other. Maybe he gets even a
picture, too – several pictures as a matter of fact. He gets a lot of pictures – things he never
thought of before. Never had that particular reality. Gets a lot of cognitions. The pictures –
they're kind of gray. They're kind of foggy, the pictures are. They're not very good, but that's
all right. They'll improve, won't they?

So the pictures get worse and worse. And his headache gets worse and worse. And the
pressure against his backbone gets worse and worse. And it gets harder and harder to answer
the auditing command. And the auditor continues to insist that he do it again.

Zhuhh. And he comes out of session and falls against one side of the door and then the
other side of the door and falls on the other side of the hall and then sits down and then sits up
again and holds an E-Meter and tries to sit up in a chair, and tries to see through his eyes, but
somehow or other they aren't in his head. And then he runs the next one and the next level and
the next level and the next level and the next level. And it's just horrible and it's all awful and
everything is ghastly. And he knows it's getting somewhere and he has faith in Ron. And it's
getting pretty grim and it's pretty horrible and then he finally gets up and so forth. And he
said, "Well, thank God, we're through 'withdraw,' 'hate,' 'clam up'. " We're through these vari-
ous levels on this thing; we're all set."

And then one day he sits down in the chair and the auditor says, "All right, now we're
going to run this level – 'hate,' 'withdraw' and 'clam up'."

"I got through all that. I got through all that once. There's no reason to go over it again,
is there really?"

"No, no, no reason at all. Well, here's the first command." And he runs all the levels
again. Because you can run these levels over and over. And if you've run about a dozen levels
– here's another tip – if you've run about a dozen levels, and the tone arm has never come
down, just go back to the first level you ever ran and just run it all over again, because there's
been something left on the levels, but by running them, has freed up. You can rerun levels
about three times as long as you keep their exact sequence. About the fourth time, this begins to get stupid.

You run them each one to a stuck tone arm, you can run them quite thoroughly. But it isn't really necessary to scrub them out utterly, with a wire brush across the pc's nose. For – because frankly, you can always go back and run the run again.

A good test is, is after the pc's tone arm has come down, you ask the pc – you just say this phrase to the pc and you don't get any reaction. You know, just this same Prehav level question that you would have asked in the first place – you just say that to get it originally. You just say that to the pc and you don't get a needle reaction, you're all set. You can leave it like mad.

But if the needle sticks, then you can start expecting some trouble on a later level. When a level isn't well cleaned up, your later levels hang up. But that doesn't mean you can't go over and over levels. You can indifferently flatten, as long as you run them an hour or so or half an hour or hour – run them to a good stuck arm – you could flatten a dozen levels, to a good stuck arm that's only stuck for about five, three – well, it's stuck for five or six commands. Still needle, still arm. You could pass that up and go on to your next level. And then pass the next one up and go on to your – and do the same way and then do the same way, and do the same way. Reassess and do your next one. Reassess and do your next one. Reassess and do your next one.

Keep them. Keep them to hand, because if you're auditing that way, sooner or later you're going to have to go back to the first one and run the whole gamut again to get the arm blown down.

But you will notice, that if a pc is getting better on the run, the arm sticks less longly at the top of the stuck. Sticks less longly. It finally gets to the point where all the pc has to do is kind of take his attention off the session and wonder if it's raining or something outside and you've got a Clear read. See? It finally gets that bad. But you approach that by gradients.

You take a break. The pc's tone arm early, early in the runs is sitting at 4.75 and you give the pc a moment's break and so forth. And you come back and it's sitting at 4.75. Well, a few runs later, of Prehav levels on the same terminal on this particular commands – these are not true of earlier commands; it's only true of this set – and up it goes. It goes up fairly rapidly and sticks. And then you have a break and the pc walks up and down the hall or something like that. And you come back in and the pc is reading much lower. And then you keep running it and it goes on up again.

And then that finally approaches a point where the pc is running it and it goes up and boy, does it stick. Thud! It just sticks very nicely and then the pc wonders what's happening outside, you see. And it goes down to Clear read with a wildly loose needle. And then you utter the command a few more times and it goes dzzu-dzzu-dzzu-zup and you'll get a tight, tight motion and the arm is tight and everything is stuck and the pc's stuck, and it's irrevocable and he'll never get out of this mass again – which is more or less the keynote of it.

The auditor is sitting there saying, "God, will I ever get him through this?" And it's a good thing to say. It's better to say the auditing command, though. And the needle's stuck, the
E-Meter's stuck, everything is stuck. It's all in sticky plaster and glue and the pc wonders if he hears any birds singing, he listens for a second and the needle is totally flop.

He thinks of the terminal, it's totally stuck and then it's totally flop. And then the next thing you know, he – not necessarily on just this one run or just this one terminal – but this kind of a repetition of affairs keeps happening and after a while you can't find him on the meter. And the way that "can't find him on the meter" begins is the tone arm rises and sticks and won't come down; to the tone arm rises and sticks and is down the next day; to the tone arm rises and sticks but during the session break comes down and then it goes back up; to every time the pc shifts his attention slightly on something else, the tone arm comes down; to the tone arm won't stick up; to the tone arm won't read, won't – needle won't read, nothing will read.

Kick the pc in the shins and try to get the meter to work. Won't work. Only that Clear won't slump. Why? You've handled the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, the reason why you're charging head-on into it this way, is you're solving the case for once and for all and you're not adding up to a slump situation. You're trying to clear it up on all dynamics and it works out.

It's pretty remarkable. The pc stays terribly interested, maybe for the first two, three, four days in their terminal. They stay very interested in this situation. It's very, very interesting, but of course the terminal then comes down to what? "Failed boredom" or something, you see. And they're not interested in their terminal. They don't want to hear about it. And if you ever listen much to the pc on how they feel about it and what they want to run, you'll lay an egg every time. You have to make up your mind independent of that, because they're an incompetent judge of what should be done with their case.

In running 3D remember this – that the pc is always an incompetent judge of what should be done with his case. He is caught in between two sets of bumpers and bulldozers and he can't quite make it out. Well, it's liable to be this or it's liable to be that. And he says the terminal – and this is – but you can listen to him, maybe something on his opinions about this and that. That's fine. Always listen to the pc anyhow. But don't let it swerve your judgment. But you – he says, "I'm no longer interested in it and I think it is flat."

Well, now that's the way you put the pennies on a dead man's eyes. It's not flat. The pc – the oldest mechanism known in Dianetics has moved into existence. The engram has moved up to boredom; the pc has come up to boredom. In this particular case, the terminal usually has come down to boredom and it decides it doesn't want to be run anymore. [laughter, laughs]

Well now, there's the behavior of this, and there's the patch-up of this. Now, I called in all these papers – and Mike will have to take them back up again afterwards, but I'm just showing you here – here's a stack of case histories. It's very, very interesting that out of this tremendous number of case histories that you see lying here in front of you, that there are only, I think at the outside – maybe when the final roundup is through, there will have been five errors in terminal – just five in this whole number of people. That's pretty good. That's pretty good. But that's with me on the job, see? So it's five errors in 3 – Routine 3 assessments, you understand? Just five, on things I was watching very closely and ready to catch
them if they fell through, don't you see? And I myself am not checking these things out. I'm not following them all the way through on their runs and so forth.

Nevertheless, that is five out of twenty-five or one-fifth, as a close figure. One-fifth error? Pretty good, huh? And that's why we abandoned Routine 3. Because we could have a one-fifth error. One case out of five would be improperly assessed and mowed down like mad. There's no cross-check on it. There is no check of any kind on Routine 3. That's why we have stopped running Routine 3.

And that's why we're running 3D. Because 3D can be cross-checked, it can be reoriented, it can be put back together again, it makes sense, it polices itself, you can always fix it up if it goes bad. You're going to be in a position of having to patch these things up; remember that you can find any part of 3D if you know exactly what one part is. If you can just establish one part accurately as to what it exactly is, you can find the remaining parts.

So 3D – we're not making this many errors with 3D. Right at this present moment, I've got it a 100 percent on the road. No mistakes on 3D, because I'm not permitting mistakes to be run because they're observable mistakes. You get the idea? So even with me on the job with Routine 3, you could fall on your head all over the place.

All right. You've got to get up with Routine 3D so with me not on the job where you'll be auditing, you'll never fall on your head. But I'm telling you that it is easy to do. And you yourself will be able to see that it is easy to do.

[The recording of the lecture ends abruptly as did the original recording.]
Thank you.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That's why I say use Rising Scale, use concepts. If you want to pull something off with somebody or other and you want a 50, 60 percent chance of making it, use Rising Scale Processing; use concepts. You know, it's just hunt and punch sort of stuff and you're going to audit him for three hours and you're not going to do very much about it all; well, it's worth putting your chips on that particular point on the roulette wheel. Because you've got a pretty good chance of doing something or other spectacular.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, a Keyed-out Clear who has not handled all those things which are the bank – he's cleared because he's keyed-out; he's usually cleared on the first dynamic – is capable, actually, of doing a double shift and going into an automatic make-up of a bank that he himself knows damn well he can't handle and because he can relapse – you could say, stable, well how stable is a hernia operation? Well, it's stable as long as the guy lives. It's stable for a few years. We don't even know what this word stable means in terms of medicine or psychiatry or psychology or something like that. These fellows never get as bad as they were. They never get as bad as they were. They never go all the way downhill and worsen. But they do lose some of the ground they make.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why? They chickened out. They didn't themselves have enough nerve to confront their own difficulties in this particular line, don't you see? In other words, they started to confront this difficulty in somebody else, confronted it themselves and ran. That's about what it was — all amounted to. I'm not saying this with any plaudits for myself, and so forth. I don't consider it anything to stand around and look and know what you're looking at as being much of a trick. Other people seem to find it so, but I don't.
So, anyway, it amounts to this – it amounts to this: This thing exists; Goals Problem Mass. You'll find it first mentioned under Admiration Processing. And I said, "Well, there are certain avenues of the mind which are better left closed."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I could say, of course and be very scientific... Science in its present state of sacred-
ness, always not-ises itself. "It is the only road out that I have so far found," would be the sci-
entific modification that makes one sound, sound and conservative,

you

know? It's the nice

thing to say, "– that I have found so far. Of course, as we go along the years, we are liable to
find another road out, you see, that will be much easier and so forth and we couldn't possibly
have found everything there was to find at this state." That's all the implication. You see that's
a nice, modest, conservative, scientific statement. So I'm telling you, of course, that it's just
the only road out.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, it takes a Class III skill to run – to find, assess, locate, itemize, build up the story
and run a 3D. Now, that's a Class III skill.
That's how they break down in terms of what auditors can do it. Because, let me tell you, that although it seems to be a very simple activity and there's somebody right now in upper northern Cape Town, of southern Bulawayo, or some place – there's somebody right now saying, "Oh well, that's kindergarten stuff like running a Security Check. I want to get into real auditing." They've got – they've just got it backwards.

A Security Check is real auditing. For instance, I will be talking to you more about Security Checks and you can pull more bloomers doing a Security Check than can be found in a modern gymnasium. They're innumerable. For instance, the little datum of the person – . You ask the person for any unkind thoughts, and then, you knucklehead, don't ask him for the overts that makes him think unkind thoughts. You don't recognize that on a Security Check that's just a trap. That's just a trap question. The person admits to saying – thinking some unkind thoughts. Don't spend an hour letting him get off his unkind thoughts. What good is that going to do to him? They're all overts, every one of them. Uttering them is an overt.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But for two weeks, I just sweat it out. I wasn't saying anything to you, but I was just sweating it out, testing commands, testing commands, trying to find out how the hell – now that we had this thing; now that – now that this thing was sitting on the middle of the table, ready to spring – how did we ever kick anybody through it? And I didn't put you on it till I had that pretty well whipped. Then I finally said, "Ah-huh. Here is a set of commands that goes through." Those were first issued on the 28th November command series, refined on the 29th and reissued on the 30th.

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

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

It starts out, the first available is the package that the pc has always complained of as their standard somatics. And if you realize that a pc can actually exist in processing over a period of years complaining sporadically about the same set of somatics, you will recognize that no process you ran on the pc in all those years ever fazed the Goals Problem Mass.
They always complained of the same set of somatics. They were always coming up saying, "Well, I get this pain up here in my medulla oblongata and there it is. Yeah, well, I've really – I've been audited an awful lot, but this lumbosis stays with me and I'm worried about this lumbosis. And no auditor will ever listen to me about it."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If you assess somebody on 3D items for seventy-five hours and the person was not even vaguely ready to assess and the person was all blocked up with fantastic withholds and they weren't in-session at all but were halfway out of session during that entire seventy-five hours, the bulk of the seventy-five hours would have been wasted.
It would have been far more economical to have simply sat down and done a Joburg and maybe a Children's Security Check and done a Problems Intensive and straightened the person out in general, found their Havingness and Confront, patched them up on all sides, because you would have gotten something done in the seventy-five hours. And listen, seventy-five hours of assessment which winds up with no assessment, doesn't get anything done at all. Because now you're going to have to run the Joburg and the – another two or three Security Checks and a Problems Intensive and the ARC Process 61 and general O/W and – and – and. In other words, you're going to do all these preparatory processes because you realize at the end of seventy-five hours that you flubbed. The person was not ready to assess.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It doesn't mean the somatics would be light in any case. It just means they're tougher. See, you're dealing with an area there that is so tough anyway, you're liable to get careless. You say, "Well, it half kills him anyway, so that's that. You know, so what?"
It's marvelous, though, how they'll sit there being half-killed. That's what's interesting. You always know this about a working process. If the process is going to get anyplace, the pc will go any – through anything to complete it. You know, I hadn't had anybody offer to blow yet on a 3D one, except a person who had been run backwards. A person whose oppterm had been run on an earlier 3 – on an earlier run – the oppterm had been run for the terminal and they were sort of thinking of blowing. But they were – what – what was really blowing around there was the winds of space.

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

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

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

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

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

Now, let's say – this is very handy to know – somebody has been cleared and they're still keyed-out beautifully and they never get any needle action and everything is fine. Only you happen to know that they were run on some goal that they can't remember but the terminal was "a whiz cat." That's the earliest record we can find of their first terminal. That's very important to find out. It's worth metering and sitting on their heads and cabling auditors and doing everything else to find the first terminal this person was run on and the first goal. Well, maybe we had no record of the goal but we have a whiz cat. We can always put the goal back in, don't you see?
Now, we get the opposition terminal to a whiz cat and it'll react beautifully. And we get the opposition goal, don't you see. And we can patch it back up and even arrive back at the pc's goal and then we'd know whether or not the thing was still balanced up. We'd get a modifier and we've got the lot. But it all entered in from a whiz cat, the original terminal. Of course, the terminal has been flattened, see? It doesn't exist anymore. But we've got to assess our 3D from the first terminal run on that case. And you'll find out there's plenty of kick in the opposition terminal to a whiz cat. That's still jumping. That's still live, see? You can find that rather easily.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You say, "Well, you uh – now, you say you uh – you've often wanted to be a waterbuck – wanted to be one. All right. That's fine. Waterbuck. Waterbuck. Waterbuck. What would a waterbuck be doing? Would a waterbuck be doing a lot of things?" Just watching the pc, you see. "Would a waterbuck be doing a lot of things? What would a waterbuck be doing? Waterbuck dance or anything like that? Waterbuck drink water?" and so forth. Just watch the pc.

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

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

And the pc says, [in a growling tone of voice:] "Well, not sure. Not sure what a tiger would be doing, as a matter of fact." [laughter]

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

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

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

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

So just make this reservation about a 3D assessment. If you can find one part, then you can find any other item. Not necessarily in order, don't you understand? It's not in order. But you can find some other item. It doesn't matter what rotation or what order you find the item in; you got one item. Let's say you got a – you got a name that serves as a terminal. All right. You can certainly find a goal for it; you can find an opposition terminal; you can find a lot of items for this terminal. Don't you see?
All right. Let's say you have a goal. You can certainly find the opposition goal and then the opposition terminal, see? Then we could find a modifier. We could find another terminal. You see? It – it's sort of like the wheel of fortune. If you find any point on the spokes, you can find some other spokes, and eventually it turns out to be a wheel. And you thought it was a square soapbox all the time.

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

But given any item on a 3D – any single item; it doesn't matter what it is – you can find the rest of the 3D from it. Not necessarily in order or sequence, but you can patch it together from that point and you finally wind up with maybe two or three extra items. Well, you have to decide if they're extra, you know? You're often winding up with extra modifiers; how about someday winding up with an extra terminal. That would be embarrassing, wouldn't it? But it might happen; it might happen. You might have a terminal from a second goal and it might be checking out just gorgeously. I've already seen it happen. Only it checks out with an entirely different pattern of needle motion. It doesn't follow the same pattern of needle motion with the pc's goal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I don't think that's the – I think it would cause an ARC break. But it is quite interesting that before you run the first run or assess for the first Prehav level, how endlessly a pc will take all these items up with you. They're still very interested and they'll take them up and sort them out and sort them out. And just by the basis of sorting them out and discussing them and so forth, why, all of a sudden the thing will right itself, for them and for you and so forth. It doesn't matter much whether it rights it for them or not. It's the auditor that counts. That's a fact. It's the auditor who must be satisfied, not the pc. The pc – I've seen pcs with such glee run the opposition terminal that I don't wonder at the number of suicides there are on Earth.
It's – it's just marvelous. They say, "Oh my, that's just gorgeous. Yes, there is no doubt about it." It's touched their pride, you see? It's touched their pride. You say, "Oh, I've always been a tiger. Yes, I remember very vividly. Always a tiger, always a tiger. I've always been thinking of myself as a tiger." [laughter] Back goes their head and that's it. They're a water-buck.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[The recording of the lecture ends abruptly as did the original recording.]
How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

Like you're not surviving. Too bad. Too bad. As a matter of fact, you know, with one or two exceptions, which are usually exceptions, you're starting to put a glow up. You're putting a glow up. Even you. [laughs, laughter]

Okay. This is 6 Dec. 61. And I'm of two minds. I don't know whether to talk to you about Security Checking or talk to you about 3D running. And let's see, the people running Security Checks look worst [laughter] or the ones running 3D look worst? I think it's definitely a Security Check day. Definitely.

All right. I'll give you the opening gun. It is stupid to try to assess somebody who has not been squared away on the basic and fundamentals included in Class II.

Item two: It is stupid to try to get somebody to assess who has not passed the basic skills of Class II. So what we're – the hill we're trying to climb is 3D, but to get the hill climbed, I'm afraid you're going to have to climb another hill first.

I recall there's been troops in this situation at numerous periods of history. They get an order to "scale the rampart." And they go ahead and valiantly try to execute this order, but it has been neglected – one little point has been neglected in the battle plan and that is only this: they haven't taken the moat. And if you don't watch it, you have a lot of people drowning in the moat. And that's about what we look at here.

Now, the penalty of your getting the latest and most is the fact that I can be absolutely counted on to do my level best for you. Unfortunately, that's a fact. I could give you a very nice, smooth curriculum that would carry forward a lot of very smooth, routine things and it would all be very smooth and very routine and awfully difficult, but the curriculum would be very smooth.

Or you have the other choice – the other choice. You get what is known at any instant of time as well as it is known at that moment of time and you pursue it and use it. That, of course, has a tendency to keep your training much more up-to-date. But it also has a tendency to learn what you yourself don't know in order to achieve your objectives. Do you understand that?

It doesn't matter how smoothly I lay out a curriculum. You're always going to find something else. And I've just given some of you a present time problem, I'm absolutely sure, in suddenly sliding Class II your way last week. But you pay the penalty for my being honest because I'll tell you what I don't know – can be counted on for that.
And it amounts to this: There is emerging from the stygian dark of the vast whirlpools of chaos – which is what your reactive mind looked like a short time ago – is the fact that the more aberrated a person is, the more "only one" he is, he moves in toward clearing from the outer dark. He moves in from his lonely vigils on cloud sixty-nine where he has been keeping the watch for the last many trillion years against all comers and on which post he learned, oh, too well, never to take any orders. And then you step up with your E-Meter and in effect give him an order. And he is so armor plated that you get no response, of course.

In the first place, the symptom of extreme aberration – and never make a mistake in this as an auditor, it is a symptom of extreme aberration – I don't care where you find it and I don't care if I step on your toes in telling you so – is a total unwillingness to receive any help.

Now, you are fooled in that, in that occasionally some person or some country will say to you, "You must help me." And by not looking it over and seeing what they do with your help, you're fooled into thinking they wanted to be helped. They're using a sort of help as a trap.

"You must help me. And only then can I show you how stupid and ineffectual you are. Hu-hu-hu."

That's help as a trap.

India is in that state right now. If you were to try to assist India, you would be in fabulously deep swamps in no time.

I was in India a year or two ago. And I was interested from the standpoint of the fact that several Scientologists had gone to India, and they've all fallen on their heads. Dear old Muriel, for instance. Now, she might have thought that she finally gave up the ghost and had to pick up another body – dear old Muriel; we'll be seeing her again one of these days – because everybody was mean to her. But in actuality she had nothing but disappointment after disappointment after disappointment at the hands of the Indian government.

She would go out there and the Indian government promised her the sun, moon and stars all on a silver platter until she tried to collect one tiny moonbeam and it was untrappable. There was no way she could lay the moonbeam in her hand.

They would keep promising her help, promising her help, opening all the gates, opening all the gates and then it all just sort of – she was somehow suddenly wrong. Get the idea?

You'll find that in insane asylums. You'll have patients come up to you, begging you, saying, "Oh, you must help me. You must help me. You must help me."

And you walk into their cell and they hit you over the head with a stool. That's the modus operandi. Any possible method of getting a thetan to walk into a trap, of course, will be used by a very aberrated person.

All right. Now, let's look over this view, and let us see: did that person want to be helped or not? Let us see if that person didn't want to be helped, actually, that person was using help for some other purpose, and so forth. So that rather obscures the view.
Now, you'll find a person on post somewhere in some large administrative activity – take one of your large companies – and he's got to do every scrap of everything himself. The desk – you can't see over it, you know, because it's stacked up in all directions.

He's emptying all the wastebaskets, although there's somebody hired to empty wastebaskets. He's sharpening all the pencils and there's somebody else drawing pay to do that, don't you see? And if he makes a telephone call, why, it never goes through the switchboard, you see. It goes over some route.

There was one company that I think is one of the most remarkable companies I had ever heard of; it had sixty-seven salesmen. And the boss and owner of the company was dealing in war surplus material – and this out in Los Angeles – and he was dealing with these vast square miles of bombers. And these vast, vast square miles he was selling off left and right. But he had sixty-seven salesmen.

And the fellow never came out of his office or talked to his sales force or anything and these salesmen would just beat themselves until they were haggard and gray selling off half a square mile of airplanes or something, you know, only to find out that the boss had sold it last week and he hadn't told anybody.

The only things ever sold by that company were sold by the boss. Not so he could get the commission, you see, but because he might get helped. You see? And he had to prove it conclusively that he must not be helped in any way, shape or form.

Now, you look over an organization that is running fairly smoothly, you're liable to find the head of the organization – see, although he's wearing lots of hats – actually able to breathe and everything else because basically what's he do? He basically makes policy decisions or something like this or draws a map and says, "Well, this is the way we're going to go," and that's it. And somebody comes around and asks him for a little help on something or other, why, he gives it to them.

And you never find him sharpening any pencils. You'd think he lived the life of Reilly. You know, you think this would be the most lazy existence you ever heard of, you know? He just never sharpens any pencils, never empties any wastebaskets, doesn't make any of his own telephone calls. You get the idea. He can be helped.

Well, frankly, although he's not in very much of a panic, a rather large activity can run, don't you see? Because he doesn't interfere with everybody around in doing their jobs. He can be helped. He'll help them. And although no organization on Earth could help – ever to run smoothly... Don't think that it could, I know that's not in the cards. Not until we have dealt them, anyway.

The fact of the matter is that it's a cooperative activity of some kind or another, and beingness is granted on both sides, and nobody's in a big games condition with anybody else, and everybody's willing to do his job, and maybe do a little bit of the other fellow's, too, but nevertheless he's willing for the other fellow to do his job, and it all runs off smoothly.

Well, when you're auditing pcs who can be helped, that's kind of the way it goes. That's sort of the way it goes. That's more or less the way it goes. The pc is somewhat coop-
erative, and you're cooperative with the pc. It doesn't have to go smoothly along these lines, you know, but auditing can happen.

Now, when you've had this fellow out there in that lonely watchtower on the end of the black nebula, when you had that occur, this fellow cannot take any communication from you. He doesn't know you're alive. He stands outside the perimeter not only of the human race, but all races. He's not in communication, and you're not going to make any effect on him. This is what he's going to make very sure of: He is highly suspicious; he is highly alert.

His ability to be hurt is so enormous, his ability to be injured is so great, he thinks, that he has to protect himself with all sorts of barricades. And amongst those barricades is: "No help; you mustn't help me."

Now, even though this individual is willing to be helped, we go to a higher range. Can he be communicated with and can he communicate?

Let's say he's willing to be helped. We've overcome that barrier, and he's not using help as a trap to pull you in and knock you on the head and that sort of thing. The communication barrier is the next barrier that opens up and that is the barrier by which you can talk to him and he can talk to you. Until that barrier is knocked apart, you will not find your meter effective.

And it just comes down to one of these confoundedly simple operations. Is your meter effective on the pc? That's all. It is just this: does – is the pc willing to talk to you? See?

Now, you can read a meter with a microscope on him and your responses go in and out because sometimes he's there and sometimes he's not there; and sometimes you're in communication with him and sometimes you're not in communication with him. That kind of a situation is a very bum one in which to do an assessment because your assessment depends on the communication factor staying relatively the same during the assessment of an entire list. It depends on that factor being present and continuing to be present. Therefore, you have rudiments.

Now, we take somebody who is not even vaguely in communication. We take that person and we're going to assess him to discover something about him. Well now, if there's very much left in the makeup of this person to the effect that anything you find about him is going to be used against him – you know, that's one of the standard modus operandi by which he operates and always has operated, you see. "Anything they find out about me they will just use to shoot me down." You see, and you're trying to find the various parts of a 3D assessment, why, good heavens, what are you going to wind up with? You're going to wind up with a total defense. He'll just bury, bury, bury, bury everything if he's not in any kind of communication with you. Right?

So your first effort in clearing anyone is to get that person into communication, not only willing to talk to you, but you effective to the degree that when you talk to him it means a little something.

It isn't that you must put him in a state whereby you can impress him or overwhelm him easily. This is how he interprets it. No, it must be so that when you speak to him, you're
not talking to him through the cast-iron armor plate of a reactive bank. In other words, something happens. He is there. He can be talked to.

Now, that we can sort a person out at all is quite miraculous. Look at the order of magnitude of things. Don't say, "Well, we need bigger and better E-Meters." No, you're not going to get bigger and better E-Meters because there's a limiting factor involved in all this E-Meter thing.

The solution was put to me once by a man of science. The only trouble with the men of science, so far, is they have not had any humanness about them, and so there's been no human science. But this chap gave me the rather extraordinary solution, which I thought was terribly amusing.

This chap gave me this one solution which he thought was fine. And that was to get a proper meter operation, you put the electrodes into the person's brain. And this was just such ordinary conversation and this was the best way to get this straightened out.

Now, you go much further than the E-Meter which we have and (1) you run into an exaggeration of body motion and (2) you run into the necessity to stick the electrodes and tie them onto the ends of the neurons, or something, you know? And it's uncomfortable. [laughter] Not so much for the pc. We'll take the scientific attitude, and we'll say, "Well, that's nothing." But think of the auditor. He'd have to put on rubber gloves and anesthetic mask and all that sort of thing and audit in that kind of a costume. And you'd have to get the auditing rooms always being cleaned up and mopped up and deodorized – because blood is odorous, you know.

And it just sounds to me to be too much work – too much work, to take the scientific attitude. That would limit it all by itself, you see.

But you have other tools.

It was interesting to me once that somebody operating in Washington was trying to get a chronic alcoholic who had just – very raw meat; had just been grabbed in, you see – was trying to put him in some kind of session with "Help." And finally, he was actually able to get a help factor established with that alcoholic. That was the effect. Yes, the alcoholic could actually help the auditor. He could actually help the auditor. They could go get a bottle and a couple of dames and go get drunk.

But I was quite fascinated, you see, at the level that Help entered. But up to that time – it took some three hours – and up to that time, up to that moment of figuring it out and getting on to the Help level, of course, "No, you couldn't help me. What do you mean? You'd just betray me anyway," and that sort of thing.

The fellow had been psychologized in a prison at one time or another and it had stuck with him ever since. But it took three hours, but he managed to break through and get something like a help factor established on a conversational medium.

Now, I don't say that the E-Meter would be inoperative on this person. I would say that you would be able to pull withholds off of a person like that with an E-Meter, providing you knew the questions to ask. You would make an E-Meter react on this person if you hit
him on the exact buttons of withhold and so forth. It would be operative, but not for assessment.

Remember, there's no charge on assessment. There's no charge on this. He's not trying to withhold anything from you violently. He's not trying to give you anything violently. He just isn't helping. He's just meat.

Yeah, it's a different view. So we take Security Checking. We find that the only place the meter has a hole in it is the ARC break and we could handle that on the basis of just looking at the person, finding out if he had any willingness to talk to us at all and somehow or another repair that even though we only used Fernando's methods of finally working on the fellow. And finally the best answer we might get out of the person is, "Yes, well, you could help me and I could help you. You see, I could get a bottle, and we could get a couple of girls and ..." I mean, even it was this low order of help you would have broken through.

And after that you'd find that there'd be some operative factor involved in your E-Metering as far as rudiments are concerned. Now, you can get the rest of your rudiments in and that sort of thing.

In other words, you'd be on your way. But that isn't good enough for assessment.

You see, a Security Check can be effective on people that an assessment isn't effective on. That's what you have to face up to. The person has to be in pretty doggone good communication with the auditor to get an accurate, rapid assessment; or the auditor has to have such fantastic altitude over the person that anything registers. Now, given that altitude, of course, even the person had a (quote) "ARC break," you'd get a registry and you'd get an assessment, you see? Altitude.

But let's take two students. They haven't got any altitude. They've got the altitude of one has been studying longer than the other, but it's not very much altitude. And they get snorty with one another and teach each other classes in sessions, and all sorts of odd things go on. But it's not altitude. And one of the bug factors emerges here and we suddenly see this thing with great clarity: I put you on an E-Meter. I ask you what your goal and terminal are and so forth and I get your goal and terminal. I wrap it up and put it – write it down and so forth.

Well, it's done from a basis of altitude. And I turn around – now, I'd be really somebody to turn around and say to you, "You see, I can do it in an hour and a half. What is the matter with you that you can't get the parts of 3D. Pc registers all right on the meter. What's the matter with you?" See?

Well, you can hold it up to some degree. I can say, well, you can do better than you are doing, but you're not operating on that particular pc from the basis of altitude. And you're going to be fascinated when you get back, having been here, auditing a pc someplace who is a Scientologist and all of a sudden you're going to see his meter bang all over the place and your own – your friend who has been auditing him for some time, can't get any assessment on him. See, you've been to Saint Hill. You've got altitude.

And you ask him, "All right. Now give me the component parts of your opposition terminal." Rappety-rappety-rap, happety-bappety-bappety-bappety-bap.
And he tells you all, and you bleed him down, and you say, "Any more?"
"Well, I guess, there's three, four, and here they are," and that's it, and so forth.

And you go back over, and you read down the list, and you go ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba-ba, bang. There it is. "Oh, that's fine. All right. We got your oppterm. All right, now, let's get the oppgoal."

You, of course, are liable to turn around and say, "Well, what is the matter with you?" to your friend, you know. "You've been working for sixty-two and a half hours on this person and you haven't even got his goal. What's the matter with you?"

Well, you can say rudiments are out, but when you say rudiments are out, you must always add for whom. See? Rudiments are out, but rudiments are out for this person and not out for that person. You got the notion? Yes, from a standpoint of, is a person assessable?

All right. You check over the rudiments and you find the rudiments are in for this person, but this person can't assess. Well, it just means the meter isn't registering for that person, that's all.

Now, we take another person. We ask them if the rudiments are in and, no, we find the rudiments out. What do we mean by that? Rudiments out means the meter was registering for this other person.

This is not spooky once you get this down. It's the basis of altitude. What command value do you have over the person? Well now, this fellow that's been out in this lonely watchtower on the other end of the black nebula has never been a member of anything since the year zero, is being very careful never to be a member of anything and receive any orders from anybody because of anything. And he just simply sits down. And it wouldn't matter whether you had altitude or smallitude. It just wouldn't matter. His meter would not register. He is not part of the human race.

Now, that's the person I'm talking about. You get these other variables. Yes, you have altitude with one pc where you don't have it with another; you can always improve that altitude. You can always put it into the run. But basically, the first barrier to be crossed is the barrier of getting him somewhat into communication with the human race.

Now, some people can do that faster than others, but it is a factor that has to be crossed. And that factor does amount to this: it amounts totally to whether or not the individual is totally armored against everything you're trying to do with the individual.

This is important. Speed of assessment is totally dependent on an individual's willingness to communicate to the person who is assessing him.

All right. Now, let's take on the one hand, a student that doesn't know one end of the E-Meter from the other. He's been running "pretended know" with an E-Meter for some years maybe, but frankly, he can't make that E-Meter talk worth a nickel. Doesn't know too much about it.

All of a sudden he's pitched into a Security Check under the eyes of people that really know how to Security Check. And they find him leaving stuff missed and, you know, and
doing this and that. He never knew they were missed before. He never knew there was ever anything there to be found.

Well, we pressure him up and goodness gracious, he finds out there's an E-Meter – this E-Meter can really sit there and sing. It really does operate. It really does function. It really does find withhold. It finds out-rudiments. It does that sort of thing. Well, it's something like teaching him to find huge white boulders in a black field, see?

That's great, you know. He finally gets cocky. And oh, boy, he can really find these withhold now and so forth. He's got good confidence. Now, we send him out to find these little, tiny black pebbles in the black field. That's a 3D assessment. Oh, it requires a terrific command. Because in the first place, he's got to have good confidence that he can operate his meter and his tools. If he does not have that confidence – if he does not have that confidence – the pc can smell it.

The fellow sits down there and he says, "Well, now, let's see, uh... All right. Uh – is it all right with you if we begin this – this session now?" You know, he sounds confident. He sounds right there, you see?

Of course, what did the other fellow do? The other fellow just assigns his altitude at that point. He gives him altitude rating, minus zero. That's the end of the assessment. It ceases right there. Why?

Well, he hasn't – he's demonstrated that he isn't anybody to have any command value over the other person, that's all.

So if we just took somebody and gave him a one-hour review of how to run an E-Meter and then set him to assessing a 3D, he would find out that he doesn't get anyplace. That's all. And he would go on not making it for seventy-five hours, at least. You know, he'd just go on stumbling and fumbling, because he's looking for these black pebbles in the black field and it's really a lost city he's on the route of.

Well, that's not very economical, then, is it? Not economical in terms of time. You've had a person sitting there as a pc with an auditor who is inexpert. The pc is not in communication with the human race and the auditor is not in communication with the E-Meter. And the end of this is a debacle of seventy-five hours of accumulated ARC breaks that we can do very well without during the assessment, right?

Well, this is what I have learned: that it is much more economical to security check a person for seventy-five hours and put him in communication with the human race than it is to assess them for seventy-five hours – using the auditor as a constant.

Let's say this auditor is no better and no worse during the seventy-five or the next seventy-five and so on. He's a constant. Well, let's just take the pc. Well, it'd be better if the pc were given Security Checks and Problems Intensives, ARC processes and rudiments in twice a session for seventy-five hours than to assess the pc for seventy-five hours. Because you're going to wind up with no gain.

The pc is just going to feel like he's blowing his brains out at the end of the seventy-five hours, but if you give him that much Security Check and so forth, fairly well done, why,
he'll come up at the other end and he'll be feeling better. He will have some confidence. He will have benefited.

All right. Let's take the next stage. This person's got to be put in that kind of shape before he can run 3D levels anyway, so if you did, by some necromancy, manage to reach into the electrosis of his brain and discover these various items in that seventy-five hours, you'd still have to run all the Security Checks, the Problems Intensives and everything else and get the rudiments in endlessly and square him all up before he could run the 3D levels. Otherwise, they'd be too rough on him.

So what's the profit here? So what's the profit? Well, if this person wants to waste seventy-five hours, all right. I can just see it now. A person comes in the Central Organization, he says, "I want to be Clear."

"All right. That's a very fine goal. All right. That's swell."

"I want to be Clear."

"All right."

"And I want to be assessed now."

And I can just see a very, very obliging Registrar saying, "Well, all right. We'll put one of our best assessing auditors on you at once."

And see the first week blow up in smoke, the second week blow up in smoke and the third week blow up in a roaring bonfire. Yet, everybody was being very obliging. See, they're being terribly obliging. They said, "Well, if the person wants to be assessed on this new clearing process, why, naturally, we should assess them."

Oh, they've taken an irresponsibility. Their responsibility is very low, because the person's in no shape to assess. Now, well, you're going to have some kind of an assessment running like this. You're going to have three quarters of each session spent on the rudiments using non-strong processes which might very well better be good, heavy, beefy rudiments-in-type processes, you know? Security Checks, General Overt/Withhold, Problems Intensives. Let's sort this person out from one end to the other. Let's get this person talking and squared away and so forth. And if you really know how to security check, you can do it.

Now, we do that for seventy-five hours. The person says, "I want to be assessed on 3D."

And the Registrar says, "All right. We would be happy to assess you on 3D and you had better get going at once on the preparatory steps." That's the proper answer.

"What preparatory steps?"

"Well, the preparatory steps to being assessed on 3D, of course."

"Oh, all right. What do they consist of?"

"Well, they consist of getting you sufficiently in communication so that we don't have to waste your money and auditing time fumbling with the thing while we're assessing it."
Actually, you have to put up some kind of an argument on the basis of it's more economical for the person to be in some kind of condition before they're assessed than to just start endlessly assessing and wind up with an equivocal or an upsetting or an incorrect assessment or no assessment at all or – you see? That's the kind of thing that you're bargaining against with this sort of thing.

Well, that's going to take a lot of subjective reality on a lot of people's parts before they finally got that in because there'll be lots of people who will come in and say, "Please, I want to get some auditing from you," whether you're a field auditor or a Registrar or HGC, D of P, anything.

And he's going to say this, and you're going to say very obligingly, "All right. I'll assess you."

Nah, it's very uneconomical. Maybe with your altitude, you'll get away with it. Very often you'll get away with it. You'll get away with it often enough to disabuse you of the datum. But you're reckoning without this factor called altitude. You've got altitude. And so the reckoning of the datum is that every now and then you will get a full assessment, you'll get it very rapidly, and so forth.

One of the things that will also upset your calculation of this is the fact that the person you're assessing has probably been audited a great deal. And they're probably in some sort of shape. But remember those points. Remember those points. I'd say if you couldn't get somebody's goal in a matter of a couple of sessions, you're wasting your time.

I'd say from there on out you're wasting your time. I mean, just to give you some kind of a little yardstick, not a very accurate yardstick, but some kind of a little yardstick to go on. I wouldn't even make that kind of a test. I'd learn to add it up in the first place. And I'd also learn to have somebody around that could take that kind of work off of your back if you're the only one in anywhere – in any area that can do any 3D assessment.

You don't want to be running Security Checks. You want to be able to teach people to run Security Checks and you do assessments. I mean, that's easy. Then that works out. Then you get a lot of people cleared. That's a practical solution.

Now, as far as auditor training is concerned, an auditor who has not got the familiarity and experience of doing a Security Check just has got no business sitting on the working end of an E-Meter. That's all.

He's just got no business doing it. Because he's going to miss the falls, he's going to be looking up when he should be looking down, you know. He doesn't know which end of the list to write on. It isn't the mechanics of the thing. It's just the fact that he just isn't looking. That's all.

He doesn't know what ought to read like which. And this is a waste of time – give him assessing, because it's liable to break his heart because you can't read assessment reads like you can read Security Check reads.

Oh, you get some fellow and you ask him, "Have you ever killed anyone?"
And you find out he murdered somebody or something like this or thought of murdering somebody and needle falls off the pin and little lights light up, instrumentation plate lights up, little bell rings someplace, arm comes out of the side of the E-Meter and taps the auditor on the head and say, "Hey, look bud," and points a long metallic finger. It's almost that wide and big a reaction, don't you see? Can't miss it.

But on assessment, it might not be that much of a reaction. Probably never is that much of a reaction. So you're training an auditor in the direction of loses.

Now, the longer you assess a pc, the unhappier a pc is liable to get if the assessment is being done badly. The longer you assess a pc, the harder the item is to get. That is a stable datum on which you can absolutely count. The longer it takes, the harder it is to do.

So you don't want an auditor going in with a wide, wild fumble. No, let's let him get the use of his tools and then he'll get his assessment faster.

Let's say we have one hundred hours to expend. I would tell you right off the bat, spend seventy-five of them in setting the person up and twenty-five of them assessing and getting his 3D straight. Your hundred hours will wind up with a person with all his items in condition to be run on 3D levels. That's a nice win.

All right. Given a hundred hours to expend, person comes in, we do no preparatory work. We use all the assessment sessions to try to keep his rudiments in. And I'll show you the hundred-hour mark with no items, an ARC broke pc and no setup of any kind. And even if you'd found them in those hundred hours, the pc not in any kind of shape to run 3D levels.

You see, what's economical? That's, see – what's practical? What's the effective thing to do?

And ordinarily speaking, the effective thing to do would be to run the person over the jumps on all standard Security Checks. Run them through a Problems Intensive. Do what you could to knock out some of their hidden standards and upsets and worries and so forth and get them in some sort of shape so that they could be audited. And they'll feel fine. That's done more for them than anything else has done, so it's good effective processing. So that person feels fine now, and then you set them down on the cans, and you say, "All right. Give me your goals list."

And it goes off brrrrr-bow, and you get that, bang, and you get your next item, boom. And you get your next item, bang. And you get your next item, bang. And you get your next item, bang. You got your 3D. Find your level and run it.

Now, that's the way it goes. Now, the only reason an auditor starts worrying about an assessment on 3D is he himself is assessing somebody who doesn't have very good reads. And he has not recognized the fantastically mechanical nature of an assessment.

The only thing in a 3D that requires any judgment of any kind, whatsoever, is how do the parts fit right. After you've got all of the data, the judgment is required, now, at the point of who is what. In this game of the cowboy in the white hat and the cowboy in the black hat, who is the cowboy in the white hat, see? And you'll get some fantastic, oddball curves thrown at you there. You'll find the oppterminal is the pc's terminal, but the goal that you found is the
pc's goal, you see? But the pc's terminal that you found is unfindable because his terminal is already in your 3D as the oppterminal.

You just strike this kind of thing. Where do the levels fit? What are you finding? What have you got? This requires judgment. There are various mechanical tests that can be used, but none positive enough to overthrow judgment.

We have "black grasshopper" as the opposition terminal. "Black grasshopper." And as the pc's terminal, we have "chorus girl." Doesn't make sense to me. And if you run it, you won't make sense in the running either. Pc will say, "Oh, yes, I can see how a black grasshopper would frighten a chorus girl." You'll get three answers on a 3D problem-type command run. That's all. He's out. He's finished.

No, that requires judgment. The rest of it is a totally mechanical operation. Start realizing that point. And then what I'm telling you about preparatory steps, and so forth, will make a great deal of sense to you. It's mechanical. It is the mechanics of getting your rudiments in, getting somebody into session willing to talk to you about their difficulties and so forth.

All right. Now, there is a little bit of art connected with that, but from there on, bang! You get, "Give me the goals list." You get the goals list. You bleed it down for antisocial goals, withheld goals, secret goals, anything else, you add it to the bottom of the list.

You get your rudiments in. You get them in very, very, very carefully. You square it all around. Remember, your pc's got to be in some kind of shape they – that you can get the rudiments in on this pc. Remember, that's a necessary adjunct to all of this.


The reading of the meter should be of no concern to you, whatsoever. You should just know that cold. When that meter talks, it talks. That's it. And you know what message it tells you. And it's just cold. I mean, the list is either in or the list is out. The goal is there or it isn't there. That's all there is to it. And it's there to the degree the rudiments stay in. You should realize when the rudiments go out and your whole list, all of a sudden, goes null.

Take a goal that was just alive. Go back and read it again. "Bark, bark, bark. Thank you. That's out." Ow, ow, ow, ow, ow, ow. That thing was just alive as paint just a few minutes ago.

You came right down the line reading right down the line past that goal, and it went clang as you went by it, and you marked it as in, and you went down to the next one, and it marked something or other. And something tells you that something has gone to hell in a balloon around here someplace or the pc is acting up or the pc is talking in the wrong places or laughing at the wrong comma marks or something of the sort or just kicked the back of the E-Meter with his foot.
But just go back and read a goal that you've just gone over and you know it's still got kick in it. Just read it once. Stop the run. Get your rudiments in. See, you've got it proven that up there they were in. And now they — somehow they aren't. Get them in, squared around, and keep your list going.

In other words, as you go down to the end of the line, if your rudiments are in, if you keep your rudiments in, you'll wind up at the other end with the list you got in the first place with the pc's item on it. I mean, that's all there is to it. It is so mechanical, it's more mechanical than painting a wall. Painting a wall you have to make some judgment on the basis of the color of the paint. There's no judgment of color involved with that.

You just wrote down everything the pc said, and you bled down till the meter was null on any more and you've got the complete list and then you get the rudiments in real good and you know they're in. And then you go down the list and you null it out. And you'll be left there sitting there with the item.

All right. That's just a straight, mechanical action, and you do that with item after item. And you'll get good enough sometimes so that you consider putting a 3D together rather mechanical, too. And you get the oppterm. You get the oppterm from the pc's terminal. And you get the modifier on the basis of getting an opposition goal to the oppterm. Or something of that sort. You see, you can do it backwards.

You can take the opposition goal and you say, "Well, what would really happen to this person if he didn't (goal)?" see – opposition terminal's goal.

"Well, he'd be dragged down and wiped out."

All right. That's the modifier.

You can learn to do these things backwards and ask for different items, but that has nothing to do with the mechanical action of writing down the list of items, assessing the list out.

The reason you think it's complicated at this particular time is you're going over cases that have been assessed and on whom the assessment has been changed.

We've had some cases here that were running Routine 3 very nicely and very sweetly, and everything was going along beautifully and all of a sudden "Ron! Don't dare have an overt on him because I'd have to run it in a Sec Check session."

But anyway, we had to get the rest of the 3D items and it stopped everything. Oh, well, all right. So there's been a change in middle stream. You're going to find equally there will be an upset with the pc. He's been sitting there saying, well, he's a teddy bear. He's being all smug on the basis of being a teddy bear. [laughter] Always loved teddy bears, he did.

And you have to gently break the news to him, at the other end of the line, that he's a snipe. That's not so good. That's not so good.

The pc says, "I am?"

And you know, sometimes it stays as an ARC break. It's interesting, but then it'd mean that you're giving him the 3D and straightening up the 3D has caused rudiments to go out.
Well, you have to get them in again and you've got weapons with which to do this. All you have to do is get the invalidations off the thing.

Now, worse than that, you've had cases that have been assessed slowly. That doesn't mean that all the cases in the world that ever get assessed will always be assessed rapidly – so this is something that applies very broadly. But you've assessed some cases slowly, you knucklehead. See, that's a real knuckleheaded thing to do. You know, sit there, and fumbling with the meter, you know, and so forth. And saying, "All right, now, let's see. Let's see, the Instructors say I had to look at the meter – . No, I look at the meter while I read the goal, and run TR 0 – . No, that's not the right order." You know?

And you've assessed slowly. That's all. You've taken this list which is a very simple list. All you had to do is look at the list, look at the meter while you read the item – *pang, pang*. You can do that.

And you said, "To – pick – goose – berries. Oh, I'm sorry. I must have missed the instant read. To goose – . Excuse me. To – to pick goo-o-o-ose-berries."

You get a fall, of course – ARC break. So you write down, "That goal is in."

It's just a totally inaccurate job of assessment, don't you see?

I mean, there're all the parts, they all fit and it's all being done clumsy. And you're sort of trying to fix a watch with mittens on. And you've done a slow assessment. And you've had ARC breaks, and you've patched these things up. Of course, the assessment drags out. It's an hour's worth of assessing and it's dragged out now to three hours, to three sessions, to three weeks, same list. But all this three weeks you've been reading for the oppterminal.

And the pc gets to resemble – hardly a pc, but he looks more like a blank wall, you know? He's gone now back as far as anybody could possibly go. He's walking around like this, you see, all the time. You chant an oppterminal or anything on his chain of oppterminals to the pc, and he'll actually practically get blown away. You have to get in and out and get that one fast. If you don't get the oppterminal in the first couple of hours, you really ought to get another item that's on the pc's side. Get the modifier. That's at least blowing the other way. See? This is just good sense.

And try for the oppterminal again. We miss on the oppterminal for some reason or other. We'll get the pc's terminal, because now we've got the G plus M. Get it blowing the other way again.

All right. Now, that – we're just gathering data that's on the pc's side, and we finally wind up with inevitably the other side of it will fall into our laps.

And sometimes these things are all backwards, you see. The pc has given you the opposition goal. And he himself has given you the modifier of the opposition goal as his own goal. That's all split up. And the things all read differently and backwards, and they all get a read. But where do they belong? You're always left with a 3D with a jigsaw puzzle on your hands. That's where your judgment comes in. But it isn't judgment that comes up to the point of assessment. That is not judgment. It is a mechanical action based on good sense of the factors I have just enumerated to you.
Your auditor with experience in Security Checking and some idea of assessment or getting things in, and so forth, with experience on the thing, familiarity with a meter – he does the job rapidly enough that, well, there isn't anything to it. Because it becomes a mechanical job.

Now, given a pc who has some of the basic elements flat on him that puts him back to at least the outer ghost perimeter of the human race, he's got one toe inside the perimeter of the human race by means of Sec Checks and all that sort of thing. All right. Now, that pc becomes assessable.

All right. Given that and given an auditor who is rapid and accurate in doing it, and actually knows how to read a meter and so forth and assessment's just bang! Just like that.

Now, that is what you should be trying to attain. But auditors who worry about assessments remind me of a mechanic who is walking around and around a car wondering what is wrong with it without ever opening up the hood, you see? Never lifts the bonnet, see? Worrying about a pc? You don't worry about a pc. Hell, man, that's just an open and shut proposition.

The pc is either in shape to be assessed or is not. Well, that's told at once as to whether or not your pc is responsive on the meter.

All right. The assessment is done by simply listing the items and nulling them out. That's all. That's totally mechanical. And if you can get up to a point where you look on this as a totally mechanical action, you all of a sudden will have a long sigh of relief and you won't care who you assess or how many. But somebody will sit down in the auditing chair, and you say, "All right. Do you have any ARC break? Do you have any withhold? Do you have a present time problem?"

You get no reads of any kind. And finally, why, you say, "Well, what's been your goal in – some of your goals in life? I'll write those down now." The tone arm just sits there; the tone arm never moves. No tone arm motion on a goals listing? Oh, no, man. Let's not go assessing that list. What are you, crazy?

Your meter's not responsive. You've sat there and assessed opposition terminal on some pc that didn't move off 2.3. And you've gotten the whole list with the pc just sitting there at 2.3 on the tone arm. No tone arm motion. How do you suppose there's ever going to be any needle motion on the list? There's no tone arm motion on the list.

He gives you all of these things that he's been fighting all down through the trillennia and he's not going to get any tone arm motion? Oh, hell, give that guy an application blank for the human race or for the auditing session. There's something wrong here. I mean wrong, man. That's not faintly out. It's a nonassessable condition, just staring at it right in the face. It's nonassessable. That will require Security Checks. It will require General O/W, it will require ARC Break Process, it will require some kind of a Problems Intensive. "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting," run for several hours. All of these things, you see?

And then all of a sudden the fellow can remember this lifetime somewhat. You're not asking him – putting him in very good shape. You got a pc down the line here right now I could probably assess, but – not here in this unit. I could probably assess this pc, but, boy, it'd
just be from a basis of altitude and breathing down the pc's throat and almost energizing the pc's reactive bank myself.

Because this pc can remember nothing. Yesterday fades away. It's gone. It's the automatic solution: Remember nothing. This pc would give you a list, and they wouldn't know what they had given you a list of, for, what or why. Well, it's all right. You could do an assessment of some kind or another. You'd probably find a forgetful person. Well, it's probably all explained when you get to the terminal.

Let me point out something to you. This person can't remember long enough to remember they're in session. They can't even sit still. They're in bad shape. And you've forgotten how bad shape Homo sap is in. You deal to a large degree with Scientologists, and you audit people who have been in PEs, and people who have had a little co-audit, and people who have had a little patch-up auditing here and there, an assist here and there. You don't see the degree that they've been graduated up.

Not until you get this garage mechanic that would walk around the car and wonder and worry about what was wrong with it and never lift the hood to find out, never even sit onto the driver's seat and push – try to push the starter button, you know. He'd just walk around the car and worry – something like that.

Well, you get this guy and you sit him down in the chair and you say pick up the cans and he says all right and he does and you start assessing a 3D.

Well, he'll be interested. You can run his goals, yeah. Funny part of it is you could get away with a list of goals. He'd probably give you a list. He's not interested in anything as much as he is that. But when you'd finished the list of goals, then he would want to know something or other or something and he would have – and you would suddenly realize that this person didn't have the faintest idea of why they were there or what they were doing or what you were doing or how this had anything to do with their life or anything.

And this person may be sitting there with some screaming present time problem of some kind or another. You wouldn't know. You know, just some howling problem of some kind like, well, he hopes you will tell him when the session is over because, you see, if you didn't tell him when the session was over and tell him to go home, why, anything might happen. He might forget where he was and so forth. And he comes into session and he isn't feeling very well and you don't cover it very thoroughly. You ask him if he has a present time problem and you don't get any reaction on the thing. He doesn't know what even a present time problem is.

But you say, "Well, what has happened in the last day that has been worrying or upsetting to you?"

And if you asked him that question for thirty minutes, with variation, he would tell you that he was very worried because all morning he had been walking around his room believing fully that he was about to go insane. Not a minor thing he was up to, you see.

But after a half an hour of questioning, you finally get this fact out. Now, you find out he does this every morning, or something like this.
Why don't you just say, "All right. Get the idea you can reach but can't reach. Get the idea you can withdraw but can't withdraw."

And he does, and in a gleam of insanity or something, you do something with him, you know. Zzzzzz. And he says, "Hey, ooo, that's better," and he comes back. "Man," he tells you, "that's all right. I only woke up at six this morning and I only worried about going insane for just about a half an hour. That was pretty good. It was pretty good. It's a lot better."

But the guy's whole life is a present time problem. He never sees a wall. He sees a facsimile of walls. You get the idea? I mean, that's the kind of people you're liable to be dealing with. I don't care if they're holding down positions as premier of the land. Position has nothing to do with it. It's quite the reverse. It's when you start getting them going up in position, they're liable to start going up the pole, too.

No, you haven't any guarantee, whatsoever, that this fellow has enough balance to sit there and just sit there, see? That would be a high skill to him – to be able to sit there for an hour, see? The basis of a high skill, you know. He doesn't know how he could do it. And all the time he's sitting there, he's worried, "Will I be able to sit here for a few more minutes. I don't know whether I will be or not. Will I be able to sit here for a few more minutes? No, I don't know whether I will be or not. Am I willing to sit here for a few more minutes?"

You don't know what trouble these people have, man. There's hardly anybody out in the society these days, and so forth...

Well, take a bunch of college kids. You'd think they were in awfully good shape. Or take a bunch of children out of some earlier school. You'd say, "Well, they're in fairly good shape."

Ah, you get down to pitch with these kids, and really you take the half an hour to find out how it is. Wow! It'd be hard for one imagination to paint any part of the randomness that you would discover. See, these people are worried. These people have problems. These people are upset one way or the other. And if you haven't cracked any part of that perimeter at all, you're going to assess it? Aw, no, no, no. You're not. Mm-mm.

See, if a person's problem is can he sit there for a half an hour or an hour or something like that, how can he tell you anything, see? It'd have to be a damn strong E-Meter that would give you the reads that you were capable of arousing on this person on some subject or another.

Yes, you could get him interested. Yes, you have all the tricks by which you could do all this. But wouldn't it be kinder to security check him and find out why he was so worried? Because the basis of his worries are all contained in Security Checks.

If you want to find some reason somebody is worried about going mad, just find the people he's driven mad, that's all. I mean, it's quite, quite simple.

You got somebody who is just terribly worried about nervous indigestion and ulcers and that sort of thing. You find out that his father has nervous indigestion and ulcers, and he has nothing but O/Ws on his father to the word go. He's got them by the thousands. And you're going to cure up his nervous indigestion by just some passing the wand over him?
Well, you're not going to cure it by getting off the overts on Father, but you're certainly going to take his mind off of it. These things are all the subject of overts and withholds of one character or another.

So the kindest thing to do about anything like that is take the weight off this life before you send him back eight trillennia. How can a guy ever get back there? He doesn't dare leave present time, not with a pink elephant stepping on his foot all the time, which you never hear about. You see how all this – all this – this fits together?

A fellow who has constant and continual worries, who is nagged all the time in all directions, has to have them alleviated a little bit before he can get anyplace. Well, this tells you, all right, well, how about this fellow that's just so spun in on his terminal and his opposition terminal and his goal and all the rest of that, that he's just so spun in, the only thing he could possibly do would be to relieve these things.

No, that isn't true because all of his overt acts are locks on his goal and you're doing a job of unburdening when you're doing the Security Check. You're just unburdening the things that he's been into. Along about the fifteenth level on the second rerun or the third rerun or something like this, this person will all of a sudden look at you very fixedly and say, "Tha – That's why I drink water in the morning."

"What's this about drinking water in the morning?"

"Well, you remember – remember several weeks ago I told you that I always woke up with this burning thirst and my throat all raw, and so forth. And then we took that up and we did something about it. Well, actually, the truth of the matter was – the truth of the matter was that this terminal I'm running here, a mermaid, you see ..." And pfft, the thing blows, you see. He won't get down to the heart of a thing. But you can always unburden things.

Frankly, that is the anatomy – unburdening is the anatomy of the Goals Problem Mass operation that we're doing – unburdening. We're taking the solutions off the top of the thing. It's very interesting. You can deal these solutions off the top of it and of course, it deintensifies as a problem because these terminals and things are as much as a problem as they had been solved.

The big trick, you see, is to solve it without solving it. And the only way you can solve it without solving it – because if you solved it again, you see, you'd bring it in on the person.

Medicine and psychiatry have been solving these things for a long time. And it just dumps the person into it.

So your solving, of course, has to be done without solving. And, of course, how do you solve without solving. Well, you solve without solving by taking off the solutions. Well, then that leaves it unsolved. Well, that's where it should have been in the first place.

The only mistake your pc ever made, who has a terminal of a waterbuck, of course, was obsessively solving problems about waterbucks at the expense of tigers. How do you solve problems about waterbucks? Well, you solve problems about waterbucks because of tigers. And that's the problems you solve about the waterbuck and waterbuck problems. Waterbuck problems – solve, solve, solve, solve, solve, solve, solve, solve, solve, solve, solve, solve,
solve. Till you can actually work it out – as I told you several years ago – you can actually work it out so that the whole physical universe is just one cure after the other. And if you look at anything in the physical universe, it's there because it cured something. Well, what's the difference between cure and solve? That's the upshot of it.

All right. The other factor that stands in your road – and it stands there good and strong and looms up in front of you – is your pc is not at all sure that anything can be solved. Any pc as he enters in at the lower rung of things is just a little bit hopeful, but he's not at all sure that anything could ever be solved.

And he's sitting there in a total insecurity about his own case. What case? He's sitting worrying; he's saying to himself, "Scientology work? Does Scientology work? Does Scientology work? Does Scientology work? Does Scientology work? It couldn't possibly work. It couldn't possibly work. Couldn't possibly work."

And you say, "Alright. Give me another goal."

"Well, spitting on trees." "Does Scientology work? Does Scientology work? Does Scientology work? Does Scientology work?"

Yeah, smart thing to do is make a citizen out of him. Yeah, oh, you can always do that.

You can say, "What are you having trouble with? What are you having the most trouble with now?" You spend a half an hour trying to find out what he's having the most trouble with.

"All right. Well, who had that trouble? Who had that trouble?"

Now, this is the most elementary Problems Intensive you can give anybody.

"Who had that trouble now? Who do you know had that trouble?"

Well, all right. Spend another half an hour, hour, two hours, three hours getting him to remember his wife. And he finally says, "Oh, oh," his wife had that trouble. Yes, that's right. His wife had that trouble.

"All right. Well, that's fine. Now, what was the dirtiest trick you ever played on your wife?"

"Well, I never – ." *Clang!* You know? "I never played a trick – ."

"Now, what was that?"

"Well, I've had some very unkind – ."

"Ah, you've had some unkind thoughts about your – . Ha-ha! That's real good. Well, now what have you done?"

"Oh, I da-da-da-da-da. I didn't want to do anything to her except beat her. Just beat her. Oh, I remember one time I felt very bad. I beat her and she hit her head against the kitchen stove and it both burned her and bruised her at the same time. I feel different somehow."
That's your inevitable conclusion. That magic is always available in your hands. It's always available. You can make it work from one corner if you don't make it work from another corner. You can always find something.

So this guy is sitting there, and he's saying, "Nothing works, nothing works, nothing works, nothing works."

Well, Q-and-A with it. What the hell.

"Did you ever know anybody else who didn't think anything ever worked?"

Well, let's just assess it out until we finally find somebody for whom nothing ever worked.

"Anybody in your whole life that you know of that's just totally apathetic all the time. Did you ever meet anybody like this? Did you ever run into anybody like this?"

Of course, that's his terminal, but we won't worry about this. Let's blame it on somebody else for the minute.

"Oh, well, yes." He says, "By George, I had forgotten all about her, but Miss Binge, yes. My first-grade teacher. You know, I hadn't remembered her for years."

He'll finally unbury this, you know, dig it up like an old bone. And you run O/W on Miss Binge. He's going to brighten up, going to feel better, see? You can always count on whatever the pc's complaining about as having been present in another person and having been keyed in by the fact that he did O/Ws to the other person. And you can also always count on it that it's also on his own goals line. It's always his own terminal or the oppterm, see. That for sure, in the final analysis, is where it is.

But you can always go on this little excursion and unburden the thing. And sometimes you're lucky and get it at once, and sometimes you're unlucky and take quite a little while to get it. But you can do it. You can do it if you're in there with a Security Check program that's adequate. It's a piece of magic that is always available to you. You didn't handle that part of it, well, handle something else. But try to handle something for the pc. That's one of the first ways to get your meter to read. You handle something for the pc, your meter will read better. Check me out on it. You'll find out that's true.

Person comes in and he isn't anywhere in the perimeter of the human race. You know, we're not trying to make a Clear out of this person before we assess him. We're just trying to get the person to sit in the chair unworriedly with some small amount of confidence that something will happen. That is all we are trying to do.

Well, it takes quite a bit of doing with some people to get them into that state of mind, but that's the state of mind you're heading for. They're going to be able to sit in the chair for the whole length of the session. They are fairly confident that something will happen before the session is over, you see. They have these points of view. That's all you're trying to do. You're not trying to make them well.

This guy had his head cut off in World War II, and you're not trying to grow a new head for him. You're not trying to do anything stupendous like that. You're just trying to get
him so that he's easy in his mind sitting there. He has some confidence you maybe can do something.

Well, it's – you'll find out – the more you work with raw meat, you'll find out, you'll get almost contemptuous of it someday. It's so easy to do. It's so easy to do. We were doing it in 1950, only we did it on a different route. We expected it to key out just by the pc remembering it. You could always find something the pc could remember that would key something out, oddly enough.

Pc's worried all the time about this throbbing pain in his head. You say, "Well, who had a throbbing pain in their head? All right. When was that?" and so forth.

We expected it to leave. Now, you don't expect it to leave. The reason that skill folded up is because only about 20 or 30 percent of them ever lost the pain in their head. You get the idea?

I mean, it was too small a percentage to play with. There was some other factor, because it would key right in on them.

I remember old Burt one time. I took something away from him with a one, two, three and then asked him to remember it again, and he went straight into it like a head-on torpedo collision. That was at old 42 Aberdeen Road.

And the next step to that, of course, would have been to run O/W on whoever he had elected. See, and that would have finished it off and straightened it out. Not to run the engram of the occurrence, but to run O/W on whoever he had elected. Whatever had been wrong with him – and he said, well, that was his Aunt Minnie, or something like that, you see – and it didn't fly away, all you had to do was run Aunt Minnie on O/Ws, you see. You just run O/W on Aunt Minnie.

Of course, you can always run a person for a little while as a terminal. Not very long May be his opposition terminal. You never know before you got at 3D what you're auditing. Whether you're auditing tigers, waterbucks, willow wands, or what.

You yourself may be sitting there as the opposition terminal to the pc. Don't be too surprised when you get a 3D done, if that were the case. On the contrary, think of your auditing skill as rather tremendous that you could get a 3D while you were the opposition terminal. See, you're a girl. The opposition terminal is "pretty girl". You actually were able to sit there – this pc was rather ARC breaky with you and so forth – but you could actually sit there and get a 3D on this person. It means that you're pretty clever.

You're going right into the teeth of the pc's worst aberrations. Every time you sat down in the chair, of course, you keyed the pc in. Auditing will work over the top of that. That does not make an impossible situation at all. As a matter of fact, it's a rather ordinary situation.

So your job in handling a pc is to get the pc to sit down and have some confidence and read on a meter. And then is the time to assess. Well, how long does it take you to get him into this state of mind? Well, you had to be rather effective in getting him into this state of mind. It may take you up to seventy-five or more hours to get him into this state of mind, but it's all well spent because you're not going to get anything done until that state of mind exists.
And if – certainly you're not going to get anything run until that state of mind exists, don't be so impatient. See, what's the hurry? He's been crazy for the last hundred trillion. Sometimes, you know, it's more economical to take a break than to audit. Did you realize that? Sometimes it's more economical.

I've seen people auditing past ten o'clock, for instance, that learned that to their sorrow. It would have been much more economical because the following day they patched up the ARC break of having been audited two and a half hours over their session and not been able to keep their appointment with their girl.

It not only was totally wasted on the night before, but it was actually totally wasted the next day, too, because the two and a half hours he was being audited all the time up against the present time problem of having to meet their girl.

And so next day you have to audit out the present time problem. Well, it would have been better just to have knocked it off at ten o'clock. Then you wouldn't have had the two and a half hours of ARC break followed by the two and a half hours of cure of the ARC break. See, we gained nothing. In other words, we fell down a well. And we climbed up our two feet and fell back five. So that was no good. And these are all adjudications on the subject of auditing.

All right. Now, when auditor training is concerned, definitely it is better to confront a pc in an assessment with an auditor who has a degree of confidence and expertness and knows what he's doing. Because you're going to get – the confidence of the pc is going to multiply at once, isn't it? The pc's confidence is going to go up. Therefore, you're going to get something like a 3D.

All right. So it all works itself out for us fortunately. Fortunately, works itself out. It's just a matter of the pc is being run on Security Checks and the auditor is getting familiar with the meter at the same time and we trust that that auditor isn't going to miss too many Security Check questions.

It's always economical when you're security checking on a training basis – in other words, we're security checking and we're security checking for blood, but we're not too familiar with the meter ... You get some student that you're training sometime, not too familiar with the meter, and so forth. Have him put into his end rudiments, have him end every Security Check session early. In other words, let a half an hour be the time for end rudiments. And he's going to make that up with the pc's havingness or this other burning question which is added to the rudiments in addition to any other rudiments question, you see, is: "What Security Check question has been missed?"

You're going to make him keep that rudiment in. Well, that's the only safe thing to do because he might have been looking out the window whistling "Dixie" when the Security Check question was falling off the pin. Or it might have been a withhold that he has, see? And very often people won't ask about their own withholds. Quite interesting.

But if you say, "What Security Check question has been missed?" then the auditor, you see, doesn't know that he is asking for his own withhold, see? He knew it when he was asking the question "Have you ever raped anyone?", you see? He knew that he was asking for
his own withhold, so he said, [speaks very hastily:] "Have you ever raped a woman? That's fine. Thank you very much. All right. We go to the next question now."

Now, he comes down to end of session and the end rudiments, and he says, "Now, has any Security Check been missed?"

He gets a reaction. So he says, "Well, what Security Check question has been missed? Well, all right. What one has been missed?"

Big inspiration, you see. Knew what to ask right that minute, see? "What Security Check question has been missed there? There seems to be one."

"Well, I – I don't like to tell you."

"Well, what security question has been missed here? Which one was it? Which one was it? Was it early on the list, late on the list. Where ..."

"All right. I'll tell you. It's have you ever raped anyone?"

And the auditor says, "Oh, well ...[laughter] All right. Who'd you rape?"

See, you can catch this one two ways from the middle. Anyway, not being snide about it, that's the safe thing to do on all such things and keeps your pcs from getting upset. You'd be amazed how upset somebody could get from having a Security Check question missed.

You can actually also be amazed how upset somebody gets if you never plunge for the withhold. You should realize that critical thought questions – by this time, you should realize that all critical thought questions are simply trap questions.

The individual says, "Well, yes, I thought some critical thoughts, some critical thoughts, critical thoughts, critical ..."

Well, let him get off a few. So what? It won't hurt him.

And now you say, "Now, what did you do to (blank)? You. You. What did you do to (blank)?"

"Oh. Oh, nothing." Clang.

"Well, what was that?"

"Oooo, oh, that's juicy."

Then all of a sudden we get the source of all critical thoughts. People go around thinking critical thoughts have committed an overt. That's all there is to that. The overt is against the terminal or is associated with the terminal rather closely. Another thing, you'll find that following out instant reads only is always reliable on a Security Check. You never plow along on latent reads.

The only example of this is when you tell the fellow to think over that area, if he tells you he can't remember and you see the needle bang suddenly. You could overdo this trick, by the way. You can say, "Well, now, what did you think of just that moment?"

And the fellow will tell you what he thought of just that moment and that will be the withhold that you're looking for and it'll even surprise him.
This is not, however, a latent read. You're not reading a latent read. You're not asking a question getting a latent read. You've asked, "Do you have a withhold" or some withhold question and you get a reaction. You know, you get an immediate reaction.

Well, you get a latent read on the thing, leave it alone. Don't bother with it. But the other way to use this thing is you just sort of set the fellow thinking, "Now you say that you haven't ..." so on, so on and so forth. The idea – the implication is, "But you – you obviously were falling on something here connected with this. Now, what do you suppose that was?" And the fellow sits back and thinks for a moment or two.

Of course, he actually runs off the track of your Security Checking, so you get the instant read played back – basically what it does. You can always ask for the played back instant read because you asked for it to be played back.

Jumping down people's throats all the time with, "That's it, that's it, that's it, that's it. What's that, what's that, what's that," all on latent reads. "Have you ever raped anybody?" Clang! Well, that didn't – that was an instant read, so we avoid that one. "All right, let's see, what's ..."

"No."

All right. You say, "Have you ever raped anyone?" Clang! "What's that, what's that, what's that? What is that? What was that one? What was that one? What – what – what – what was that? Which way did it go?" [laughter]

And you're going to find something about rape. Hasn't anything to do with the case, and it has nothing to do with a withhold and, boy, can you just run a Security Check out to the longest possible time that way.

But setting a fellow thinking about something – "All right. Now, you just think over this family, here. You're telling me you don't have any more withholds. I want you to just think over this family of yours about withholds, and so forth. Are you sure you haven't done anything more to them? Now, just think it over for a moment." Something like that. I don't care what wording you use. It goes clang.

You say, "All right. Now, what did you think of just then?"

"Oh, well, that. I had been meaning to tell you about that, but uh-hah."

And you got the withhold. I mean, there's other ways of attacking this thing. But the point I'm making is you've got an auditor with some confidence on Security Checking, confidence in handling the meter, he knows the tools of his trade. He can put up a good show and he's rehearsed a bit on assessing and that sort of thing. And he can go in on the pc and get an assessment done providing the pc has been set up. So it works out rather optimally.

If you don't set up the auditor so he's skilled enough to do an assessment, you won't get one. If you don't set up the pc well enough so that the pc reads on the meter, you won't get an assessment and that's all there is to it.

Now, a valuable datum was turned in by somebody in the class and that is the invalidation of a goal is liable to read like the goal. I appreciated that very much when that was turned in.
You get the goal and the terminal will get a certain read. *Tickety-tac*, whatever the read is. The invalidation of it will also read *tickety-tac*. Interesting datum. If you're looking for an invalidation of somebody's goal or terminal – this I give you conditionally; I haven't checked it too closely – but it goes the same. You get the same read on the invalidation, apparently, as that you'll get on the goal.

In other words, the goal thetaopped eighteenth of an inch wide, why, you possibly will get an invalidation on it that thetaops an eighteenth of an inch wide. And it's interesting to be able to differentiate this between that. You'll probably also get a fall and some other things, but – in addition, but this has been turned in as a – as an observation of what goes on.

So therefore, you could miss an invalidation of a goal because it'd read like the goal when you were mentioning the goal.

And you say, "Well, has anybody invalidated your goal?"

And you get a read which looks like the goal's read and you think the person thought of his goal and therefore it read and that wasn't the case. He thought of an invalidation and it read just like the goal, so that you could pursue such things down.

And you can always get invalidations off using various tricks and mechanisms of one kind or another. You can always straighten these things out, providing you're expert on an E-Meter. But the time to be expert on an E-Meter is during the assessment, not after you've goofed one, see? Because it's unfortunately true that – you were insufficiently expert to do a perfect assessment, the probability is you'd also be insufficiently expert to do a proper patch-up, see?

So the time to do an assessment is when you can do one.

Now, therefore, I recommend to you, very thoroughly, in handling auditors and so on, in training auditors, that you don't let your better judgment get overswayed by their tremendous anxieties, that you keep a practical hand on the thing and that you say, on the one side, well, when an auditor can run a perfect Class II examination and he's perfect in his Class II and he can run Security Checks and he knows all of that very well, we'll start to teach him how to run goals – you know, how to get assessments on goals. That would be a smart thing to do.

And on the other side of the thing, somebody comes charging up and somebody absolutely has to have the 3D items now because the world, you see, is going to end tomorrow morning. They've been like this eighteen trillion years, but the world obviously, just by pure coincidence, is going to end tomorrow morning, and they've got to have their 3D now.

Well, there could be such circumstances. For instance, there could be some kind of a circumstance where a guy wouldn't have any time to get audited and wouldn't get audited for the next eighteen years, or something like that. Yeah, you might do something, and you'd be sorry if you did it. But there might be some reasonable arguments; but you'd be sorry every one that you'd bought.

Not to prepare a case for an assessment is the equivalent to just wasting auditing time by the barrel load. So on the one side, prepare an auditor to assess up to the level of Class II.
Prepare him so that he's got all those skills perfect and then teach him some assessing skills because you're now not teaching him basics. And on the other side, prepare the pc up to a point where he can be assessed. Between these two things, you're looking at a high, old time ahead. And if you neglect those two items, you're looking for mud up to your neck. And that's going to be rough. It'll be rough all the way.

First action I would take in going back into an area, if I were one of you going back into an area, would get somebody by the scruff of the neck... And not tell them everything you had learned at Saint Hill in the first morning. Get them by the scruff of the neck and I would say, "'You' rhymes with 'two', and therefore you are going to be a Class II Auditor, and you're overdue as one."

Because it would be very much to your benefit to have some people around that could do all the preliminary work. And then you could run a lot of pcs, and your skill would really count, you see?

And of course, it works out for them, too. If they're doing a perfect job as Class II, why, if you've got some confidence in them, then bringing them along and teaching them to assess, and so forth.

So everybody wins.

But this isn't really on the basis of everybody wins, so much as, as far as I am concerned at this moment, there is no other way to win. If I knew of a royal road to geometry, I would tell you. But there apparently is none.

Okay. Well, I talked to you about Security Checking, didn't I? And I talked to you about clearing, didn't I? Well, that's a good thing because I expect some of these people that are being run now – we got – it's coming up toward – it's moving up toward half the class on levels now. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Half the class on levels. It's getting right in there toward that. It's past a third now, and at any moment – at any moment, you will be saying, "My God, what do I do now?"

And I just wanted to give you some confidence. I know what you should do then, so don't worry about it.

What you should worry about right now is getting all the levels run that you could run on your pc to the best of your ability straight on through. And when you get a dozen or so of those levels run and good and flat, and the tone arm stuck very high and everything gone to hell in a balloon and so forth, I'll show you what you do then. It's really pretty easy.

We're going to make some Clears here. We're going to make some Clears here. Going to make them in rapid-fire short order, and, basically, we're going to make some because you actually have been very patient, and you have learned very well. And I'm actually – where a great many of you are concerned – am quite happy with the way you are doing, quite happy. And the way with the others, why, we won't mention that just now, because I'm in a benign frame of mind. [laughter]

Thank you.
EXPECTANCY OF 3D
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Is there a heater on there? All right.
How are you today?

*Audience: Fine.*


*Audience: Seventh.*

It's the seventh. All right. And I think you just had a sheet handed out here. Well, now, you've had an experimental sheet handed to you. There have never been any runs on this sheet. It is simply handed to you as a trick pattern of command structure. It has to be tested. Maybe one or two of you will be run on it. But there's nothing very deadly about it. But let me point out to you here that you have an opportunity to clear with the pc, problem, situation, difficulty, confusion, MEST trouble (whatever it is), and what he considers the solution is – solve, made okay, cured, finished, ended, "that's-that-ed" or whatever he considers the thing is, you see.

And then you've got a thirty command which is fifteen bracket. Thirty commands with fifteen brackets, which is pretty good because it covers just about everything, and so on.

Now you'll find that some pcs will hang up a little bit if you don't have "others" in the run and so forth. This is a very comprehensive coverage of this particular thing.

And I would say offhand that if you could run it with "confusion," it probably would run faster than with "problem" on quite a few people. But this gives you an opportunity to clear it all up.

This is no – let me point out to you, this is no change. There isn't any change here. This just gives you – this is all possible elements that you could run on 3D commands with all – all effective brackets. There's even "you and you" in there. There's a bracket in there, "Tell me a problem you have had with you." [laughs] That's for those people amongst us who have valences. [laughter, laughs]

All right. Well, that's just a – it's just a tricky command sheet. I handed it out to you more or less for your curiosity more than anything else. And yet we will run it, and probably do something with it. But possibly, it'll be refined before it is generally issued. I thought you might like to be on the upper end of the assembly line for a moment. Okay?

*Audience: Thank you.*
Well, I've practiced enough for the Washington congress, so I'll sit down.

This is 7 Dec., still a nautical month, and we have the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we have some people who – that look wonderful and some people who look horrible. [laughs]

I'm going to make to you just a few random comments today. I haven't really very much to talk to you about. You're all doing perfectly. There's no possible improvement that could be made either on your cases or your auditing. You will recognize that. Except in a few instances. A few instances your auditing could be improved, and in a few instances your cases could be improved, you see. But on the whole you're all perfect except "you." [laughter, laughs]

All right. You're not getting – sitting in the – way down in the bull pit – you might say, with a pc, you're not getting a broad view of the working of 3D, and I might tell you something about this.

You're getting a one-pc view of it, and your coffee-shop comments. And that's – that's a little different. So what are the expectancies of the thing? And I'd better give you some idea of the expectancies of what would happen with a pc on 3D. And I'll just take one through from start. Okay?

All right. These are broad expectancies, and these expectancies have been routinely borne out. When these are not borne out, there is – it's nothing. It's – the assessment is wrong or something is goofy. When you don't run into the phenomena which I'm going to list to you here, why, something is wrong.

All right. This person staggers in, see, and hits both sides of the door and sits down to get audited. And we put him on the E-Meter, and we say, "Well, what were – what did you have to eat for breakfast."

And he says, "What breakfast?"

And you say, "This morning."

He says, "What – what this morning?" that sort of thing.

Well, he is not in a position to be audited with an assessment on 3D. You wouldn't assess that person.

You ask this person various questions about life in general, and the person seems to have a tremendous amount of worry in present time. I've already told you that present time – an elephant stepping on your toe here and now, even your little toe, is far more important to you than an elephant who squashed your whole body a few million years ago. You – you recognize this, see.

A peanut which you are not able to procure right now is far more important than an empire which you failed to secure several trillenia ago. Let me point this out to you. The havingness – the further it goes back on the track, why, the more unlikely it seems. And the importances of a case must be concentrated, to some degree, at least over this lifetime, and can't be concentrated in the last three minutes of life.
Now, if you find a case that the rudiments are very hard to keep in on, you're finding a person whose life is a constant problem. Unless you can do something for this, it isn't likely you will ever get his attention off this constant immediacy onto what might have caused the immediacy. He's not so much interested in what caused him to go broke. He's interested in the fact that he hasn't got a sou.

Well, that he hasn't got a sou is what's worrying him, and that the causes of his decline and going broke are the least possible interest to him. The fact of the matter is he's broke, and this is all he can concentrate on, you see. There he sits a mental bankrupt, and he hasn't any – any margin on which to operate at all.

In other words, his mind cannot play even easily over this lifetime. You see, he sits there and he says, "Well, when I go home this is going to happen, and when I come back this is going to happen, and then – then I'll go, and so on. I wonder what I'm going to do and-and-you know, it's terrible, and isn't life horrible right here and now?"

Well, you try to get him a split instant off of "now" and of course, he has to at least have the idea of going "then" somewhat before you can get an assessment, even though the assessment is in right here and now. You understand that?

He – he doesn't, however, appreciate that the assessment is in here and now. He would much more easily have you take the elephant off of his little toe than to remove the empire off of his back, you see, because he's not very aware of this empire that's off – on his back. But he sure is aware of that elephant that's stepping on his toe, you see? He's very aware of that.

So, this person is not in an assessable state because his concentration is, well, on the auditor: "Is this fellow going to do me in? Isn't he going to do me in? I don't know. I was audited by somebody out in California one time, and that's enough for anybody. Uh… God, isn't that terrible, and is he going to fix me up or isn't he, or – or is he really? Or is he just in it for the money or is there anything to Scientology? We don't know there is anything, and uh-yuhr-uh-rrr" – automaticity, automaticity, automaticity, automaticity.

And he's saying, "Well, I don't know whether I'll go home or not or whether I've got any money and car fare or whether I should take the bus or whether I should take the car. I wonder if I should buy a car and… uh-nahnah-na and so on. Should I eat breakfast? Should I have steak for dinner? Or shouldn't I? No, it's very expensive. No, I shouldn't have steak for dinner because I might have… Better have beans for dinner. Uh… so forth. I wonder what they'll think if I do have beans for dinner. I wonder what beans…" [laughter] And that – that's just somebody with the rudiments out, see. [laughter]

Well, the process of getting rudiments in can be begun at that point. And if you regard it no more than just getting the rudiments in, you'll see what we're talking about, because it may take seventy-five hours to get the rudiments in.

All right. From that point of natter, natter, present time elephant on my toe, don't know what I'm going to do – from that point for the next seventy-five hours he gradually gets back to a point where he can look at this lifetime, where he can sit in the auditing room, where he can look at the auditor, and keep his mouth shut while you're reading a list to him.
Now, in other words, you're – you're into a condition here where the individual can be fairly relaxed in a session, and therefore you can get the information that you want for an assessment.

So that is the usual condition of a person as he moves into the perimeter of auditing. In other words, he doesn't know, and it's this way. And then gradually, over a period of time, particularly if you are doing something very effective, like Sec Checking, Problems Intensive, racking around one way or the other, curing up his bad memory, anything you can think of that makes him easier, gets the rudiments in, gets some of his overts off, gets him into communication with the auditor. During that whole period of time, you should be getting a more and more responsive meter.

Now if you read it always that the meter action should be loosening up, you are going to make a mistake. Because a meter action can get – get looser and tighter, and so forth, somewhat disassociated from the response of the pc's mind on the meter.

There's a difference there. The pc comes in feeling very relaxed and – physically – and feels very relaxed physically and actually does get a fairly decent dial drop, see. Feels pretty good. Well, actually, it doesn't really not follow, and it doesn't really follow that his mental response to your questions is better. It doesn't immediately follow.

The response of the meter to the question is not necessarily independent of this other, but it is itself – it is itself. How much is the person reacting. Now, I'll – let's give you an idea. I might just have been auditing this person, and I straightened them up, and they feel fairly comfortable, and they've got a dial drop on the can squeeze, you see. And the following morning an HPA student from a Central Organization fumbles with the meter and asks him a few questions, and so on. He'll get a dial drop. He won't get any response. You get the difference here?

He'll – he'll still get the dial drop, but he says, "This is different than what happened to me yesterday," and he's, of course, got a present time problem. He – he says, "I don't know," and "I – I'm not sure," and "What is this all about?" And he's thinking about this, and the meter response to the auditor is the factor there which doesn't necessarily coordinate with the drop of the can squeeze. Do you follow that?

In other words, your meter might be responding if somebody were making it respond or if the pc accepted who was making it respond.

Now, your job in the first seventy-five hours is getting the pc to accept the meter responding, see? He – he accepts your communication. He feels that it's better – it's – it's all right to be audited by you.

Now, this is a hard bridge for an auditor to cover during that particular period, and it's something that you should put your mind to. This – this is something that you should know as – as an auditor.

Yes, you can goof up. Yes, you can make mistakes, but your auditing – even the worst auditor in this unit at the present moment, perhaps with one or two exceptions – is better than most of the auditors in – practically all the auditors in 1954. See, there's – there's – here's a difference of auditing here.
We can't go out on the basis entirely that it is quality of auditing. Let us assume that the auditor does a halfway interested, technically correct job on the pc.

All right. Now, let's just take auditor A who is doing a halfway interested, technically correct, more or less, job on the pc, you see. He's not doing a perfect job. He's not doing an imperfect job.

All right. We have him, in rotation, audit fifteen pcs taken from different strata. This is the same auditor. And then without allowing those pcs – without allowing auditor A to do any advertising, without allowing him to tell them how he is a good auditor or any propagandizing at all – we take these pcs, and without permitting them to talk together, we get each one's opinion of this auditor. We're going to get fifteen different qualities. Going to get fifteen different opinions of the same auditor. And if these people are unaudited people by and large, you're going to get fifteen bank expressions to something that had nothing to do with the auditor.

Auditor was wearing a yellow dress. All right. Very good. Pc number one likes yellow, so it's a good auditor. Pc number two doesn't like yellow, so it must be a bad auditor. And it'll be something as oddball as that.

During the first seventy-five hours, you should actually not take to heart any opinion the pc has of your auditing. You should not take it to heart at all. Because it has nothing to do with observation. Nothing to do with it at all. It's just his various reactivities reacting. And I've noticed you, as auditors, worrying far too much about what the pc thought of you in the early stages of your auditing of the pc. Well, the reason you're worried about it is because your rudiments aren't in.

Well, your rudiments wouldn't be in. It wouldn't matter what you did or if you had changed the color of your hair and wore a funny nose, you'd have the same opinion exactly on the part of the pc of your auditing. And if the pc… Well, let me give you a better example.

Did any of you ever have your parents get acquainted with you? No, you see. Well, this had very little to do with you, but had a great deal to do with your parents' ability to observe. They didn't observe very deeply, and so they didn't know you very well. That's about the way that adds up.

The pc's ability to observe during that first seventy-five hours of getting straightened up is negligible. His powers of obnosis stink. He could go down the street, and you ask him – I'm not talking now about a strange off-color, neurotic personality. I am talking about Homo sap, average issue, school tie and the lot, see. And we have him walk down a street one block and then ask him at the end of the block, "What have we just seen?" and you would be amazed. You have either seen nothing or you have seen something else, or the people you have passed have been entirely different people. His obnosis – the power of observing the obvious. The ability to observe the obvious. It just is not present.

So you actually should not feel bad or be influenced by this preclear's opinion of you at all, up until the time you've got 3D levels about three-quarters of the way run. Because, you see, he can't observe. This – this is something you should keep in mind. It's quite important, because I've seen a pc who was sort of bad off, curse and swear at one of the finest, smoothest
auditing jobs I've ever seen. And I've seen a pc who was apparently in fairly good condition, and so forth, totally satisfied with one of the lousiest auditing jobs I was ever punished to witness. There's just – the pc had nothing to do with this.

So what you do, you see, is you be satisfied with yourself. You see? "Am I turning in a representative auditing job? Is my interest in the case adequate, and is my technical accuracy, as I work with this case, is that adequate? Am I turning in a representative auditing job? Is my technical skill there?" And that's it. Now, if you have that confidence, you'll never get rocked. Otherwise, you will continue to get rocked always because your job could be utterly perfect, and you would still get your eyes clawed out by some pcs, and your job could be horrible, and you would still be kissed on both cheeks by other pcs, you see. "Oh, my auditor's a wonderful auditor. She gives me such good advice between the auditing commands." [laughter] Could get pretty wild, couldn't it?

So it's actually up to you to hold and maintain a standard of auditing. You have to know what is – what does a session look like? And what should it look like? And then just hold that standard, that's all. As best you can, hold the standard. Just turn in a good job of work on the thing, one that you won't be ashamed of, and one that you don't think I'd be ashamed of, and you'll – you'll have it made, you see. That is what counts. It is your belief in your auditing job.

Now, that belief, of course, can be enormously influenced by the pc, providing you are not sure whether or not you're turning in a technically perfect auditing job. As soon as you become sure of that, no pc in the world could shake you. It's only when you are doubtful about what you can do, doubtful about your skill and doubtful about your technical accuracy that you can be shaken.

Now, you just go ahead and hold a standard. That's very easy to do, and so on. Because the first long run here is not going to be done before a reliable judge: the pc. He is not a reliable judge.

In the first place, he's – he's even further introverted during a session than he would normally be. So he is frankly less capable of observing because you're trying to make him observe himself. So his observation of you, of course, is very poor. So, don't pay any attention to that. Do you hear me on this? Might practically save your bacon some day.

Maybe if I'd told some auditor this earlier, why maybe we'd had a few auditors who wouldn't feel so bad about some of their failures or something like this. If somebody had ever told me that, I know I wouldn't feel so bad about some of mine. So this is the way it goes because that first seventy-five hours may, if your technical accuracy is good and if you're doing the things and using the tools the way you should – remember those tools are well put together. Don't – don't think those tools aren't.

You're going to see a little change in beginning and end rudiments adapted to Security Checking or adapted to 3D, you see? You're going to see a little variation between those two Model Sessions, but the bulk and body of Model Session is unaltered. These things are not altered. Your Security Checks, they're very set. Your Problems Intensive, that's very well set. The packaged processes which you have, they're very well set. These things are not variables. And you are not dealing with variables.
I could give you a table, and I will try to compile you a table, of what to do in almost any – with any type of pc – a very simple table, using exactly the tools you know how to use.

But those first seventy-five hours, well, you just do them.

Now we get up to a point where the pc has needle response. I don't say that it takes seventy-five hours. And I don't say that you, graduated from Saint Hill and really knowing your stuff, will not be able to get enough altitude over some pc who is sitting there kind of wide-eyed and overwhumped anyhow. And you say, "Give me your terminal," bang! You got it, you see. I mean… Crash, the meter goes. You get tremendous meter reads, you see, because you got altitude. Don't count on other auditors you train having the same altitude, and don't make the mistake that I continue to make. Please profit by my mistake. I make this mistake continually.

I can sit a pc down; I know my business. I have altitude with the pc. Even when I don't have altitude with the pc and know my business, I can get command value over the pc very rapidly. I can really make a meter read. Can really make it read.

All right, so then I expect you to do the same thing. That's not a proper – proper thing for me to do.

But over the years, over the years I have finally learned this fact: One, that I don't know what a process will do until it is done out of my sight. See, I don't know what a process will do. And the other one is – is that I have every reason to expect comparable-level auditing from everybody who audits. Oh, you thought I was going to say the reverse, didn't you? No. You can audit like that because I found out I audit the same way you audit except I just know what I'm doing, and you don't know what you're doing. And that unconfidence that you sometimes display at those crucial points on the thing is your only fault. Now, all you've got to do is get that confidence, and you've got it made.

I'm not saying then that a pc, raw meat, could not be assessed on 3D. You've got tremendous altitude with this pc. And you sort of overwhump him, and you hold him like a frozen halibut in-session, and he responds. And he hasn't any choice. I'm not saying you cannot do this. At the same time, I'm not advising you to do it. Not that you couldn't get it. Not that it wouldn't be fine. Not that the pc wouldn't get tremendous gains. Not for those reasons. But because you're not going to get that even a run of it. The bulk of the pcs which you sit down across from will not be in any shape to audit, and you'll be wasting your time on Class II skills when you should be assessing. That's all.

So that you – you should have enough nerve, either yourself, to set up somebody you care about a great deal as a pc, to set them up perfectly for assessment and get the rudiments in, or turn them over to somebody to be set up one way or the other so that you can assess them. That's what you ought to be doing with it.

All right. Now, what happens at this point of assessment? Well, you've got a needle response. Now, don't expect the needle response to stay constantly good. You've got these rudiments in sort of on the basis of mounting a couple of toothpicks on the side of the Empire State Building, you see? And there's a high wind, and toothpicks are frail, and they're liable to fall off at any minute.
Don't expect, because you have invested seventy-five hours, that they will stay in. All you've done is guarantee that you can get them in. That's all you've guaranteed with all of this. Actually, the pc will feel better; he'll live a better life; he'll think things are wonderful. You've actually done something to change his way of existence; he'll think this is fine; he'll have more confidence in you. These are all factors. He'll think these are gains. You, under your future experience, will learn these aren't gains at all. They don't amount to a hill of beans. But they amount to something to the pc. They're more than the pc could get anywhere else from anybody else.

All right. And you've just brought him up to a point where you can get the rudiments in. That's – that's about all you could say.

You brought him up to a point where at the beginning of session you have some guarantee that you can get the rudiments in and that they will stay in, probably, maybe, throughout the session. See, probably, I guess. Mm-hm. Maybe, you see. But it's no more positive than that.

Now, you couldn't have gotten the rudiments in on him seventy-five hours before. See, so that's the single gain that you can expect to have made: that you can get the rudiments in on the pc after the pc has been well prepared. It isn't now that the rudiments will stay in on the pc. They won't. But they will be much, much better, much easier to keep in. You won't find yourself coming into session and having to take up two hours of the session with a present time problem. See, you can get the rudiment in as a rudiment.

You've got him to a position now where you can call – he tells you he has a present time problem, and then you say, "Well, what's the prior confusion to it?" See check it a little bit, and it blows, and you can get on with the session. Do you understand?

But every session – every few sessions you may find yourself confronted with some upheaval in his life which requires that you spend a whole session putting him in some kind of shape – every now and then, even though he's been prepared.

You've just given yourself the fact that ordinarily you could get the rudiments in. That's all you've done. After all that period of time.

All right. Now, we don't care whether the pc feels much better, whether he thinks Scientology is wonderful or whether he thinks it's now horrible. We care nothing about his opinion. We just hope that he is in a bit better communication with the auditor. That is all we hope for. This pc is going to keep telling you constantly, "Well, you know, my left eye still twitches. Hm-hm-hm-hm-hm-hm. My left eye still twitches. Hm-hm-hm-hm-hm-hm. You know, when you ran that Problems Intensive it didn't do my left eye a bit of good. Hm-hmhm-hm-hm-hm. You can kind of touch the head of the arm so that it'll play the next groove. But that's about all you can do about it. Because I can tell you frankly his left eye twitching is buried in the middle of some kind of a wild Goals Problem situation that you couldn't have got to with an oil-well rig, you see. So, just pat them on the back and say, "That's fine."

---

8 This refers to the old record players which sometimes – when the record was damaged – sprung always back into the "same" groove instead of going forward.
And they come in and they tell you, "It is so wonderful, so wonderful. I feel so free. I feel so marvelous. You know, my chest no longer hurts. All these years, my chest has been hurting. And my – chest doesn't hurt very much. And I... Achmmmmmm! It's marvelous what you've done for me. I'm so happy about the whole thing."

You say, "Thank you. Thank you very much," and get on with the game because you know very well his chest is going to turn on in full before it turns off again. See, you frankly haven't – you – you haven't done more than key a few things out.

All right. That's fine. But, if you expect to do anything horrendous for him, you see, in five hours of Security Checking and so forth, disabuse yourself of the idea. You're not. Whether he's happier or unhappier, we couldn't care less. It's just whether or not we have to do that five hours of Security Checking while we're assessing or do that five hours of Security Checking before we start assessing. And it's always smarter to do it before we start assessing. That's – that's all there is to that.

All right. So, we get him into assessment. Now, we spent – there's time been spent on this pc. This pc is in pretty good condition. Sleeps, oh, almost every now and then, you know. [laughter] Sleep is much better now. Sleep on the job all day or something like that. And he's eating. Pc's eating now. He's eating now. He's graduated from eating only nuts to being able to eat bread and nuts. You see, all these great gains, you pay no attention to these things at all. But he's got all these things, see. He's all straight, everything is nice, life is going to continue out now at a high climb, and everything is going to be wonderful. And then you start assessing.

Well, during the goals, he's very, very interested, and everything is fine. Now, during a goals run, a pc is very interested, unless you start goofing and losing his goal, and invalidating it and so forth – he'll get upset. But even then you can bring his interest back. It's marvelous. Their interest is right in there with goals. And they go right on with this very nicely. And they just do fine under a Goals Assessment. And nobody's ever happier than a pc when he finally finds his goal. And that's quite understandable because he's been looking for this thing for a long time. If anybody had come up to him three or four years before and say, "What do you intend to do in life?" it would have thrown him into the awfullest confusion he'd ever heard of. And now he can say to them, "What do I intend to do in life? I intend to knock the tops off buildings," or whatever goal you found on the pc, see. That's fine, see? All right. But he feels good about this. I'm not making light of that point because that is a tremendous point. He feels fine about this.

Now, the reason Routine 3 is so attractive and why you're going to find people backsliding and trying to do Routine 3 is just this: You can find a terminal, and the pc is very happy to find his terminal. So now he's got his goal, and he's got his terminal. You can also run this terminal, too. And it makes the pc happy to have it run. That's all dandy.

Now, that route, he'll stay happy. The other route that you're going to follow, he's not going to stay happy. So you just make up your mind to it.

Now, he's very happy, and he found his goal, and he was so happy to find his goal. And he's very cheerful, and he's got this big gains of now he can sleep all day on the job, and he never could sleep a wink before. And he now eats bread and nuts, and he only used to eat...
nuts. Now, you got all those big, tremendous, forward strides in life. On your very next action, you're liable to lose all of them.

He's liable to backslide on any one of them because it's something like you getting in with a stick and stirring it up. Now, the pc will stay with it, but your technical accuracy and the rapidity with which you do it measures how well that pc will stay with it.

Well, I don't care what part of 3D you find next. You can't find the terminal because you haven't got the modifier. You could find the modifier next as in 3A. That's a hell of a fight trying to find a modifier when you've got no oppterm or anything of the sort, but it may – keeps the pc a bit happier. The pc really does not get terribly unhappy. You're still fighting on his side, you see, when you find the modifier.

No, I'm afraid it's a little bit better, however, to just run down the 3D exactly the way you're doing a 3D. You look for the opposition terminal. Well, no telling what you'll find. You may find the guy's terminal, but you might not have found his goal in the first place. That might be the opposition goal. This thing is liable to go all topsy-turvy before you get through. The point is have it right. That's the main point. Don't have the pc happy about it; have the assessment right.

And if your goal is to make the pc happy while you're assessing, you're being very foolish. You should keep the rudiments in while you're assessing, and the devil with whether the pc likes it or doesn't like it, you've got to have enough ascendancy to make him sit still while you get the rudiments in and while you find the next item. And this pc is going to go over the rolly coasters.

The process of finding the oppterminal – well, you're asking the fellow to confront an enemy he has never confronted. He just had never confronted this as an enemy. He's never even identified the enemy. It may be his best friend. You might even be it. Who knows? Who knows what this oppterm is going to be? The thing to do is get it before he has a chance to wake up and inspect it. That's always fastest. In other words, let's get the thing and write it down, and three days later on the comm lag, he says, "What do you know? Opposition terminal – a building. You know, I'm in them all the time." You know? I don't care. Just find it. You can find it before he finds out about it. If you – if you do that, that slippily, you'll get it for sure and get it very rapidly and easily. I'm not saying to be covert about it because you can get it head-on, too, with his full cooperation or without it.

All right. Getting his opposition terminal is going to upset him because you're going to turn on the winds of space. He's going to feel that backflow. He's going to feel that he is opposed. He is going to feel that you are no longer really his friend. And if, at that stage of the game you've got – he's got overt on you, that you haven't pulled, by God, you can't hold him in-session worth two nickels and a collar button, don't you see? He's just not capable of sitting there.

Well, actually, you're sitting there chanting at him when you're doing the assessment list. He's a cop, and you're – you're saying, "Robbers, thieves, murderers," so forth, and you're going on over every enemy the cop has. It's very easy for him to associate you with a deadly enemy at that point. See, if your rudiments are out, he will, too. Why? You obviously are
connected with them because you are saying these things. These are dirty words to him, really.

Pcs will get some of the most remarkable actions on having assessment lists read back to them again, or getting them checked out. One has even informed a checker that he shouldn't use such dirty words. The most remarkable reactions occur.

Well, don't expect them to be sensible reactions because you're dealing with the bottom rung of his aberration. Now, he may be a nice guy and sensible at all times except when being assessed. And then while he's being assessed, of course, you're playing around with and stirring up all of his worst, meanest, most viciousesses selves.

Now, doing an assessment is sort of like taking a pomegranate apart. When you first looked at the pc, these things were not separate. These were all identified, and by assessing them, you separate them. Don't think that this separate item was sitting there separately. No, it is the piece of glue to which all other pomegranate seeds are stuck. And it's quite a trick because it might be any of the pomegranate seeds, you see. It might be any of them. But in actual fact it's just one of them holding the rest of them together. And everything will come off except the last seed. And that's the glue. Only that isn't part of the pomegranate. That's the bank.

You've now got your hands on the bank, and the rest of this that you were pulling off of the thing, you have simply been causing the pc to differentiate.

So, the case is coming apart in your hands while you're assessing. So therefore, if you do a crude job of assessment, it is very comparable to doing a very bad job of auditing. You see, if you aren't handling the assessment well and pulling this pomegranate to pieces rapidly or skinning the onion or whatever you want to compare it to, you're doing a kind of a slow, painful auditing job on the fellow. Because it's really auditing. It really isn't searching. You see, you're pulling those seeds off one after the other, and so forth, and you may pull out the center seed and put the whole pomegranate over here on the right and say, "We're through with that." And you will do that often. That's no great blunder. You've missed it.

After this, you keep – all of a sudden there's nothing sitting at the table in front of you at all. What happened to the pomegranate? See, it's gone, and we have to get back and get the original list. That's why you always preserve original lists. Because it might have the one piece of glue that was holding this thing together on it. You see?

There's only one, and there it is, so you've got to have that. And in taking this apart, the pc gets a tremendous feeling of relief when you finally find the one piece that was holding the rest of it to pieces, and you identify it.

Now, he doesn't have to agree with it at all, and in a lot of the cases he won't verbally agree with you. He won't verbally agree with you. He will say, "Oh, well, that couldn't be it, and I just gave you that in the first place. I was actually just throwing a red herring. I this, I that, I… that..." so on and so on. Because a pc can always be counted on to do himself in if you restimulate his opposition terminal, because that's what he's trying to do in. And he will do in what you will find if he's been trying to do it in in life. Yeah, after you've found it, he will try to do it in. This you can count on in a large number of pcs. After you've found it, he
then explains to himself how it couldn't be it and you couldn't be it. See, he will do this. This is in some number of cases.

The thing which you will see most generally is the person will be just, "Well, of course, yes, that's it! Well, of course, yes, that's it, that's it! No, that couldn't be it. Well, I sure doubt that, yeah. Well, that's it! Of course, that – that's the one. I – I really realize that. That's just exactly what I've been doing. That's just exactly. I don't know how you found that thing. Don't know how you found that thing. Couldn't be right." He's liable to be of some kind of a reversible frame of mind here very easily, so you don't pay too much attention to it.

All right. You go on and find the opposition goal. Now, this is cruelty beyond cruelty. Having turned on the winds of space on the bird with the opposition terminal, you're now going to chant opposition goals at him. Well, if this pc were very touchy, of course, it might be a smarter thing to find the modifier before you found the opposition goal. It doesn't matter what sequence you find the remaining items in, but this is going to turn on more winds of space, but also it's going to make things much better when you finally have it. So it's sort of a choice at that point.

And then when you finally get it, he feels better, he feels worse, he feels better, he – but in general feels better.

Now, you're going to find his modifier. And of course he doesn't believe that, although he says, "That's what I do, all right. Yeah, but… uh… Yeah…" That's what he does. They – they have a tendency to accept their modifier pretty well, except if it's terribly discreditable and they have given you a terrible time finding it. And if they've given you an awful time finding it, of course, they've got overts on their own modifier. They've got overts on you now, and they can – liable to get all balled up this way.

Well, you go across now having found the goal-plus-modifier and knowing what it's against. You can find the G-plus-M by simply getting the opposition, "What would oppose the opposition terminal?" That's easy, isn't it? Or "What would oppose the opposition goal?" See? You could take it from there or you could just take the goal-plus-modifier and "who" and "what." There are many ways you can assess this thing. If you wanted to be sure, you would assess it several ways and find out how many parts you have and then check the parts out and you'll find some of them are null.

So you could get more parts, apparently. For instance, if – if you got the G-plus-M, the goal-plus-modifier terminal, you just got a list of these things, you assessed them, and you got a G-plus-M – you don't like it. You – you don't think this is quite right, or you just want to be sure, or for some reason like that. You could turn around now and you could get, "Who or what would oppose opposition terminal?" Same assessment, isn't it? But "Who or what would oppose..." You get another list, and you find out nothing occurs on this list that occurred on your G-plus-M list – Where are we going now?

Well, that's fine. Assess it out and write it down and don't worry about it too much, but try to find some new ways to find parts, you see? See if you haven't got some excess baggage here someplace. Find the opposition "actual goal," the actual opposition goal which isn't the opposing goal at all. It's – it's what the opposition as a person would do – person or being would do. Find that. Find this and find that.
Well, the aspect of the pc while you're doing all this sort of thing is – because you don't seem too confident because you're finding two or three additional parts or you're trying to sum this up or add this up, and he, of course, is withholding like mad on these things, and all of this – is an upset aspect. And all these beautiful gains are liable to just blow up in smoke through that period.

Somatics turn back on again, the pc becomes apathetic, the pc becomes very upset, the pc becomes this, the pc becomes that. The only thing you should worry about is when the pc becomes something so they won't have a session. That's the only thing you should worry about. But those beautiful gains might be all wiped out, right on up to the time when you've got a proven-up, settled assessment.

Just before that assessment is finished, you can expect this pc to be an absolute "blank." The "blank" doesn't mean he's blank; it means a dirty word. Pcs before a 3D assessment is finished, can be expected to be bitchy or upset or unsettled and worse off. They don't like it. They're in a terrible confusion.

You've thrown them into the midst of tremendous numbers of parts and haven't found the parts they – that fit. And so they react to this confusion and they are very, very upset. And there may be no worse period in their whole processing time, in any processing session, than they go through twenty-four hours a day during a 3D assessment. They do not look good or sound good when they're going through the ends run of a 3D assessment. Goal? Fine. Opposition terminal? Well, all right. Opposition goal? All right. Modifier? Well, we're not quite sure by now. And by the time we get down to finding the terminal, oh, God. Life is too horrible. They're liable to become very dramatic. They're liable to become much more dramatizing. Anything that they would naturally do by reason of their valence they now do twice as hard. Not commit crimes, but they're liable to be very, very hard to get along with during that particular period.

I've noticed this as a recurring phenomenon. And just before a 3D is finished up, God help everybody. So that's not necessarily a beautiful vista. And all of a sudden you finish it all up, and they say, "Of course," and if it's absolutely right, they relax. And some of these gains we had before, but which vanished during assessment, return. And that's a good thing that they now have recovered confidence because they're about to get them all back again the second we start a run.

Frankly, that is the aspect of a pc right up to that point. You can expect that.

All right. Now, during the first assessed run, we can expect the pc, during the first part of the run, quite ordinarily – it all depends, on a long run – if a person's been run on the terminal before the first level, flattening of the first level, is pretty – pretty easy. They don't mind this too much. Or they mind it terribly, or it could be quite variable. But ordinarily, your first run, the pc's willing to sit there and take what comes and so forth. And you run the second level, and – this is in a fresh pc that had never run the terminal before – and – and you get them where they'll sit there and, "Well, and there's the next one. That's all right. I'm not quite sure about all these somatics. Is this quite right?" This couldn't be right because he never had this many somatics before. And they're sort of used to the somatics which they have, you see, which is a severe pain across the throat and a hollow feeling in the stomach. That is life.
"How do you feel?"
"Well, I feel a severe pain across the throat and a hollow feeling in the stomach."

They would have told anybody this for years. And now all of a sudden their best friends are gone. They have a horrible pain in the middle of their back, and their right leg feels paralyzed. This hollow feeling in the middle of their stomach has become much more hollow, and their throat isn't there. And this is a totally unfamiliar view. Well, what's happened to them is the Goals Problem Mass is moving in. You have whistled it up and you've said, "Well, all the way. Come on." And it's moved on in.

Actually, it hasn't moved at all, but their perception of it has changed, and they finally will focus on it, and when they – if – if it isn't a correct terminal, they never get the goals-modifier terminal inside their own body. It's out there someplace.

But eventually, after two, three, four, five levels have been run – certainly by that time they should perceive that they have been living in a double house, and that where they stand, something else has always stood. And where the body is, something else has always been there.

Well, the somatics that they get at this particular stage of the game are very changeable, they're very harsh, they are very upsetting, and they go clear around to the back of the head. They make them feel like the back of their head's going to fall off. Actually, they're frankly not too worried, but they sure hurt. They don't like this particularly. They're liable to complain, and you're liable to believe that something is wrong. Yes, there's something wrong if that doesn't happen. There's something wrong with your 3D if that doesn't happen, because that is routine.

All right. Now, what's the routine behavior of flattening a level? Somewhere from – it all depends on how strong a level you found off the Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale. And it might even – you might even get a stuck TA with only two or three commands. And then it takes you the rest of the bracket, and by the end of the bracket, it's obvious that the needle has been still for half of the bracket. Well, that's – that's getting too tough. That's awful still. That's awful stuck. But normally the tone arm, if the assessment is proper, can be expected to go up and stick. And then the needle sticks. First the tone arm sticks, and then the needle shows a little driftiness, and then the needle sticks, too.

When you're first running across these runs, that needle can stop with a clank. You can almost hear it clank. It is just not about to move anyplace. It is in brass. After a while, on later runs, you'll find it just sits there. It doesn't necessarily sit there at screaming attention. But it's still stuck, and it's still stopped.

Now you can expect, then, on this first level, for the tone arm to go up and the needle to stick. And that happens. And when that happens, you don't overrun that. You do another assessment, and between them, if you had the right havingness, and if everything is going well, and the rudiments are in, and so forth, the person should come down off of that before you run your second run. It doesn't matter much if they don't, but they actually should come down off of that. You should be able to get them down off of that, just by virtue of their not running it for a few minutes.
And you run the second level, and it goes up and sticks. The tone arm sticks and the needle sticks. Both of these things stick. And they stick very solidly, and you don't want to overrun that too far because assessment will be very difficult to do. So you come off of that, and you do it again, and it just – just keeps happening. Up goes the tone arm and sticks. And the needle sticks. And that is all that happens.

And you go on, and you run level after level after level after level, and that's what happens on every one of the levels. And the pc's somatics, however, abate after a while. They get less severe. After you've run four or five levels, why, the pc's somatics are – he's getting used to them. There are still sticky masses inside of him. The mass picture hasn't changed, and so forth.

Now, during this early run and even very late in the runs, you cannot expect the pc to get clean, clear pictures. There – everything is fuzzy. He won't even see probably a picture of the terminal until you have run something – if you count running a level as also rerunning a level – until you have had about twenty runs on levels, he may not even get a dub-in picture of the terminal. And he'll eventually collide with a dub-in picture of the terminal in some phase or another. This may puzzle the pc, but of course he is it. How can he see himself?

The pictures are all smashed in on him, and they're all fuzzy and mucked up and they aren't really engrams. They aren't really pictures. They shouldn't be in 3D. They probably aren't in color, there's probably nothing very startling about them. He gets impressions of them. It's a sort of there's a picture over there way over to the right someplace, and he gets something about that. There's a steady picture is liable to occur and reoccur out in front of him that he can't quite make out. Black ridges occur inside of his head and around him, and he's not sure what these things all are. And that's quite ordinary. Quite routine. Nothing to that. If he had a clean track, he would have been able to inspect it, and he wouldn't be there. And he wouldn't be in that condition, obviously.

So, all right. Now, what is the – that's – that's one of these aspects, that the needle goes up and sticks, and tone arm is... Pardon me, the tone arm goes up and sticks, the needle sticks, and that the pc has no pictures. Now, after you've run ten or twelve levels or something of that order, you should rerun all of your levels. You just take them up in sequence from the earliest level through and rerun them.

Frankly, you should rerun them by assessment, but it's not the same kind of assessment that you do on the Prehav Scale. You just mention – you take the first level and you mention it, and you don't get any needle reaction, so you take the second level, and you mention it. And you get a needle reaction, so you run that level on its same original commands again. And you'll find there's a little tone arm motion left in it, and it goes up and sticks, and as soon as it goes up and sticks and you're sure everything is good and stuck for a few commands, and so forth, you come off of the thing. And you mention the third level to the pc, and that, of course – nothing on that. And you mention the fourth level to him; there's nothing on that. So you mention the fifth level to him, whatever it was, and you get a tick or a sudden stick.

All right. You rerun that level. You rerun it again. And so you go over these things.
Actually, you go over all of them a third time just this same way before you go on up above – certainly above the level of ten or twelve. Before you find ten or twelve levels, let's get all of the early ones cleaned up by passing over it at least three times on this assessment basis that I've just talked to you about.

Now, the pc during this time has not lost the mass. The mass is still observable. It is much lighter. By the time you've done the second or third run, you will find – you know, across those levels – and before you're ready to do new Prehav Assessments you will find that the pc isn't really bothered by these things, except occasionally they get a sharp pain or suddenly be sitting there thinking about nothing in particular or somebody will be talking to them, and their oppterminal gets mentioned or something like this, and they feel a sort of a zhuuuuuu. They feel kind of winds of space hit them for a minute, or they had a hell of a pain in the back of their head or – or their chest will start acting up suddenly, and then they forget about it and so on. It actually isn't too uncomfortable to them. It's probably sharper but actually not as bad as some of the illnesses they have had.

Now, they're liable to believe during this period that they're going to get sick. That is to say they're liable to throw up, they're liable to get very – thing – or they're liable to develop a fever, or they do develop a fever between sessions. But their sicknesses for the trillennia have all come out of this Goals Problem Mass. How do you expect this person to do otherwise than react to it?

As a matter of fact, I did the anatomy of how a thetan feels pain, and they actually feel it through a Goals Problem Mass. You have to have a valence and a valence in order to – for a thetan to have this sensation of extreme pain. You have to have a double-rooted whizzle to collide with a whatnot, you know. You have to have two things colliding, and then he believes he isn't one of them, and believes he is the other one, and – and you get that. And then these two things will come together, and then you get the pain registered. What you're doing is pushing the pc beyond the borderlines of extreme pain. He will not be able to feel extreme pain when you figure – when you get one of these things flat.

All right. And of course that's very bad news to a pc who is so overwhelmed that he thinks pain is delicious.

Anyway, along about the third run or something like that, or sometime during that period, a pc is liable to suddenly develop the symptoms which used to tell him he was going to get sick. And this will worry him.

Well, I'll give you an idea. The person gets a – gets a bad throat, bad throat. And they knew at one time or another that when their throat felt that way that they were coming down with a sore throat and tomorrow it was going to be worse. Well, frankly, this was the somatic in the Goals Problem Mass which, when it moved its few inches further on to the rest of that particular engram, was the sickness which they used to suffer from, see?

And you've caught them at this point which is the warning point. And they've always used this as a warning point. They got so that they noticed that when their throat got dry, they then went on and got sick. What they didn't realize was what was making their throat dry was always – also what was making them sick. And it was simply a cycling through an incident of some kind or another which was totally, flatly worn on the body.
So they get this, and it gives them an idea they're going to be ill, and they go around thinking they're going to be ill. And they don't get ill. It's very puzzling. And it upsets their considerations with regard to these things because life has been pockmarked and predicted by these various sensations, and their map is disappearing, you know?

"When am I going to feel sick at my stomach? Well, I'm going to feel sick at my stomach when I get this small feeling in the back of my neck. Everybody does, you know. Before you're sick at your stomach, you get this funny feeling in the back of your neck." Or, "I know something terrible..." Here's a more familiar one: "I know something terrible is going to happen because I have this terror feeling in the pit of my stomach. And I know that will—probably something bad is going to happen tomorrow." And all of these signals turn on, see? These are superstition signals that the person has used.

And of course, they wake up in the morning, and by God, they've got that terror stomach. They know something bad is going to happen today. It always has happened. In the past, every time they woke up in the morning, you see, and felt that way, why, something bad was going to happen in the rest of the day. That's for sure.

So they wake up in the morning, and then their stomach feels bad, so they know something bad is going to happen in the day. And then they get up out of bed, and it disappears. So they suddenly remember it was the level the auditor was running on them yesterday, which was "worry" or something like this, you know, or "terror" or something, you see? And it evaporates. They don't mind all this. It's just what's going in and out.

Now, as you go on and run Prehav levels from that point on, you get a slow gain. The pc is not really going to raise hell with you and not going to complain about lack of progress particularly, but they are going to natter that it doesn't all happen at once.

Well, now, you're running a problem, and the pc suffers from all of the illusions given to anyone about a problem. A problem is everywhere at once, is hung in an instant of time, and time doesn't move. These are all the illusions given to one by having a problem. And when he has a hell of a problem, he always knows time is not moving. And he'll talk to you about why isn't it happening faster, and I wish it could happen faster. And this is all this—this stuff which is resultant from this—from being up against the central problem of their whole track, is what you collided them with—with a crash, you see.

And this runs out slowly. I hate to tell you this, but it runs out slowly. It does not run out rapidly, because you're running it out on the basis of socking the pc into the problem. You're not taking any chances on this thing going off and getting keyed out and then keying in again in a few years. The best thing to do is throw him in the middle of the whirlpool and get rid of it.

What's going to happen here now is that he is not going to notice his improvements. This could upset an auditor. It is quite common. The pc does not notice his or her own improvements except on a comm lag. They notice them on the basis of about three days or four days or something. They suddenly realize they haven't had any trouble sleeping.

Well, for years, you see, they've had a lot of trouble sleeping. They can't even spot what this was or why they stopped having trouble sleeping. They just don't have any trouble
sleeping now. They go to bed, clonk! You know. And they wake up, thud! You know? And they say it's never happened to them, you know? That's fantastic.

And this problem about bread and nuts and that sort of thing, well, they – they're just all set about this and so on. It gradually comes over them as they're sitting there; they're eating this great big steak, and they're chomping into it, you know, slop, slop, slurp, slurp, you know, gulp, gulp, gulp. Suddenly, comes up, "You know, I've never eaten steak before!" You know? Or the following day they suddenly remember that they have never eaten steak before, you see? Something goofy like this goes on.

And some of the things that they suffer from get worse. They've always had a bad itching back. Their back has always been itching. And every time they've ever sat in company, you know, they really felt like doing this all the time, you know, but they didn't dare. And so they get a sort of a suffering look on their face, and they… And you'll see them sitting in the auditing chair and they'll be going grrr, and so forth. And actually their back will get much, much worse. Much worse. And it'll itch and itch and itch and itch. They'll complain about it and complain about it.

Well, they're headed in forwards into a Goals Problem Mass, and the last part of them that gets affected is, of course, the rear. [laughter] That's all – that's all there is to that. And they – they – first just turns on, it turns up and up and up, and it becomes far from unbearable. But it… They complain about it and complain about it and complain about it. And then one day they're coming into session, and they're complaining and complaining about their cold feet. And they're complaining and complaining about their cold feet.

And you say, "What's the matter with your back? How's your back today?"

"Oh, well, that. That was nothing. That was nothing. Don't pay any attention to that. I don't know why I ever worried about that, that's gone. Why are you worried about that? I'm not worried about that." That's their main answer.

You'll see them fly up a flight of stairs taking three steps at a time, you see? Zip! You know, come up to the top, and then fly down the flight of stairs. Just thud, see? And they come down to the bottom, bang! No breath shortage. Nothing, walk along, not panting.

He used to go up the stairs four at a time and then, pant! pant! – you know. They don't appreciate your calling this to their attention though. They say, "Of course. That's the way I am." Or they'll explain to you with a perfectly straight face – perfectly straight face – that if they were – their terminal's a waterbuck, well, that's the way a waterbuck is. [laughter]

And their social conversation – they give people long lessons on the subject of this and that, and it's really terribly interesting to listen to. But they are prone to do this. It's terribly interesting. But it's rather interesting to have somebody give you a dissertation on the subject of… It must be hell on waiters. That's all I really…[laughter, laughs]

This fellow says, "Well now, you see, in the seventeenth century, violins weren't made that way, you see – these violins. I remember a violin I made one time and – back there, and uh…" About that time you can just hear the waiter's neck creak.
"Well, I don't think they should have come across the sunken road at the Battle of Waterloo. I was down in the middle of it there on a cavalry charger, and it was not comfortable. You see, cavalry chargers have to be very carefully disciplined." And here we get – here we get the – the know-how on the subject of the handling and training of cavalry chargers. Or "Books aren't printed that way in the upper galaxy. They don't print books that way at all. They have electronic beams, you see. They have this big machine..." It's very educational.

But the person's thinkingness, you would think at this time, is being far more – this is the mistake you can make – is being far more colored by their terminal than it ever has been before, or that their views are far more colored than they ever had been before.

This is not true at all. Their views are much less colored because they know now what they are talking about. And they are very conscious of the fact that while they are talking about that, they are being a waterbuck, you see. They're very conscious of this fact. And they're also conscious of the limitations of a waterbuck. And it begins to dawn on a pc about this time that the terminal was the limiter of the things it pretended to extend.

In other words, if their terminal was a swimmer, at first they're of the opinion of "That is why I have succeeded," and this lasts quite a while into auditing "Well, I have succeeded as a swimmer because I have a terminal as a swimmer." And then, eventually, as they get the thing run, they start remembering all the races they've lost, you see, all the swimming races they've lost. And they find out they've lost practically nothing but swimming races. And then they suddenly realize that in order to be a successful swimmer, they'd have to get rid of this cotton-pickin' terminal. That would be the way to be a successful swimmer.

In other words, the terminal appears to be valuable up through a certain strata. And then the pc all of a sudden starts to fly on his own and realizes that the terminal itself is a limiter of ability, and that the pc realizes eventually that he has these abilities himself, and the terminal never had any abilities. But all the terminal did was specially channel the abilities in such a way as to make the pc relatively ineffective in executing these abilities. That's all.

For instance, if we had somebody who was – had a terminal "a gigolo," you know. We'd find out he's been a dreadfully bad gigolo, terrible gigolo, you know? Never asked an old lady for a sou if he could possibly get out from under it, you know. And he – he just never really was a good gigolo. And we get him all straightened up, and he goes out and chucks an old lady under the chin, and she at once reaches into her purse for the hundred franc note, you see? Pang! You know? I mean, just – just like that. It's – he's gotten rid of the terminal. You see, it was in his ability to be a gigolo, but as long as he was being a gigolo on a dramatizing basis, of course, he never could be a gigolo – not really. He couldn't be a good gigolo. It's very interesting.

There's a certain sense of freedom, then, begins to emerge, and that actually begins to emerge somewhere toward the end of about the third rerun of the first twelve levels. And the person starts coming out of this feeling of "I'm good because I was a..." They don't come out of it very thoroughly. Then they sometimes very wisely realize that it was because they were probably pretty well educated at one time or another into being a "..." that they have so much data on the subject. And they begin to realize that they are data wise.
Now, I told you one time that if you cleared a cannibal, you'd have a cleared cannibal. Right? Used to say that fairly often. Now, the truth of the matter is we have exceeded this definition of Clear with a Dynamic Clear. And this is where we're going and why we're going in that particular direction. If you clear a cannibal you no longer have a cannibal – today. And furthermore, this person will also be able to learn to do something else or will resurrect the data which enables him to practice something else, and so forth, at the same time, while not depriving him of the ability to dine succulently on human flesh. But he doesn't have to do it anymore. And he also has sense enough to realize, as he looks around the civilized community, that hardly anybody in there is eating any bodies. So it isn't done here, so he doesn't do it. And he wouldn't do it until he got someplace where it was socially acceptable again, you see? In other words, you have judgment on the subject.

Now, what crime is, is action without inspection. And this is what you've restored. And you restored it fully. Action without inspection.

A person will begin to realize while he's – why he's holding himself down while running these things, too. Some of the most unlikely cognitions will start turning up. He's holding himself back so that he won't cannibalize. He has to have all these things. He doesn't dare move out around the grounds for fear he might start dining on human flesh, you know? Because he's got reprehensible – not all terminals are considered to be reprehensible, but there is not one terminal any pc will ever run that doesn't have its reprehensible side. They are – there are no terminals that are free from all sin. See, it's impossible, because they never would have been a terminal.

All right. Now, let's look back at the review of this, and let's find out that it – what this was all about. Now, how did the pc get into this mess in the first place? Well, he objected to the activities of the terminal, so he attacked the terminal, and then he accepted its enemies. He attacked the terminal, interiorized into it and accepted its enemies. He accepted its enemies before he attacked the terminal. He accepted its enemies after he attacked the terminal. And they were both the same enemy.

In other words, he chose this thing as something to attack. This was something he objected to in the society at large. So he decided to eradicate it. And he got enough overts on it, and they were mostly failed overts, and failed withholds, and while attacking it, he lost often enough, and he finally became this thing. And now ever since he's trying to get rid of it because, of course, he hates it.

So, therefore, people commit suicide, cut their own throats, fix themselves up with unsuccessful lives; of course, they're still trying to get rid of this terminal.

All right. Now, the individual's freedom, of course, is tremendously restricted as long as it is totally patterned upon the terminal and its opposition. Because the individual will continue to go to the opposition to eradicate himself as a terminal, and so we get this weird explanation of human behavior. He'll continue to do this always. It rather explains human behavior. It's why they behave this way.

All right. The individual, as he comes up the line, then, improves on runs very gradually. He approve – improves gradually. He doesn't improve suddenly, flashily. And it would be a bad thing if he did improve flashily. He wouldn't know himself from day to day.
But he starts straightening out, and you can be very, very disinterested from a professional viewpoint if suddenly some pet somatic of his—oh, you've run now—you've run twelve levels—twelve levels three times through, you've gotten all of those flat, and the pc is still sitting there with one of his favorite chronic somatics. Don't worry about it. Don't worry about it. These things go away slowly, they don't go away rapidly.

Now, a pc can run level after level after level without a single cognition, and it's sort of like—he'll get several cognitions running his first level or his second level, he may. And then he may run several levels without any cognitions whatsoever. Just grind, grind, grind, grind. And he may get the same problem over and over and over and over. He may get the same circumstances over and over and over. And he may get the same scene over and over and over. It doesn't matter a bit. You just keep running it. We don't care what he's getting; and it doesn't matter at all because all of this thing will shake out sooner or later. And then he'll spend a session and he'll just have cognitions, cognitions, cognitions, and he, "Oh, is that what that's all about? Is that what it's all about?"

Or late in the evening, he was sitting down taking his socks off, and an hour later he's still poised there with one sock halfway off, you know? A whole string of cognitions have suddenly cut loose and started going off like skyrockets, you know. And he'll try to take up the whole next session and give you the cognitions he had the night before. Well, you want to fix him up with new cognitions, not review old ones.

But anyway, there's—there's your expectancy at this particular stage of the game. And if a case does these things, this is a poor show: A case runs nice, big, beautiful 3D pictures, doesn't get into anything for three or four sessions, gets into nothing, gets into this lifetime only, doesn't really tangle with anything, and the tone arm does not go up, and the tone arm—and nothing sticks, and so forth; well, you just got a lousy 3D combination, that's all. It's just bum.

But if the tone arm goes up and sticks, and the pc seems to be alert, and the pc to you looks better, and the pc looks less like they're being smashed against the wall, the chances are that you're running the right terminal, you see, and that you're running the right oppterm, and that the 3D is okay, and everything is fine, it's going along—providing the tone arm goes up and sticks, and the pc has collided with a mass, and so on. All these things are the expected things.

Now, you could have an oppterm slightly off and have a pc run oddly. If you run the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal, it's going to be odd, all right. It's going to practically blow the pc's head off. The pc is just going to sit there, and there's more and more pressure on the front and less and less happening about it. You've got him in the ranks of the enemy. But that they get pressure is a foregone conclusion. They will get this running their right terminal, you see.

But I'm talking about it's—it—they get blown in on. Everything's blowing at them, you know. And their face is sort of disappearing, and their chest starts disappearing, and ye-owwww: And that's running the wrong side of it.

If more levels start going alive... That's why you must keep up your 3D forms. You must keep up these 3D forms. List your levels. And every time you do an assessment on the
Prehav Scale, put down after it on the 3D form over there, "Anger: twenty-seven alive." See? And you'll come back to it next assessment. You're thinking about other things, you see, and you put down, "Jeopardize: thirty-seven alive." Well, that's a bit dangerous. All right. And then you run another level, and you put down "Hate: seventy-six alive." Well, it's about time to put the pc on the plane to Saint Hill or – or something, or – or be sensible and do another 3D, or something of the sort. Or look the thing over, inspect it, try to get some more terminals, try to get some more parts, check out what you've got, and so forth. Because you're running a wrong terminal if that's happening. You're not just on the opposition side of it. You're running a wrong terminal.

Well, the oppterm – I can't quite tell you what goes wrong when an oppterminal goes off. You're running the right – pc's right terminal, and you've got the wrong opposition terminal. If you have that, the thing is going to go awry, but at this stage of the game I can't tell you because I haven't observed one. So I wouldn't know.

But I don't think the Goals Problem Mass will come up and hit the pc in the face. The Goals Problem Mass will hit the pc in the face if he's on the opposition terminal. See, you'll run him into the Goals Problem Mass with a thud. Well, with far too much in the way of air currents, things don't get solid to the pc, they get blowy. You know, winds of space.

If they're on the right terminal, they get plenty going on in front of them and inside of them, but it's getting solid. It is in the level of solidity. And they have an outflowing aspect. Although they're being smashed in, they still have an outflowing aspect. They sort of feel like "Wooooo, it's uuuu... Well, it's out there, and I'm here, and – and so forth."

If you want a subjective reality on how it feels, how it feels, or how it looks to have the oppterm goal, why, as I told you several times, just repeat the opposition terminal to the pc several times. This pc's terminal is waterbuck; opposition terminal, tiger. You say, "Tiger, tiger, tiger, tiger, tiger, tiger, tiger, tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger – tiger..."

Pc... He won't be able to help it. You'll see – see him going back. And you say, "What did you feel at that time?"

"I don't know. It's something You know-and-it – well, something. Ha-ha-ha-ha. And it sort of – I don't know. Currents moving or something."

And then, of course, be kind enough to restore it. Say, "Waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck. Well, what does that feel like?"

"Well, it's getting kind of solid, ha-ha. That's right. Solid."

So it's the high wind versus solidity. The high wind, of course, is when you're running the opposition terminal. If you ran the pc as the opposition terminal, he can't get into it because he isn't in it, and he'll get a sort of a frantic idea of getting into it.

Now, those are some of the things you can expect out of a 3D run. It's very gradual. The improvements – they're not very spectacular. But as far as improvement is concerned, they are much greater than you would – could expect out of ordinary, old-time auditing.
They're much greater than this. It's just that the pc is not as vocal about them. They're considerably greater.

All right. Now let's take another aspect of this situation, and that is, how long would it take? Well, that depends on the accidental combinations of the Prehav Scale. That depends upon the density of the mass, the ferocity of the situation. That depends upon the auditor. It depends on how well the pc's rudiments stay in, how well the pc's rudiments are put in. And I won't give you any kind of an estimate. I won't give you an estimate. I don't know. It is much too variable. It looks to me like one of these very variable pictures.

But, I don't think you're going to get anybody in going real Clear, in five hours or ten hours. I know that won't happen because, of course, you are not now keying them out. You could only get a fast Clear with key-outs. You could key them out and clear them fast. And they'd register Clear. But you're making a different type of Clear, and your expectancies of this, of course, are different. But they're not infinite. They're very far from infinite. It's not a worrisome length of time. It's not even a bad length of time.

The biggest change your pc will get – just to recapitulate – from the viewpoint of the pc, is of course in his Sec Check and rudiments in, and so forth. He'll think this is quite a change. And then he'll say that the biggest change and the – the… You – you won't be able to observe much change in the pc except he's a little more friendly. That's about all.

But you will now start to observe a considerable change in the pc at the time you get his 3D parts. When you've got all these wrapped up, why, there is a great change in the pc. And this is an enormous shift on 3D. And when you run the pc from day to day, you will be able to see the changes in the pc, and the pc won't.

Now, it starts out with the pc seeing marvelous changes that you can't observe. That is on Sec Checking and all that sort of thing. And then it starts in on big changes that you can observe, and the pc definitely observes, and the pc is very excited about. And – and it's sort of "Wow," or "Damn it," or "Isn't it horrible," and it doesn't matter what their tone of mind is, you know. But it's change, and they're really getting a shift. They're finding exactly what it's all about.

And then after that you're the one who notices it. You've done just a complete reversal on the situation. The pc's sitting there, and the pc is looking brighter, and the pc is looking healthier, and the pc is looking more active, and you say, "Well, are you feeling better today?"

"No, as a matter of fact, I'm not. I have a pain here in my side here, and so forth. I'm kind of worried about it, you know." The pc looks about five years younger today than they did yesterday, you know. So it goes into reverse look. Of course, it is what it is, and changes are what they are.

All right. Well, I've tried to give you some kind of a – a recapitulation of how 3D looks over broad numbers of cases, and what I would look for as being right and what I'd look for as being wrong. And it might have occurred that some of you – you already have, by the way; you've all helped me do this one way or the other. I never saw such frantic comments in my life as I've had on the subject, you know.
"The pc can't get any pictures. The pc just can't get any pictures. I mean, it's just all masses out there one kind or another. Well, yes, of course, you know, and so on and so on." It's one reaction. Another one is "The tone arm just goes up and sticks. I can't make it do another thing." And the funny part of it is that I'm giving you these remarks because an auditor apparently gets worried about all the right things. See, the right things about 3D are what the auditor gets worried about about 3D. And there's the tone arm going up and sticking. And the pc can't get any pictures, and black masses, and terrible somatics inside the body, and the feeling like the pc is going no place. Nothing is happening of any kind whatsoever in the pc.

Well, something is happening, but it feels like they're going no place to the auditor. The auditor says the pc is always complaining about somatics, and so forth. The auditor never thinks to ask the pc, "Are these somatics different than the somatics you had yesterday?"

"Oh," the pc will say, "the somatics I had yesterday. Let's see. Oh, yes, quite, quite different. They're different than the somatics I had this noon, as a matter of fact. As a matter of fact, they're different from the somatics I had at the beginning of session. As a matter of fact, they're gone. As a matter of fact, they're much worse at this particular moment that we've been talking about them."

So you're looking at a – you're looking at a giddy change rate here, see. And an auditor's expectancy is geared up to very slow shift of somatics or something of this sort of thing. You'll see the way it goes.

If a 3D is wrong, why, you will be able to tell it from the winds of space phenomena which I keep describing it to you. You see, the reason I call it the winds of space is because, of course, there is no air there to blow, and there isn't anything to have any current except maybe electronic flows. Only these electronic flows probably don't exist, so they must come from someplace else. And, of course, out in outer space there are no winds. So there are no winds there, and yet there are winds there. The pc can feel them.

The other thing that would be very dangerous is levels living up. But if you're doing an accurate assessment, if you're doing a very, very accurate assessment each time, of course, you wouldn't even make a mistake on this. And if levels are living up, that is a dangerous symptom. It isn't that you should come off of 3D. It isn't that you should do this or that or do something desperate or fantastic or something like this. What you should do about it is just check the thing over and find out if there's anything wrong with this, and find out if the levels still react, and – and find out some little odds and ends about all this 3D. See? That's all you're interested in.

And then you're satisfied that the thing is right; run another level. Find out if that one came alive. Maybe that one will die out. Maybe much – many less levels alive. Maybe you're going across some kind of a peak. Maybe the pc wasn't quite doing your auditing commands. Maybe the rudiments were out, you see? There's a lot of odd, obvious auditing errors could have been occurring that would have – might else have accounted for it. It's still a dangerous symptom.

The pc can't somehow come to grips with a Goals Problem Mass, and yet the pc seems to be running their own terminal; I would probably suspect the oppterm as being off, and I'd reassess for an oppterm. You'll get another oppterm.
You might have gotten an oppterm that was almost it and would last for a little while, see, but it wasn't quite right. I normally can see these things a mile off because if it doesn't add up to me, that there'd be a conflict there, I know it isn't enough for a person to have spent a trillennia in agony over it, you see? You wouldn't have a canary bird and – you wouldn't have a canary – you'd have a canary bird and a cat. Yeah, you could figure that one out. See? Natural game.

All right. But you wouldn't have a canary bird and old boots. Old boots, canary bird. Oh, no, no, no. He might have an incident where a canary bird got caught in some boots, but I don't think it'd happen very often. That's not the kind of game we're – we're shooting these days – old boots.

And I'd just – I wouldn't throw the assessment away or suggest anything to the pc. I'd just work it over here. What's right? What are we sure is right. All right, let's take that point of departure and then let's reassess and check everything there, making sure the old item is also on the list, and we use the old list, and so forth. Let's just do a rapid check on it and see if we come out with something else this time. Ah, there was something else showed up. And something else all of a sudden was going bing, bing, and that looks much better now. And then it'll settle down and run as a pattern.

But what is a pattern run? Well, I just described it to you in this lecture. Gruesome as it is, that is a pattern run. Heavy masses, heavy valences, hidden bodies inside of bodies, aches, pains and somatics, pc acting like they're on wire.

There's one phenomena I haven't mentioned to you. After the first few runs, you'll get this: you'll be trying to make things stick, and then the pc will twitch their elbow or lean back in the chair, and you get a blowdown. After this thing gets freed up, after a 3D level sticks, it more and more rapidly goes free. It won't stay there. It won't stay stuck. Sometimes it stays a bit stuck, but mostly it'll get more and more impermanent.

In other words, your stuck is up there, and the needle is stuck, and it was for sure a stick. And three days ago this would have been like a truck running into a wall, you see? But it's real stuck, and there's no doubt about that. And then the pc takes his attention or her attention off of the thing, and puts down the cans and picks up the cans, and is reading at Clear read. They were reading at 4.5; now they're reading at Clear read, see? It – it just comes down rapidly. That sort of thing should increase. If it isn't increasing you're running with the rudiments out.

If the stuck TA is not more rapidly coming down and returning to Clear read more rapidly and more rapidly – and if you say why am I introducing Clear read, well, it starts to go down to Clear read and stay there except when you audit the Goals Problem Mass.

If this isn't happening more easily and more rapidly the more you audit, I would suspect you were auditing with the rudiments out. And that there were a lot of levels that you've covered that haven't been cleaned up. Or there were auditing levels back there that the pc couldn't answer and never told you about, or there was something goofed up here in the – in the auditing itself – not in the assessment; there's something goofed up in the auditing.
Okay? Well, I hope that's been of some assistance to you. And those of you who have not been over this ground are under no obligation to follow this exact pattern. [laughter]

Thank you very much.
SEC CHECKS IN PROCESSING

A lecture given on 12 December 1961

Hey! What do you know? There's two or three live people in here today. [laughter]
Hey! What do you know? That's pretty good, huh?

All right. This is what? The 12th of Dec.? Still the nautical month, AD 11, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And if I were in a fine fettle, boy, would you get it. [laughter]

I've heard it said that there are states beyond despair. Your Instructors have reached them. [laughs]

Well, by and large, I think you're all doing fine. And if you improve five or six hundred percent in the next twenty-four hours, it'll be all right.

Okay, well, I want to talk to you today about security checking and some other things but first I would like to make a mention of what an auditor who can really audit should have. I'd just like to mention this in passing.

He should have a good security on his ability to audit. He should have a British Mark IV E-Meter. He should have somebody to take care of appointments, receptions and do those nasty things connected with money and he ought to have at least two understudies: two auditors who have had good HPA training and who need some real brush-ups up to Class II. That's what he ought to have. I would consider that an absolute minimum for an auditor auditing – an absolute minimum. Why?

Well, he's not going to get any auditing done unless he has these things. Let's look at the present setup. Let's look at the way it is.

Are you – the only person in your immediate area who can do a 3D Assessment accurately – are you going to spend all of your time, upwards to seventy-five hours a case, getting all the Security Checks in line, getting this person up to a point where he'll respond on a meter and so forth? Because you're not going to do it. That's the answer to that. You're not going to do it. You're going to go in and you're going to try to get a 3D and you're going to fall on your heads, and then you're going to get in and try to get a 3D and then you're going to fall on your heads, and then you're going in and you're going to try to get a 3D and you're going to fall on your heads. Why? Because you haven't got time to set a case up properly. And so you're going to make a lot of bulls. That's about the way it is. You're going to make a lot of flubs. I can just see it on the wall.

Now, you better get a couple of people by the scruff of the neck who have some good Central Organization Academy training and you better gun 'em up to being good Class IIs that can do a reliable Security Check to set up cases for you to assess. And it takes about two to
one minimum, more opportunely about five. That'd be a better number. But it takes at least two to one.

In other words, you can run a 3D accurately off in perhaps half the time that it takes to set a case up if the case has been set up. So you would be auditing one for one with two auditors doing Class II skills.

Now, what about this other? What about this other? All right. A couple of very good auditors left here and they went down to an area, and they've written some letters about technical matters since, but no administrative matters. Boy, are they off the lines! Are they in a mess administratively. Somebody comes up apparently and waves some money under their nose and they shove it in a vest pocket or something of the sort. And then they audit this person one way or the other and try to keep their appointments straight and are going straight out of communication. Their administrative records must look like a cow's dinner.

And they're going to get so lost in all this mess that they will feel that they are terribly pressed and confused. Why do they – why would they feel they are pressed and confused? Why? They're not being pressed and confused by auditing. They're being pressed and confused by administration. They're being pressed and confused by Mrs. Glutz who is calling up who must have their appointment changed on Thursday. And they are all mixed up because they haven't got time to sit down and do their income tax because they can't have an accountant do their income tax, because they themselves don't have any records, so they have to do the records before the accountants can pick up the income tax in order to do the income tax. You get the idea?

So you're going to get all mixed up about how arduous it is to be an auditor, when as a matter of fact you will not even vaguely be concerned with auditing. It'll be terrible. It'll be absolutely awful trying to keep up with the administrative end of it and auditing at the same time. And the next thing you know, everything will look all confused, and you won't know which way you're going; whether you're going or coming. That's what it amounts to. And that's what anybody who has an advanced skill in society ought to be doing.

Now, I hope you're high enough on the level of Help to be able to be effective in this particular direction. Can you accept help to this degree? Yes, we know you can help people, but can you accept help to this degree?

All right. Now, I can give you something that if you put it in a newspaper, would get you preclears. It's something on the order a Central Organization should put it in: "You can always talk to a Scientologist about your difficulties." Interesting, isn't it? And that I think you'd.... Not been tested, but I'm sure you'd find that about the hottest response button that you could possibly get.

"We will talk for you to anyone about anything." That had an interesting run wherever it was done, but I would think you will find that this will enormously exceed that one.

Just – it's on this basic theory, "You can always talk to a Scientologist about your difficulties." You want to say, "Well, you can always talk to me about your difficulties." You've got about the same thing, with your address and phone number. You get pcs.
Now as far as that's concerned, there are plenty of pcs in any district, just in the field of Scientology itself. And you've got – you yourself know of a bunch of cases that have fallen on their heads or haven't quite made it or this or that or know some situations that you could straighten out.

All right. If you've got somebody that could handle money for you, you can always say – you can always say to this person, "Well, I'll straighten it out," and this other person plucks their sleeve and says, "For so much." But if there's nobody there to say, "For so much," then you go ahead and you help people ragged. And let me tell you that the world is full of people who have to be helped; have to be helped. And they never outflow anything at all. So you could rapidly put yourself in a position where you couldn't help people – very rapidly put yourself in a position economically where you couldn't afford to help people by simply having no administrative person who would take money off people so that you could help people.

Now, starting up practices and that sort of thing isn't so much the question. Most of you people are known one way or the other or you're going back to a Central Organization, but I'm just giving you a piece of advice off of the – off of the bat here: Don't go plowing yourself in and feeling how confused it all is simply because you lack a basic ingredient, which is a little tiny bit of organization.

Now, you're so used to thinking of yourself as you, so used to thinking of yourself as one person – perhaps, perhaps standing alone and dauntless against the world [laughter] – that you don't realize that all you have to do is just say to somebody, "You can help me," and you immediately have all the help you want.

The only reason you don't get personnel is nobody is telling people that you need help, see, and so on. One of the basic things that – one of the basic things that has been difficult in my experience in the last eleven years – I won't say it's too much help. No, that isn't true. But I will say it's trying to adequately handle people who want to help so that they are not dead-ending with their offers of help. That has been my main problem. It hasn't been the problem of getting help. It's been the problem of making very sure that if help was offered some way or another, it could be utilized if at all possible. And this has been a very tough problem to solve. Now, if you can get yourself into that category, you're all set.

As far as economics are concerned, you've got the world. What more do you want? It goes from pole to pole, from a Sunday-Monday line straight around to the Sunday-Monday line. There are several pounds of earth here; it weighs quite a few pounds. There's quite a bit of distance around it. Of course, I realize it's a twelfth-rate sun and a second-rate planet around a twelfth-rate sun. Nevertheless, it is a planet, and the truth – truthfully speaking as of this moment – it is yours. There is no doubt about that at all.

You let any advanced technology forward which can accomplish its ends in a finite period of time and can predict its accomplishment, and you have the area you are in. That is all there is to it. I mean, that's it. If you went into this technical society and you could just make better screwdrivers than anybody else, why, if you had any acumen at all, you eventually would make some kind of a minor success of the situation. But we're not talking now about screwdrivers. We're talking about the stuff of which life is made: life itself. And any time you
get a technology of that character going forward, and you have a grasp of that technology, you cannot help but win. You don't even have to try to win. People will come ahead and present you with large sections of Earth. That is all. I mean, it can't help it.

For instance, right now we've – I've told them occasionally, from time to time, they'd never get into space without us. I've told them that from time to time. Well, what do you know? Cape Canaveral just sent for a Scientologist. They won't get into space without us.

And then some psyrologist is going to try to copy all this, and some psychiatrist you d... Can you imagine any of these boys being able to do a 3D Assessment or even a reliable Security Check? Look at the state our technology is in at the present time. It happens to be a self-protecting mechanism.

I, as a matter of fact, occasionally held my breath and said supposing it came out so simple at the other end that all you said was, "woof-woof," and somebody was Clear, wouldn't that be nice? And you've all said, "Wouldn't that be nice?" But let me point out something else: If you let this much technology that can be that easily done, loose, you're in for trouble.

Technology which does not require a skilled applicator is what the world and this universe mainly suffers from.

You put out an atom bomb that any government official can press the button of, and what have you got? See, you've got it all set. All you have to have is one button. You push the button. They got a button up here at Brize-Norton. Very interesting. It's a big thingamabob-shielded area, and I think one key is held by a British officer and one key is held by an American officer, and frankly, the front-piece on the thing says "war and peace." And when they turn the key, it turns to war. And all they do is, they both insert their keys and they go click, and there goes the A-bombs and the H-bombs. There it is. That's all they have to do is – is that. That's it. It's that easy. Of course, it takes some airplanes to deliver them maybe or something like that, but I think they're even cutting that down to a zero.

Now, there's what happens when technology of a very powerful nature requires no special skill, because you can never build an ethic into it. Then it can be used for anything.

Let me tell you that an A-bomb release button or an H-bomb release button does not ask whether the presser is a communist, a democrat, a Kennedyite, a Presbyterian, a member of the Bach-Bach we Kill Them All Society of Southern Jungleosis. Doesn't care who, see? Doesn't care who presses it at all. And you have an irresponsibility of some magnitude.

That's what happens when the technology.... I may exceed your grasp of this thing very often. And you say, "What? You mean, it's a good thing that we have to sit here at Saint Hill and shiver out in the – in cold rooms, and – and – and – and get up in the dark and go home in the dark? You mean, it's a good thing we have to sit here and sweat?" Yes, ladies and gentlemen, it's a good thing. It's a good thing you do.

All right. For one moment, then, with that one out of the road, let's take an – look at something else. Let's look at the – at what we're walking into forwardly.
The broad program on which we are operating is a very broad and a very concise program. We have Central Organizations and offices all over Earth. It's no exaggeration they are functioning; ways and means are always being implemented to make them function better to get up their units and that sort of thing.

What they suffer from mainly is lack of technology. As soon as that technology is secure, why, you'll be in a very fine position. Supposing I were in a position now to tell somebody in northern Quebec – and I said, "Now all you have to do is go down to the New York office and get yourself a Class II rating and go home. You'll be able to take care of your wife all right." And supposing I could say that with fantastic security. Supposing I could say that with such security, that I knew very well that the message passed on to the New York office would actually pull the person in when they got there; would they be adequately and rapidly trained to the exact degree of skill or audited to that exact degree of skill and rundown, which would produce that exact result. Be fabulous; be utterly fabulous.

All right. Now, therefore, we're working right now on establishing a technical superiority and security in every one of these Central Organizations. And it's proceeding with considerable speed. I mean, we're doing all right with this.

It's going rapidly enough so that right up till two weeks ago one Central Organization was falling on its head; didn't know whether it was going or coming or what to do with its property, or who was fighting it or otherwise. It had been enturbulated for about two or three years with rather poor handling and all of a sudden got all of its organizational rudiments in and got things pretty well squared away, and suddenly got the idea that our business is Scientology; started doing Scientology and had their first thousand-pound week since February. Just bang; just got their house in order and started making money again and everything seems to be falling off.

Now, that's because it was running on a pattern. It went back o running on pattern. It's never been on pattern before – that particular Central Organization. Interesting.

My policy with regard to Central Organizations and City Offices is to build in self-reliance. Self-reliance, initiative, the ability to act and operate under a fixed pattern with considerable aplomb so that they can take care of what goes on in their area.

We don't want a situation where every time they want to buy a new teacup, they have to send a cable to Saint Hill. You get the idea? Nah, that doesn't ever work.

Well, it depends to a large degree – having an organizational setup of that type – on the technical accuracy and results of the application of technology. If you can do these things – if you can train people well and you can process people well and if you follow a set pattern – people know what they're doing, you can't help but win.

All right. Now an extension of that, we have franchise holders. And these people routinely and regularly are trying to put up a standard and it falls in on them, and they try to put it up and it falls in on them, and they try to put it up and it stays up for a while, and then it falls in, and then they try to put it up and it stays in for quite a while, and it falls in. And they'll – that's about the cycle they've been going on. But remember, that they have been much less
accurate on an average – field auditor auditing results – have been much less accurate and much less high than Central Organization on an average.

Most field auditors don't believe that, and I myself might not believe that if I myself had not long examined the records. Now, of course, there have been exceptions in the field. There have been exceptions and these people have all – have all done very well, but I'm talking of the broad average.

Do you know why an HGC was ever started in the first place? What was the genus of the Hubbard Guidance Center? What was it? It's because field auditors could not audit pcs to results. They couldn't. So we had to set up some kind of a unit that took care of this. Up to that time we were only interested in training. But that was why an HGC got set up and that happened right here in England. And the results were too chaotic. And we got better results in the HGC than were normally gotten elsewhere.

Well, there's various reasons for that, but the basic reason – let me put your attention on this for a moment. The basic reason is because there is a more severe discipline in operation in an HGC, and that's just about all there is to that.

Even though I may lead them over hill and dale occasionally and get them onto this and get them onto that and so forth, and try to get some results in spite of it all, nevertheless, they do get better results with all that.

Now, the Central Organization, as long as it's impoverished or feeling bad or feeling upset or something like this, tends to combat other activities. It tends to go into a games condition with other activities.

You get two Central Organizations on either side of one continent, they'll go into a games condition with each other; or on two different continents, they will. And they do tend to go into games condition with, let us say, field auditors. And the field auditor goes in games condition with the Central Organization.

Do you know what this is? This is simply lack of success. That's all.

It's very funny. When pcs are scarce and everything is scarce and it's all running on a high scarcity, you'll get a games condition. The havingness is inadequate. And so the Central Organization tries to pull in all the pcs and keep the field auditor from having any pcs, and the field auditor tries to pull in all Central Organization's pcs, and so forth. Well, what is this? This is just scarcity.

Scarcity is repaired by technical excellence. The better job you do, the less scarcity there will be. That is all there is to that. And I always look at a Central Organization or a field auditor who has gotten into a games condition as an organization or a person who aren't getting results. That's just as simple as that. It just goes one, two. If they're in games condition with everybody in sight, they're not getting results; that's all.

All right. This course here at Saint Hill was instituted and instigated for one purpose only. It wasn't because I didn't have enough to do. If you'll look over my roster, you'll find it has – I have a couple of odd jobs. This was all in the direction of getting the highest possible level of technology which was attainable.
Now, I've tried to stabilize the technology which was in use and we have stabilized it, remarkably well. It is stabilized right up to a point of – well, I think about the last third of 3D is possibly subject to variation right now. There may be some method of running a case off faster after the case has run a lot of levels. I've already informed you of this.

But let's take what is basic. There are going to be some little changes in beginning and end rudiments, but otherwise you've already had those changes and most of you are using them right this minute.

Model Session is stable; the Auditor's Code is stable; the Code of a Scientologist, the Axioms are stable. The basic processes of rudiments actually exist in too great a number at the present moment. There are too many effective processes and I'll have to shake that down so that we have a few less processes that you can do rudiments with, and then we won't make any mistakes on this and we'll get the rudiments in better. That's a little point of variation. You always expect those points.

Security Checking: Man, that is stable like the Rock of Gibraltar. That is the way you security check.

Reading a meter: Boy, I don't know. Every time I go into researching anything about advanced meters, I always come back and say what a marvelous instrument this Mark IV is. It's just marvelous. Because advanced meters of various kinds tend to do something else. They tend to read too much body action. And the body reactions become too great, and this becomes too great, and that becomes too great. And every time you increase the sensitivity of the meter, you double the response of body action and get what – a one-third gain on the mental action. In other words, when you increase the sensitivity of your meter, your mental action increases just that much, and your body action increases that much. So, of course, the responses of the meter then are lost in those body reactions.

I'm talking now about advanced experimental meters of one kind or another. No, that's a very stable meter. And I work hard to hold it stable and to continue it that way. You might be interested that the reason other meters which have been built from one time to another – why, I invalidate these meters now – is not because you might not have a good one. You might have a good one. You might be lucky, you see? You might have a good squirrel meter. But – you might have a good American meter. But on the assembly-lining of these things, some of them were built with cheap parts and some of them expensive parts, and some of them were finished by electricians who knew nothing of Scientology, who protected the action by putting in damping mechanisms. But it isn't just a damping mechanism; because they put in the damping mechanism, they changed other parts of the circuit and that was right there on the assembly line as meter number 15, and 16 was all right, and then 17 and 18 are damped, and then 19 – somebody found some cheaper component some place or another – so 19 is built out of cheaper components.

You get what's variable about these meters? It is not that you yourself – in having a meter that was built somewhere in the field or was an old American meter or something like that – it isn't that that meter is necessarily a bad meter. It may be that that meter has an instant response; that meter has a proper gradient; its linear curve for the potentiometer is all good – maybe that's all right. But the one right after that, that isn't all right. And the one right after
that is probably in the hands of some poor Joe down in Tucson that is trying to clear somebo-
dy and he gets nothing but lags, and he hears about instant response and of course he can't get
one and that sort of thing

So this is all in the – in under the heading of stability. Security Checking is very
stable. The construction of meters is tremendously stable. The various parts and things which
you are using are very stable. I don't think the TRs have been changed for years (you haven't
learned them either). And the... Now, I packed up on a Problems Intensive. We're not asking
anybody to do Problems Intensives here to amount to anything, but nevertheless it came out
in a bulletin, it's all just brrrrt, and that's the way you do a Problems Intensive. And I don't
think there is any other way to do a Problems Intensive.

So these are stability, stability, stability, stabilities. The assessments, processing on
3D, Assessment by Elimination, how you find the parts of this thing: There aren't new ans-
swers to these things. The old answers followed, give you the result.

Maybe one day I will get extremely bright and I will find out some way some – and I
will because we need it – I'll find out some way to figure out which is the pc's term and which
is the oppterm, absolutely reliably, bangbang, so that you never make the slightest quiver on
this thing. And that'd be a good thing to know. That'd be a good thing to know before you
start running a lot of pcs backwards, because on some of them, unless I myself sat down on –
with an E-Meter, I wouldn't know whether they were running frontwards or backwards. I
frankly wouldn't right this minute. I'd have to watch the pc for a session or two.

This is on a secondhand basis, not me auditing, you see? That's you auditing and me
watching your reports. And I'm saying "Ohh, is it? Isn't it?" You know, sort of hold breath
two, three sessions. Well, this is running all right and then I forget it. That's all right.

Another one – well, we don't know. We don't know. Well, all I can tell from your ses-
sion is at least the pc isn't getting into trouble; but at any moment, prepared to shift over the
opposite way to. So we need a better – a better gimmick, a better test right there.

Now, all of these things – the form of a ses-
sion – these things are all stable as the de-
vil. And we're ready, we're ready just now to push off. I'll show you some of the things that
have defeated us in the past. Remember old Step 6? Well, do you know Step 6 would work
today? It was never done, and that is very true of practically, well, 99 percent of the stuff.
Step 6 was never done. Do you know what you had to do with an object before you had the pc
make it bigger and make it smaller, and solider and all that sort of thing? Do you know what
you had to do with one? You had to find a null object on the E-Meter. It had to be a null ob-
ject, and wherever it beefed up the banks, you didn't find a null object.

Well, let's look at that with relationship to the Goals Problem Mass. Of course, if you
had any object that quivered, you'd be onto the Goals Problem Mass and wouldn't dare do
anything with it.

But you could take something not associated with it, which wouldn't register, and you
could do something with that. And therefore you could exercise the pc – it's an interesting
idea, you see – you could exercise the pc on creating and mocking up without antagonizing or
messing up, particularly the Goals Problem Mass. And you could stay off of that and come off
of that theoretically, and then the pc with some of the automaticity – this is theoretical – some of the automaticities of mocking things up off, of course, could then have had the Goals Problem Mass evaporate. That's theoretical. That's theoretical. If he wasn't close to it, it could have been knocked out by exercises in creatiness.

We have one pc right now, whose auditor is quite concerned, who is running Create on a level. I think you're the only one in the whole unit anyplace that has hit Create as a Prehav level. And of course, this is giving this pc fits because it fits the terminal perfectly and it's just about to run forever.

Well, why is it about to run forever? Well, it's the basic button of the reactive bank, of course. What else could it do but run forever? It's going to go on and on and on. Of course, the more he creates, why, the more – the less bank. And it's doing something to the Goals Problem Mass all the time, so he isn't running into it. You say, "Well, that'd be a good idea. Then we ought to run all pcs on their terminals on Create." Go ahead. You'll spin them in. It was just a fluke that this pc hit it.

And if you'll notice, your pc is running for a long time on the level that exactly fits the terminal. You notice that? If you get the exact level, see, that just fit that thing just marvelously, see.

Well, here's – here's a terminal. Let's take a terminal, "a little boy" and if we had a level, Play. Now, how long do you think that would run, see? It would go on and on and on – if it were hot on the case, which it might very well not be, see?

But you'd run level one, level two, level three, and all of a sudden you'd hit this one, Play, see? (This is a cross-example because nobody has hit it.) But there it is, see, and you're running this one. Well, of course, it'll run and run and run and run. And you say, "Where's the case, where's the case, where's the case? And it – this one won't pile up the Goals Problem Mass because the Goals Problem Mass is practically totally made out of that level.

So every time you start to rassle with the Goals Problem Mass, it thins out and pieces fly off of it again, see. So up goes the tone arm and down goes the tone arm and up goes the tone arm. So instead of a lot of levels pulling the Goals Problem Mass apart, you have one level pulling it apart, because it's a basic level that fits the terminal. You could expect that to happen.

But there's something else you can expect to happen with regard to the Goals Problem Mass, is any time you're running a pc with the rudiments out, you're going to run forever. And the way to test it, is test the terminal when you're in the rudiments stage of the session. Just ask. Just say the terminal and see if you get a needle response. If you get a needle response on the terminals, your rudiments are sufficiently in to run it.

Of course, you go through the rudiments and clean them up. But if you don't get a terminal response, don't run the level. In other words, run rudiments till you get a terminal response on the needle and that is the sure test. That means rudiments are in.

Now, I'm quite interested in this other factor. You are running a double command, particularly on the 7 December, thirty-command bracket. You're running a double command. Did
it ever strike you that it could run forever on the odd-numbered commands, without the level being introduced?

And later in a run – I can add this to your know-how – if you can't get it to flatten, realize please that it is running only because of the odd-numbered commands. And the even-numbered commands which contain the level on them, are ineffective. And the first chance that you would notice of this is the pc starts telling you that the level doesn't fit the problem he has just thought up. He starts telling you this.

Oh, he can tell you once, he can tell you twice during a run. That's normal. He'll hit one or two that don't match. But all of a sudden he starts saying, "Oh, well, let's see now. Here's a waterbuck and uhm – problem about a waterbuck. Well, how to get some water."

All right. And the Prehav level is Devastate. All right. And you say, "Well, how might Devastate solve that confusion?"

And he says, "Well, it wouldn't. It doesn't."

Well, it has previously. He's hit similar problems. "Devastate. Oh, well yeah – oh, a waterbuck would just devastate the surrounding countryside and the rivers would all run, and he'd get water, you know, before going on.... Devastate, ah...."

Hm. Well, you have no choice but to have him contrive some way it would do so. And he goes on to the next one, and "How might Devastate resolve that problem?"

"Devastate. Who ever heard of that word?"

You see, what you're doing, you're getting your motion on the case – the motion on the case is occurring – purely and entirely because you're asking him for confusions which would give you tone arm motion.

You're saying, "Tell me a confusion. Thank you. Tell me ..." or problem, or whatever word you're using "Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble." You're getting tone arm motion, but no longer is the odd-number – the even-numbered command functional.

And the way you do that is – one of the symptoms would be – it suddenly doesn't fit anymore. Oh, you got tone arm action, and previously this case has been going up and sticking, you know, and everything's fine. Now, it goes up and sticks and falls off and it goes up and sticks and falls off, and the pc can't answer that – those even-numbered commands.

You had better ask the magic crystal ball – the E-Meter – whether or not that level still has any action on it. So you say, "Devastate. Devastate." It's not a prayer. It's a faintly rising needle, you know, and you say, "Devastate. Devastate." It doesn't stop it. There's no quiver. "Devastate, Devastate? Devastate? Oooooooo-oooh, all right. Very good. Thank you very much. We're going to do another Prehav Assessment." Be about the end of that. "Give you two more commands and end this process then. Is that all right with you?" (After you've done it.) you see how that would be?

You can actually get tone arm action on the odd-numbered commands independent of the even-numbered commands – and you should look at that. Because a case starts going bluuueew.
Now, it is true that if the level is right on the case's button, that is that case, you see? "Waterbuck. Swimmer." See? Swim. Swim. Swim. You see, it just runs on and on and on and on and on. "Swim, swim, swim, swim. Swim solves everything. Everything is solved by swimming. Swimming. If you get into trouble, you swim. If you get out of trouble, you swim. If you want to have some fun, you swim. If you want to get even with somebody, you swim. Swim, swim, swim, swim, swim, swim, swim, swim." And then all of a sudden after he's run from this maybe two or three days, he's very fit, you know. You've already done a lot to the Goals Problem Mass with this thing, you see. You chewed it up enormously.

And then all of a sudden you ask him, "All right. Tell me a problem about a waterbuck."

And he says, "O-o-o-h, a waterbuck getting across some trees. Getting cross some downed timber. How to get across some downed timber."

And you say, "How might 'swim' have resolved that problem?"

He says, "Swim? Swim? Who ever heard of swimming?"

And you say, "Well, think of a way," you know, just to get the question answered. I've used this myself. "Well, give me an answer just so we won't have an unanswered question, please?"

And the pc'll answer it some way. Try it again, see, because it might have been a fluke, you know?

And you say, "All right. Tell me a problem a waterbuck might have with a tiger."

And he says, "How to escape a forest fire and a tiger at the same time."

And you say, "Good. Now, how might 'swim' have resolved that problem?"

"Swim? Swim have resolved the problem? Let's see, swim. Swim. Do waterbucks ever swim?"

What you've done is run the top of the automaticity. Don't you see?

And then's about the time you ought to say, "Swim, swim, swim, swim." Not a quiver.

You say, "Well, that's very fine." But this is only after a level has been run long and the tone arm has stuck usually on other levels, and a lot of action has been going on on this particular case, and you have gotten the rise-stick phenomenon to occur. You get the idea. That has occurred, and so forth.

Well, you got this other phenomenon. So remember that it can occur that a pc can be absolutely flat on the level and be getting tone arm action like mad on the odd-numbered commands, "Tell me a problem." And as I say, the remedy is to check the level for reaction. The level no longer reacts: get off of it.

It's things of that character, little points of that character that you run into.... You'll still be getting points of this particular type clarified as people run into difficulties. You're not going to run into peculiar cases. Don't worry about that, man. I've audited too many cases. I know how they're put together, but you are going to get into peculiar questions. Usually these
stem out of an irregularity of technology. You should realize that your peculiar question ordi-
narily stems out of some additive of omission you have made from a routine lineup. That's
something to remember, and that's really something to remember if you're ever teaching audi-
tors in an Academy. Because, man, a new auditor can think of more things to do wrong than
you can catch up with all morning and all afternoon.

And if you were to take this verbal from them – meets you out in the hall and says,
"Well, this case doesn't get any tone arm action of any kind whatsoever on Security Check
Form 4," your immediate response is – you've assumed you see, that this auditor is actually
auditing and that it's all set and all square, and so you say, "Well, your rudiments are probably
out. Check your rudiments."

He goes in. He comes back in a little while, he said, "The rudiments – the rudiments –
there's no reaction on the rudiments."

Well, extraordinary solution, if you were inexperienced, would be your next step, and
you'd say, "Well, change the Security Check to a Child's Security Check."

Next day there's no tone arm action on a Child's Security Check of any kind whatsoe-
ver. And the rudiments are in because there is no response of any kind on the meter. Now,
you could really get an extraordinary solution. "Well, try the CCHs." Well, probably this
would be better because a close examination demonstrates that the student does not know that
this pin goes in this side of the can.

You'd be amazed! You'll be amazed. You'll be absolutely amazed.

Now, the other one is.... I know you don't believe that. That that can happen. That can
happen. It's the weird things like that – well, they hadn't got the meter turned on or something
stupid like that. There – that's what can throw you. It's wild departures that you couldn't even
envision. You sit back, and you sit back and you think and you think and you think and you
think, "What could they be doing? Now what are they doing? ... I'll bet.... You don't suppose
they never go to session?" And that would be closer to the actual answer than the one you will
think up with your own background of training. It'll be that – it'll be that type of thing. It won't
be the type of thing that their Model Session wasn't perfect and their TR 4s weren't perfect,
and so on. It'll be the fact they don't know the E-Meter plugs in or that they read only body
motion. They read only body motion.

I saw some experimental shots taken of a – of an E-Meter, just as an experimental film
basis, and the person making them had used nothing but body motion. And any trained Scien-
tologist – they look at this and they say, "Well, all right. So the pc's moving," you know. Just
a picture of the meter. "So the pc is moving." See, they were trying to make a rock slam look
like a rock slam. Didn't look like a rock slam to anybody that was trained. So the pc was mo-
ving is about all that particular shot would have taught anybody.

But these little distinctions are not present at a lower training level, so you really have
to reach for it.

Now, I was going to say some more about Security Checking, and I am. You should
be terribly, terribly interested, then, with the material which I have been giving you here or
talking to you about. You should be terribly interested in getting people up to Class II. Not
only will your life become livable, but your PEs will make gains if you are terribly interested in making Class II Auditors – if you're terribly interested in that. And your life will be as peaceful as – as far as technology is concerned – will be as peaceful as the person who is turned over to you for assessment has had a perfectly accurate Class II job done on them, and then your assessment is possible, and accurate and swift.

I know you don't think you can ever do a two-and-a-half-hour assessment, but one has just been done. Two and a half hours of assessment was done in Cape Town. This, by the way, was a patch-up, one of these patch-up assessments, you know. Two elements had already been found and run. There wasn't enough action left on the meter to bother with. Yet the person found the other elements of the 3D in two and a half hours. That doesn't seem believable to you at this stage of the game.

Let me tell you though that people leaving here find this rather easy. Why? Because you're operating from an altitude. Here, you're a bunch of schnooks. [laughter] There's nobody going to…. Who'd respond to his command value? For the last two weeks he's only had two passes a week. [laughter] You're used to reading 3D with a microscope, you know.

And you ask Miss Glutz of upper Burbank, "What terminal would oppose this?"

"...That could only – only represent a cat." Half-dial drop. Your reaction is a half-dial drop. "Cat" drops a half a dial for you from there on out. You ask her – she had no choice but to tell you because you were you.

Yeah, but some student – nyah. "Give him a list of 442 terminals. Let him sweat."

[laughter, laughs] Big difference in attitude then.

So you should get terribly, terribly interested – not in just becoming a good Security Checker – but in what it takes to make a Security Checker. In the first place, we probably should stop calling it "Security Checking" and start calling it what I've started to call it several times, which is "Processing Checks." Those are much more easily explainable and we will – you'll see "Processing Check" in literature going out, so don't let it throw you. I'm talking about Security Checks. But anyway… [laughs]

But you go ahead and reap the whirlwind by taking some person who has had some HPA training three years ago, and you're going to make a Class II Auditor out of him. You indifferently say, "Well, they can sit there and hold the E-Meter balanced well on their lap, they look appreciative and alert, and so therefore we'll classify them as Class II," and after that go blow your own brains out because that's just about what you're doing.

You're going to be assessing a 3D after this person someday, or you're going to be patching a case together after this someday, or you're going to be holding the hand of some fellow auditor someday who has just been trying to – or this person himself feeling this cocky about it all, has now done an assessment and what is worse, run it. He knew how to run it: If it didn't react on the meter at all, he knew he had the right one, see. He read Step 6. That's what we're doing, isn't it. You know?

No, you're just setting up trouble for yourself. And when you carelessly rate an auditor, you basically set up trouble in your area today – or in an organization or wherever you're operating – if you carelessly rate an auditor, you're setting up grief. There will be trouble from
there on. Make this classification amount to something and you won't have much trouble with regard to it.

And I'd classify people Class III away from Saint Hill when they had a beard – even the girls – down to their toes. Oh, man, I'd really make them come through for a Class III, man. I mean, I'd really make them sweat. But certainly, make a good Class II. And then you have protected yourself.

Now, a Class II must be able to security check so that no Security Checks are muffed. That's the first thing. No questions are muffed. No withholds are missed. And that is your criteria.

Now, if the rudiments are in, in the session, of course the person will get the withholds. But if you come along with greater altitude right after this fellow and get an additional withhold, don't think it's because the case improved. It was because that Class II Auditor didn't have altitude enough to run the case with rudiments out, and you will have, so rudiments were out for him but in for you. They knew better than to tell you a lie, but they knew they could lie to him. See? This is the difference. So actually your criteria has to be very high to get around that sort of thing so that they will get all of the withhold; so they will get everything.

Now, the fastest way in the world to upset a case and reap the whirlwind is to miss a withhold. Take it from me; that's the fastest way. I've had more trouble with this single item. What trouble I have had – actual, out in the field, and here and there trouble, in the last three months – than with any other single activity anywhere: missed Sec Check questions. That has been way up on the graph.

Nearest approach to it ... Well, it just didn't approach it. It's something like the order of measuring a grain of sand and the sun. They just were not of comparable magnitude. I've traced every single upset I've had back to missed Sec Check questions. Initial – initial withhold setup, one kind or another, caused a randomity in the area. But where the randomity was tamed down by somebody and they missed a Sec Check question, the randomity doubled. It wasn't so bad before that, but the whole roof was falling in now, you see?

So that can really cause an upset. So I better tell you just two or three very brief little facts of life about this sort of thing.

When a pc starts to curse you out – these are little maxims that you could use – when a pc starts to curse you out, find the missed withhold. That is a rule of thumb that you will never, never, never, never miss on. When the pc starts to curse you out, find the missed withhold.

Where did this pc miss? There is a half-truth or a completely missed setup there. You won't believe this until you've got a good subjective reality on it as an auditor. And one of these fine days as an auditor, you're going to run into this – right here on this unit. And the pc's going to be sitting there saying, "Well, what ther-rrr! Why don't you rraoww! Wow-wow! And I want too much to do with that anyhow, and so on. And why don't you study your TRs a little bit? Your TR 4 is certainly terrible, and so forth."
Well, maybe it is, but they would never have commented on it if it weren't for a missed withhold.

Now, of course, you chop into all of this suddenly. "Now, what was the missed withhold question?" You see? You throw your rudiments out at the same time. So you've got to go into it smoothly. But you can always find it. You could always find it. And there is something here which has not been aired to the bright, fresh sunlight. There is something still floating along in the stygian dark. That's an interesting one.

And until you solve one like this, you won't believe how much fury can come out of it. It's as though you've suddenly charged up the machine with a pressure pellet of some kind or another. Like you've suddenly thrown ether into a petrol engine. This thing is really going to go on a higher roar and tear, and finally it's going to fall apart. Then you suddenly get bright all of a sudden and say, "You don't suppose there could be a missed withhold here? Well, let's just check it out to see."

And we breeze over what we were doing, and we bridge it in, and we get it into a position where we can do a little bit of withhold asking, and we just ask for any withholds we've missed, or any half-truths they've told us – which is the same thing. And all of a sudden, why, there you've got it. The pc is just sweetness and light. And at the end session, end rudiment – you're getting in your end rudiments – and you say, "All right. Are there any ARC breaks or upset in the session?"

The pc sits there, "No."

"Well, how do you feel about that mess that we had at the beginning of the session?"

"What mess? Oh, oh, oh, that. Oh, well, that's nothing. I was probably being very hard on you. No." This is really goofy, you know.

Well, the liabilities of Sec Checking... The reason Sec Checks are difficult lie in the 3D items. So a Sec Checker is always sec checking over the unknown identities of the 3D items. He doesn't know what mores the pc would violate if the pc had a withhold. See, the mores of the terminal – the oppterm – these various combinations are what established the moral caliber of the pc which gives you the mores on which the pc will or will not operate. So a Sec Checker is always able to do a much better job after a 3D has been found. And then you don't have to do any. Isn't that interesting?

Just the time you've got all the data to do a perfect Sec Check, you don't have to do it anymore. I think that's something or other.

But isn't it odd that if you don't do a very fine quality series of Sec Checks before you assess, you don't get the 3D at all. So the Sec Checker actually has to be tremendously skilled because he's going up against an unknown. And this unknown won't become known until the pc is assessed, and the pc can't be assessed until some Sec Checks are done. Now, how do you like that? You always enter the case at the hard end. The longer you audit a case well, the easier a case is to audit.

The best auditing must always be at the beginning of the case. The most skilled auditing is always at the start of a case. So don't get any ideas that a Class II Auditor should be a
bum; that you can get away with something as a Class II. You can't. Because it requires the smoothest TRs and the smoothest metering and the smoothest Model Session that will be performed on the case are needed at the beginning of the case while those first critical Sec Checks and so forth are being run. If any upset occurs during that period, you of course, are messed up on an assessment later on or the case just never gets up to being assessed. So the person at the open gate is actually the Class II Auditor. He's the seneschal because he can shut people out entirely and completely. Until they get past him, they're never going to be assessed.

And all he has to do is miss some Sec Checks questions. All he has to do is ARC break the pc. All he has to do is run the wrong preparatory processes. All he has to do is muck the case up, and of course he's finished the case because the case won't come through to assessment. Case will blow, leave for Alaska, get a job with the United Nations – which is the most suicidal activity I can think of right at the present moment. Pc's liable to do anything, in other words – any low thing. So that's not an unimportant zone. That's not an unimportant zone.

And I'll give you another maxim, is: A Q and A puts the withhold in to stay.

Now, let me give you a very precise thing; a very precise example of Q and A:

"Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

"Yes, I stole my father's once."

Auditor: "How did you come to do that?"

At that point, an Instructor should set up a militruse on the one side and a rocket launcher on the other side and pull both triggers. That is Q and A of magnitude. Changed the subject, didn't it?

You ask for a withhold, the guy gives you a withhold and now you ask him about the withhold. No, you asked for a withhold. It is enough that he got off the withhold. Now the only question is, does that withhold still register? If it still registers, there's another withhold.

So, here's a maxim: Any additional registry that you get on a withhold question stems from fresh, undisclosed withholds – not from the withhold he has given you.

That'll keep you from doing any Q-and-Aing, and it'll do – it'll keep an awful lot of auditors you train from Q-and-Aing. That's quite important.

This is proper:

Auditor: "Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

Pc: "I stole my father's once."

"Okay. Thank you. Have you ever stolen any other umbrellas?"

"Well, no. No, no, no."

"All right. Thank you."
Now, look at your meter and say, "Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?" Instant read. So you look at the pc and you say, "All right. When is the first time you ever stole an umbrella?"

"Oh, well, I'd forgotten that one. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Just slipped my mind. Yes, as a matter of fact, I was two years old and we were out at a garden party, and I saw an umbrella with a silver handle, and I dragged it out on the lawn – and they teased me about it for a very long time afterwards – but I really didn't mean to take it."

"All right. Okay. Well, have you stolen any other umbrellas?"

"No, no. That's all."

"Okay. Thank you."

Get a hold of your meter. "Have you ever stolen an umbrella?" Remember, that was the auditing question. That was the question that made it fall. Well, that's the question you're trying to clear! You're not trying to clear whether or not this person is related to umbrella manufacturers in the Marcab Confederacy! You're just trying to clear whether or not they ever stole any umbrellas. That's all you want to know and any other material to that is simply assistive. Any other questions you have is assistive to clearing that exact question. That's the only question you want to clear. That's the only thing you have any interest in.

Now, the reason you vary the question is just to get more withholds and that's where you go astray.

The Instructor says, "Well, vary the question. Don't keep saying, 'Have you ever stolen an umbrella? Thank you. Have you ever stolen an umbrella? Thank you'. " Because he won't get anyplace.

You have to ask him, "Well, did you ever – did you ever pinch one? In restaurants? Did you ever take umbrellas accidentally in a restaurant?"

You know, you're helping out the pc.

"Did you ever – did you ever take any out of offices? Did you ever take any out of homes? Did you ever take any out of shops? Shops, shops" – watching the E-Meter. "Did you ever take any umbrellas out of shops?"

"Er, I'd completely forgotten that. Ha-ha-ha. As a matter of fact, me and a pal ra – robbed an umbrella store one time when I was sixteen."

"Oh," you say, "Good. All right. Now, have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

That's the question you're trying to clear. That question must follow immediately after, see. "Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

"No."

There's no instant read and you're off of it like a startled deer and on to the next question.

Now, providing you routinely check up to find out if there are any withhold questions that have been missed, and providing this always occurs as a question in your end rudiments
of any Security Check-type session, "Have I missed any withholds on you?" you will never miss. And you'll find it all goes off like hot butter.

Now, let me give you another horrible example of this.

"Have you ever been mean to a pc?"

"Oh, yes, as a matter of fact, I was mean to a pc. Yep, I was mean to Eleanor when I was auditing her."

"All right. Where was that?"

This is just – from here on, see, we.... This is the blow-the-brains-out type of an approach.

"Oh, that was in Washington."

"Mm-hm. Well, what were you doing in Washington at that time?"

"Uhm...."

"Is that so? Mm. Did you ever ride any horses? Do you like cats? How've you been feeling today? Do you think it's going to rain?" I mean, all of these questions are equally relevant to what you're doing. "Do you happen to know the exact figure of gold production in the Rand area during the past fortnight?" would just be about as pertinent to the case, you see, as any of this other bunk, you see.

You want to know if this pc has ever been mean to any pcs or mean to an auditor, or whatever the question is, see. That's all you want to know. And you set out to find this exact package fact, and that package fact is the only fact that you were trying to find out.

Now, if you suspect that this question may be related to some other questions, which are also withhold questions, you add these as though they were also Security Check questions. And you clean each one of those, and the proper way to do it is not sit there and clip them off the end of your bat. The proper way to do is sit down and write them down and clear them as though they were a complete list. Otherwise, you're going to wind up missing some withholds.

Now, that is the severely proper way to do it. But don't ever monkey with these Qs and As. That is a Q and A. The pc says something, so the auditor says something, so the pc says something, so the auditor says something "And what is the price of gold do you suppose in upper Tibet or was it on March the 9th, 1913?" That has just as much to do with auditing of the case, don't you see? "How many photons fall per minute on the head of a pin in latitude 0, 9 minutes, 11 seconds, north, longitude 167, west?" Well, that had nothing to do with it. See?

So in Sec Checking, be pertinent to what you are doing. Be pertinent to what you're doing. If that's what you're doing, do it. Don't wander around about it.

Now, if a burst of misemotion occurs on the part of a pc during a Security Check or a Class II activity, it is turned off by what turned it on. And that is true of all secondaries. Now, that's particularly true of an assessment, running HAVINGNESS, or a Security Check question. What turned it on, will turn it off.
Well, what turned it on? Getting a withhold turned it on. What's the withhold that's still keeping it powered up? That's the mistake you make, you see, is taking up the secondary. You don't take up the misemotion in any other way than what turned it on. You get what I'm talking about? I mean, you turned it on with a waterspout, you'll turn it off with a waterspout. That's all there is to that. It's the same thing. Otherwise, you're guilty of mopery and dopery and misdemeanors on the high seas. The point I'm making here is you're running Havingness on this pc and you're saying, "Point out something. Thank you. Point out something. Thank you. Point out something. Thank you."

And the pc says, "Whaaawoo, terrible and so forth."
"Point out something. Thank you."
"Oooooh, it was terrible."
You say, "Thank you. Point out something. Thank you."
"Wooooooowowwow." 
You want to ask him what's wrong, you say, "What's happening?"
And when he says, "Ooooo-hoo, I just remembered. Oh, it's terrible, and so forth," you say, "Thank you very much. Good. Point out something. Thank you. Point out something." Why?

It is complete cruelty to stop the process that turned it on and say, "Oh, poor Bill. What are you crying about, Bill? Well, let's run that as a secondary."

You idiot, you're running it as a secondary. The process that's running it is "Point out something." Do I make my point clear about this? See? It's a cruelty to do it otherwise.

Even though the pc just begs you to be sympathetic, you can go ahead and be kind and half-kill the pc. Because you will.

All right. Let's take the middle of a 3D run. "Think of something, or – Tell me something – Tell me a problem you have had with a waterbuck."

"Well, wooooow! My God. Oh, gee. Ooooh-ooh, terrible."
Now, this is dead wrong; this is utterly dead wrong, see: "What happened? Oh? Oh. Well, what happened just before that? ... Well, what was the waterbuck doing just then? ... Mm. Oh, yes. When do you suppose that was?"

You're going to park him. You're going to park him just sure as hell. He goes wow! Crash! Terrible! And so forth.

Well, what made it go wow, crash, terrible? It was thinking of a problem that a waterbuck had. All right. What'll settle it down is, "How might swimming have resolved that problem?"


And you say, "All right. Tell me a problem a waterbuck might have had with a tiger."
"Oh, well, so-and-so and so-and-so." You get all around it and you come back to it again.

And you say, "All right. Now, tell me a problem you might have had with a water-buck."

"Wow!"

It's the same problem. He gives you the same answer, see. Still charged.

You get another level. It's not going to flatten on that level. I'll let you in on something. He's got several million incidents of that type. Only you just happened to have hit one that he was expressing. The way to handle it is to go on auditing the pc. You will be tempted, on many occasions ... 

Now, on a Security Check question, you say, "All right. Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

"Woooow! Oh! Gee, why have you brought that up? That's terrible, and so on and so on."

"Well, have you?"

"Yes." [laughs]

"All right. How many?"

"Oh, lots of them, lots of them, lots of them."

"How many times have you stolen umbrellas?"

"Oh, lots of times. Oh-ho, lots of times." [in a tearful voice:] "Think of all those poor people out there in the rain – umbrellas stolen. How mean of me to do this."

"Okay. Thank you. Now, have you ever stolen an umbrella?"

"Ooonoooh. Gee, you keep asking that question. My God!"

"Good. Have you stolen any other umbrellas?"

"Well, yeah. You put it that way – yes. Yes. I used to collect them out of the whole faculty at my prep school."

Now, that's what the grief is coming from. The grief was coming from a withhold. See? Because the withhold had the incident charged up.

Now, if the incident remains charged up, there must be another withhold.

See, if you can set off an incident by simply getting off a withhold, you must realize that if it keeps running, it's only half set off. So there must be something else there, so there's another pin to pull. An unkind thing to do is to run it.

I can tell you this because I've watched this over quite a period of time now and the only safe thing to do is remember vividly that what turns it on turned it off. If you want to turn something off, with what we're using today, well, just keep on running some of the same, and you'll get it off – but that's the only way you'll get it off. Because the other processes of
Two-way Comm and this sort of thing are so much weaker than any other process you happen to be running now, that they don't come up in order of magnitude.

So you're running Sec Check question, Sec Check question, Sec Check question. My God! I've seen the – practically the dead get up and walk if you ask the right Sec Check question! And you're going to all of a sudden run, "All right. Think of a time you were happy. Thank you. Think of a time you were happy." Well, think of how many times you've run some such inane process on a pc and nothing happened to the pc. You sat there and sweated for an hour or two. You knew it was the exact process to fit the case. You knew he should get up and walk, but by golly, he never did. Have you ever had that experience? You run some mild process.

All right. Well consider it as though you were all of a sudden running a 155 millimeter process, you see, and it's going boom! you know, in salvo. Boom! And then you all of a sudden – the pc says, "Oh, thud. I've been bracketed."

And then you suddenly say, "BB gun, BB gun, BB gun, BB gun, BB gun." You – of course, you leave the pc right in the middle of the woooooouh. The only thing that could possibly boot him through it was what you were running.

3D Process? Absolutely fantastically powerful, that process is. Sec Checking? Very, very powerful process. Extremely well done, a Sec Check can do almost anything with a pc. Havingness? Tremendously powerful process. You think you're going to get processes all of a sudden out of a – out of your hip pocket that are suddenly going to outrank these three processes? No, you're not.

So if they turn something on, believe me, you're not going to get it off by getting a Kleenex and wiping the pc's fingernails or something. It's going to take more of the same. See? So that's something for you to realize.

Now, in training Sec Check people – in training people to sec check – you should recognize that their first tendency will be to be kind, and in that lies their greatest cruelty. In auditing, in kindness lies the greatest cruelty always. You're being kind. And by that I mean the pc is crying, so you say, "Well, we better not keep the session going because it's getting the pc too upset." Huh-huh-huh. Slit your throat; you just did.

Another instance of being kind: "Well, the pc was too upset in the session yesterday, so I'll let him get rested up a little bit, and we won't have a session today." Cut your throat; you just did.

Pc is always getting angry every time you approach Sec Check questions in the rudiments, so avoid them. That's the kind thing to do because it makes a nice, smooth session in which nothing ever happens, ever.

You could audit him for thousands of hours and nothing would ever happen with the case. Case has obviously got withholds.

All right. "Because the pc might get upset pulling the withholds, we won't approach Sec Checking on this particular pc because it's very kind. The best thing we can do for this pc is to run a 3D Assessment very, very rapidly – without any Security Checking, without any
Problems Intensive – and just get it very, very rapidly, and hang it all together again, and so forth, and then run him immediately and rapidly on a 3D level. That'd be nice, because he wouldn't then be upset at all that Sec Checking and all that wasted time, and it'd be the nice thing to do." Cut your throat; you just did.

Case is in no – might have been in shape to be assessed. You might even with altitude have gotten by and through and finished with an assessment, but let me tell you something. You'll never – never get him through alive at the other end of a 3D run. See, even if you did do the assessment, you would never – they – they'd just probably wind up practically three-quarters of the way dead at the other side of it.

If you haven't noticed – I think some of you have noticed 3D runs are a bit tough. They have a tendency to have some somatics connected with them. Have you noticed that? You noticed there was something to a 3D run. [gives an artificial cough] Indeed.

Well, how would you like to go into a 3D run with the entirety of a Joburg loaded and undisclosed? Isn't that kind of gruesome? Completely out of communication with the auditor and liable to ARC break with the auditor at any moment and go out of session so the 3D run is left half flat. Oh, that'd be great, wouldn't it? Wouldn't that be ducky? That's just exactly what the doctor didn't order... That's what the doctor would order.

I ran a pc one time – I learned my first lesson on this. I ran a pc halfway through an incident. Pc turned on an actual, registrable temperature of a 102. Medical doctor observing, took the patient's temperature and instantly stood up with great heroic gestures and said, "The pc must at once go to bed because the man is obviously very, very ill."

And I said, "The doctor must at once sit down because I am in charge here. You're not."

He sat down looking somewhat cowed. And I ran it through at the other end and in a incredulous fashion – it was only fifteen minutes later – he takes out his thermometer and puts it in the pc's mouth, and by God, the pc's temperature was normal. It had gone from normal to 102 to normal in the matter of a half an hour.

I said, "You want to see it go up and down again, Doc?"

"No," he said, "No. No." He said, "That's all I want to see now."

His whole concept, you see, of what turned on temperatures had been turned upside down.

All right. Seeing somebody suddenly in duress and agony, the doctor's response was, of course, to do something heroic and different. And that would have been the one thing that would have dished the pc. That would apparently have been the professional or the kind thing to do, but for a Scientologist that is neither professional nor kind – very cruel.

Pc gets upset and we don't drive the pc through to the other end of it – it's cruel. Never kid yourself otherwise. It's a cruel thing to do to a pc. No matter how a pc is upset, we know how he got upset and we know why he's upset, and I'd straighten it out.
If we had a Sec Check question half-flat in the last session and we approach this session, we can't get the rudiments in, do we spend the rest of this session getting the rudiments in? No, we do not!

We get the rudiments in somewhat in this fashion: "Room, auditor, withhold, PTP? Thank you very much. Now, the question is: 'Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?'" See, pc's all upset. Well, that's where we left the pc. That must be what he's upset about. And you'll find out it'll usually work out that's exactly what the pc is upset about. Now, the pc goes out of session reading at 3.0 and comes back in session reading at 5.0 on the tone arm, we ought to notice this. Something has happened in the interim. It might be – not considered socially marvelous to go around and inquiring after everybody's private life. And it might not be the accepted thing, but it's a cruel thing to start a session without having noticed that. Tone arm's gone up two divisions? What did this pc do between sessions?

Now, we're going to try to get the rudiments in. Ah, well, it's going to be a very rough job – unless we're terribly specific. We say, "What have you been doing?" We don't even get a session started. You look at this and it's on the E-Meter, and you just got him on the E-Meter. "All right. Start of session. Thank you. Now, what have you been doing since yesterday afternoon? What has happened?"

"Oh, well. We don't want to go into that."

"Well, I'm afraid we do. Now, what's happened? What happened?"

"Oh. Well, I've got a ..."

"Well, that, that – that you see right there. What – what has happened? What – what happened?"

"Well, I don't want to tell you, and so forth. My third wife arrived. You see, I've never – I've never bothered to get divorces from my first two wives. And she just got into town. And I didn't mean to tell you, and ..."

Tone arm goes down, clank! Now, you spend the rest of the session discussing this? No, not unless it shows up as a PTP.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc is very often – is trying to sponge a session off of you or something of the sort. You're getting registries, see. You're getting registries on the meter, the meter isn't null because of an ARC break, see. If you can get registry on a meter, you know, the pc hasn't got ARC breaks to the point where you don't get a registry. You recognize that – that some people are not going to.

All right. And your registry is right there, and very nice. Everything is fine, and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" You don't get any response of any kind whatsoever. You couldn't read it with a microscope, you know.

The pc says, "Oh, well, yes. I mean I have terrible worries. And I'm awfully worried about Aunt Agatha and Aunt Bessie and all of that sort of thing."

And you say, "Well, all right. Now, how do you feel about that now?"
"Well, I feel terrible about it."

"Well, all right. Good. Good. Thank you very much. Okay. Now, is it all right if I ..." You're off of it.

Sometimes it'll ARC break the pc, but it'd only ARC break the pc if you missed the withhold question that went immediately ahead of it.

So if bypassing a PTP upsets the pc, you go back to the withhold question. That's the mechanics of the situation. Pc has been trying to tell you something, and he circuitously wants a present time problem run or something like this. The pc wants something else done in the session. Well, the way you keep the pc from dictating what's going to be done in the session is return to the earlier rudiment. That just mechanically is good sense, but it's also Scientologically good sense because the pc didn't get upset about this unless he had a withhold of some kind that you missed when you went by the withhold question.

All right. There are these little maxims of one character or another, and I could go on about these things for some time, but I've given you the principal ones right here.

It is actually not a very difficult job to do a Class II, but it is sometimes very, very, very difficult to get somebody to do only a Class II. They want to do eighteen other things, too. You've got to blow a lot of confusion off somebody.

The person is sitting there and he doesn't know whether you're supposed to look into the top of the case or the bottom of the E-Meter or the pc's shoes simultaneously while... And how can you possibly read the question off because at the moment you're reading the question off, of course, the E-Meter might be moving on the instant read. But at the same time you have to do TR 0, but your TR 2, you see – that might be poor, and the pc might not quite be getting that either, and – and it just looks like a big mess to the person.

Now, if it looks that confused to the auditor, the pc of course, will get very upset. So, actually, the pc is sort of trying to stay in-session and make a session out of it and is eight times as hard to audit. See? So, a confused auditor – a pc is much harder to audit. In actuality, the pc does not behave properly for a session because the pc is reacting to the confusion of the auditor. So therefore an unskilled auditor has much tougher pcs than anybody else. That's – that's the horrors of the – of the truth of the matter.

Now, your next point is: that because it is all so complicated – the auditor who's learning this routine – of course, doesn't see anything wrong with throwing five or six more complications in on top of it. So he starts doing all kinds of additives. And it's frankly not so much a job of teaching somebody something; is trying to teach them some "only" things. See, it's not so much trying to cram all this stuff down their throats, is keep them from imbibing all of this useless gutter water along with the drink of wine, you see. And it's sort of you go on "onlys" on this type of training and you will win. You know, "onlys." Figure out something very simple. Figure out something very simple.

How do you hold an E-Meter on your lap? And get them to do that one well. And then for a while, just get them to read an E-Meter on body responses or something. And then get them to do something else like read a Security Check question. You know, no meter around, you know. Get some dummy Security Check question, and let them fire that.
"Have you ever been a horrible person?" you know. Something like that. Something you would never miss. "Have you ever been a horrible person? Thank you. Have you ever been a horrible person? Thank you. Have you ever been a horrible person? Thank you."

You say, that isn't the way you audit a Security Check question. You ask the person pointedly, "Have you ever been a horrible person?" And, admitting that they have said, yes, they have been a horrible person, now let's ask them if they'd been a horrible person any other time than that. And let's just keep plugging the idea of a Sec Check question on a horrible person on this thing until the person runs out of answers on it. And let's do it that way.

All right. Now, let's get registry on the meter of these things and let's see if these things register on the meter.

In other words, any way you want to plot it up. I'm not giving you the ideal combination. I'm just giving you an idea that you teach them they can do these things, and it's not really a matter of upending a bucketful of facts over their heads. It's trying to keep them from upending a bucketful of facts over their heads. You know?

See, they're thinking all the time, "Let's see, the potentiometer, and I wonder if one tone arm – do you supposed to get a tone arm motion while the needle bops... Is – is – is there any data in here about – about rock slamming. If it rock slams, if the sensitivity is high, maybe – maybe as the rock slam turns on if the sensitivity's too high, maybe if you turn down the sensitivity, wouldn't have a rock slam. Maybe that has something to do with it. I wonder what – if you have to read the proper name of the Security Check off to the pc before you start giving the Security Check. That seems to me to be awfully important.

"Uh – let's see. This is a Form 3. Uh – I don't know why it's called a Joburg. Uh – that's – that's not very good auditing presence, but – and so forth. Oh, I have to remember I have to keep my TR 0 in. Keeping your TR 0 in is going silent and motionless like a cigar store Indian for forty-five seconds with nothing happening."

When a person starts to learn these things, he looks like a juggler, you know, with fifteen Indian clubs and eight cubes in the air and all of them about to hit him on the head.

The thing to do is to show him there's one Indian club, and that is an Indian club, and really get him to a point where he'll actually go out and tell people, "This is an Indian club," and think of himself as a great authority on the subject.

Now, if he can do that, he eventually gets this one thing. You know, I learned this from a psycho girl one time. She was really crazy. And I saw her turn sane – just like that. And she was never crazy afterwards. It was "Look around here and find something real." You know? "Something that's really real to you" is, I think, the wording of the old one. And this girl picked up one sugar bowl and all of a sudden clutched the sugar bowl to her bosom and said, "It's real! It really is! It exists!" I couldn't get the sugar bowl away from her. I never did get to flatten the process.

And that happened to other auditors, too. All of a sudden, somebody would – "No!" you know. And then the process didn't seem to work anymore after that. They'd made all the gain that the process was capable of making. Well, that's kind of the way training is. If you went over... You could actually train a person on an E-Meter this way. You could name off all
of the parts of a Class II Auditor until you got a fall. That one would be real to them. Get them to learn that one. Sounds weird. And get them to learn that one real well, and you'd find in practically no time at all, they'd become a complete authority on it.

Now, go over all the remaining parts of Class II on the E-Meter until one fell and then get them to learn that one. You could do it this way – I'm just *reductio ad absurdum* – but I'm trying to give you the idea that if you can teach them an "only," not an "all" – the "only" approach, not the "all" approach is what wins in this, because the pc is already snowed under with the "allness" on it. "Oh, my God, here I am actually sitting here tampering with somebody's mind and didn't I learn 5,685,000 years ago that tampering with somebody's mind was my downfall? And I wasn't supposed to do that – and oh – I must keep my TR 0 in.

"Yeah, now let's get on to the E-Meter and so forth here. I wonder if you reduce the sensitivity if the rock slam comes off. Mm, TR 0."

So it's rough, man. I mean, you can practically hear the brains wheel when you're doing this kind of thing so it seems very easy to you after you've done it a lot. It seems very simple to you. You'd say, "Oh, well, I can do this. Why should anybody else ever have any trouble at any time" and so forth.

And now I come in and tell you that as soon as you get back to where you're going in a Central Organization or otherwise, you should tap two people on the shoulder and you say, "Many are called, few are chosen." [laughter, laughs]

And one of them says to you sneeringly, "Oh, I've passed Class II skills. I've already been passed on it. Huh-huh. I've already passed on it."

Check them out. They won't get to the first paragraph of the examination without falling on their heads. Then you start in from scratch and make a Class II Auditor out of them. After that, if you've got to assess somebody, you can always send somebody to that auditor. You've always got that auditor to lean back on.

You better do that – because you're going to need help. You're going to need it, but not in the way you think – not in the way you think you will need help. The way you need help is to keep an assembly line going, to keep people getting audited with the skill that only you can provide. Other people can provide the more basic skills, but of course, you have to know those basic skills much more perfectly than anybody you will ever teach. So get busy.

Thank you.
All right. This is 13 Dec. AD 11, right?

Oh, dear! How sad some of these people are and how bright some others look. Well, they go up and they go down and some go up and some go down. And it hadn't anything to do with the auditing. Well, anyhow ...

I want to give you a little more data here about putting a 3D package together.

Now, at the time I'm speaking to you, there is no cinch. Nothing on this criteria should be taken as a lead-pipe cinch in this stuff I'm about to give you. These are indicators. And as soon as we've got a lead-pipe cinch figured out, why, I'll give you the lead-pipe cinch. But until that time let me give you what thinking there is on it.

A 3D package is as good as it is assessed. And that's all it is. It's as good as it is assessed. You get an assessment on a pc which is well done, you – you get your list, you bleed down for any other items on the meter. You make sure there are no further items on the meter and you make sure that the reaction on your question, "Are there any more items?" is not an ARC break. You know, more people have gotten hooked with that. You know, they can stack up to a thousand terminals with the greatest of ease by simply saying each time, "Are there any more terminals?" and the pc is ARC broke, gets an ARC break reaction on the needle and then flounders around and digs up some terminals. And the auditor never says, "Is this question an ARC break?" at which time he would find out, yes by God, it sure is! And then, you get your list null. That is that the meter, then, is bled down. The only thing that gets in the road of that, however, is that ARC break reaction.

Therefore, you get a complete list – be sure when you've bled down the meter that your list is complete and that is your complete list. Now, your pc from time to time will want to add another item or two. This is fine and if he wants to add them, you put them down. Now, as you assess this, it assesses quite mechanically. If your rudiments are in, you will get reaction. And if the rudiments are in, you will get the item. And it doesn't take any long Egyptian dream of eternity to assess the thing out. It just brrrrrrr-pang! And you're taking much – you must adjust your viewpoint of how long it takes to get a 3D item.

The longest one is the goal. Why? Because you have nothing in view. Nothing. It is just a wide desert and you are staring across this uneven, monotonous plain. This is life. And there's nothing showing and until you get a goal, you haven't got a handle onto the Goals Problem Mass. But as soon as you've got a goal – now, it may turn out to be the oppgoal. But you've got a goal. You've got something that reacts. You got something that stays in.

Now, get that, make sure it's the only one, make sure it's right and take off from there. Get your next item. If this item does not pan out rapidly and there seems to be a lot of trouble
concerning this particular item and it seems to be all tangled up, try for another item. Just don't keep beating the pc to pieces. Well, look, you've got a – you've got a goal – we don't care what goal it is – let's get a goal in opposition to it. Terminal unknown.

If we can't get the oppterminal, let's try to get the oppgoal. All right. And maybe we couldn't get the oppgoal at a lick and a promise and quickly, you see? We can't get that oppgoal either. It – apparently, every time we speak of opposition to this pc, the pc goes zzzz. See? Well, let's get something on the pc's side, then. We've got a goal; we're fairly sure it's the pc's goal; at least at this stage of the game we can assume that it's the pc's goal. So, let's get his modifier.

And finding his modifier is a very simple proposition. If the pc is bogged down on finding his oppgoal or oppterminal, he will pep up on finding his modifier. And if he doesn't pep up on finding his modifier, you've already got the opposition goal; that's why you couldn't find it. 

So, anyway, if we've got his goal and modifier and we haven't got an oppterm and an oppgoal yet, do you know we can find his terminal and then find the opposition terminal to that terminal. See how many ways we can weave this thing? We don't care how many ways we're going to weave it. Don't get the idea that you can spend session after session after session after session looking for a 3D item. This is balderdash; this is complete nonsense. It does not take very long to find a 3D item; it takes about one hour once the goal is found.

So you just might as well settle your sights on that particular target and realize that if you can't get a full 3D package on somebody, after you've got the goal, if you can't wrap this up in about ten hours, that you certainly are bucking the tiger in some way or another. And the usual way it is, is because you have been too optimistic and you have taken the pc before the pc was prepared for an assessment. That is the first biggest fault.

Your next fault on the thing is that you are looking for items you've got. Now, that's the next biggest error that auditors are making; they're looking for items they already have.

Now, how is that? They have found a goal, only it turns out to be the opposition goal, so when they try to find the opposition goal they've got it! So of course they can't find it. See, they've got a terminal. But they keep looking for the opposition terminal to the goal or something of the sort. Only they're looking for it on a bias, you see.

They've got the oppterm, they haven't got the terminal. So, you look and look and look and look and look for an item if you already have it. And you won't find it. It's there! You've already got it. It's – there it is. You see what I'm talking about now?

All right. Now, you play this thing crisscrossed, in other words, and if something starts giving you trouble, you find something else and it'll start clarifying. But remember, you're taking apart a piece of black porridge that's full of string, that has been made with the best quality glue. And it's a horrible mess and it is just lucky as the devil that the goal sticks out. That is just lucky, because that's the only handle you've got.

That's why you must try to get the original goals list of a pc, the first one he ever wrote. That's why you must take any terminal that ran well earlier on the case – the first terminal that ran well on the case and assess from there. That's in patching up cases and getting cases
that have already been run on Routine 3 and so forth. You must *use* these items. Because you aren't going to find another one; you're going to find another subordinate package that will never collide with a Goals Problem Mass. And you can run the pc practically forever if you're not using the original items.

That's something to know. So when patching them up, you say, "Well, what was the goal found on you? To shoot cats. All right, that's fine. Now, what was the terminal that was run? A cat shooter. All right." That, so far as you're concerned, is the entrance to the 3D package. That was the first goal and the first terminal. That was the entrance to the 3D package.

This has been run on somebody, don't you see. This person's already come up to free needle with a Goals Problem Mass still floating around in their vicinity, ready to key in somewhere up the track, see? So those are the things you use and you try to put a 3D together.

Now, you will find that most of your Routine 3 cases which failed and which did not go Clear, were being run on their opposition terminal, possibly with the opposition goal and this must be a great number of them. Must be a lot of them were found wrong way to. All right.

Therefore, although you've taken the person's goal – this person has been audited to Clear. Let's go that extreme. Or not audited to Clear; we don't care. But he's been previously assessed and audited. Let's take those items which have already been done on the case ... of course, if he's gone Clear, it's prima facie evidence the fact that you had the right goal and the right terminal. Now you've got a goal and audit it so as to find a Goals Problem Mass. So you've got to have the oppterm and the oppgoal and the modifier and the rest of this package. And you're liable to wind up here with somebody who has had a beautiful floating free needle and just about the time you looked for the modifier it all went *clank* again.

In other words, you keyed it in, you didn't stand around waiting for life to key it in. So it goes *clank*! So now you're going to find the Goals Problem Mass and you're going to shoot it full of holes and this person then will come out at the other end, if you do any kind of a good job at all and the needle will go free again and this Clear will stay stable and he won't be Clear on just one dynamic, you see?

All right. Now, the person who has been audited endlessly on Routine 3, but has never gone Clear – ah, this is another proposition. By the rules of the game, just a fluke, you might have his right goal and his right terminal, but somehow or another it hasn't stacked up right or something or other or something or other. But the high probabilities are that you were auditing – they were auditing the wrong side. But you still take it, because it's probably part of the 3D package.

Now, you don't take it as complete evidence that it *is* the 3D package. See, you don't – you don't take that as complete evidence. But you know the person was audited on it. And maybe it was a bad job of assessment and maybe it's a lot of things and maybe the reads aren't very big on it and maybe there's going to be a lot of trouble about it. Well, that's – you're an auditor. That's what you inherit – trouble.

All right, so this situation then, integrates on the basis that you take this unsuccessfully run 3 case, Routine 3 case, and those are simply conditional. Those are nothing but condi-
tionals. It was the probable goal. It was the probable terminal. That's all. And then try to check out a 3D from there. Well, now, you could crisscross a 3D from there; you can probably arrive at the Goals Problem Mass and you will eventually perhaps even lose the original terminal they were run on. How do you do that? You find the opposition terminal, the opposition goal, and then you find a modifier and then you go back and you find – you take their terminal. And now you try to find an opposition terminal to it and if it's not the one you found for a 3D package, it wasn't right. See? So, you could check this thing out.

Now, you can do other things. You can take the terminal, find the opposition terminal to it and then find a goal for the opposition – opposition goal for the opposition terminal or a goal for it. Check back, find out if this matches against the goal and then find a modifier and then find a new terminal. The old terminal disappears. It was simply used as a leader. Do you see how you could do that?

But when you finally get through, you should have all five items of the 3D package checking out uniformly. They all ought to tick the same way. Click, click, click, click, click. And incidentally, for your amusement, your first Prehav level ticks exactly the same as the rest of the package.

And if you haven't got a package on 3D that goes click, click, click, click, click, five times, there is something wrong with it. So what do you do? You get the rudiments in, you straighten it all out and you check it across. It isn't that the whole package is wrong. Some of that package is probably right. But some of the package will null and some of the package will stay with you. So you take the package that stayed with you and you get crisscrosses, you get "What would oppose a cat shooter?" you see, and then you put in a new terminal. You do a new assessment there and get a new something-or-other in there. And you keep working it on a cross-play, don't you see, until you've finally got five items that will stand up and stay in. And then you've got a 3D package.

But even then you're not sure the package is in proper ordered. Now, having a 3D package and having one all arranged for the pc, are two different things. You can have five items and they all stacked up beautifully. You've got them all assessed, all the items nulled, they all read the same. But you haven't found yet who is the pc.

Now, when I first entered into this, it seemed to me to be a very easy thing, because I simply asked the pc and there was no one doubt in the pc's mind as to which one the pc was. But since running it and since it's been in your hands, there's apparently considerable doubt and argument as to which one the pc is. So, a piece has gone astray here, so we need a regulator for this thing.

Now, once you've got the package, that simply means that all the parts of the package check out and there isn't one part of it going null and coming back and going null and coming back.

Now, mind you, you can get a bouncer modifier. The only thing that is wrong with all of this is you can get a bouncer modifier that'll make the whole package flicker. If you had a modifier "but always be late," you're liable to get the whole package on a quarter-of-a-second latent read. Did you know that? That's quite amusing. I mean, the package is obeying the modifier. So there isn't any great certainty there. But look, the chances of your getting five items
that all read a quarter-of-a-second late are so remote; it is the package. See? The modifier has a lot to do with the behavior of it.

Now, if you want to get rid of a modifier, all you'd have to do is deintensify it. Just chant the bouncers and deniers and so forth to the pc. A very crude operation, but it can be done that crudely. "Leave, leave, leave, leave, leave, leave, leave, leave, leave, leave everything, leave everything, leave everything, leave everything – ." And all of a sudden the thing will read. Of course, it won't read very long, because you haven't pulled the bottom off of it yet and it'll charge up again. But you can at least get it discharged to a point where you can make it read and if you can make a modifier read that way, you can make a whole package read for a short time. Interesting, isn't it? It won't be until you run it that you actually get charge off of it.

Now, those are criteria of selecting a package. It does require a bit of auditor skill. But less skill, ordinarily, than you would imagine. It's basically – selecting each one of the items is a simple mechanical job of getting the list complete, and then getting it all null with the rudiments in.

Now, I'll give you a check to find out whether or not the rudiments are in. At any given time, if you have a proven part of a 3D package, you can say that to the pc. If you get a reaction, the rudiments are in. If you don't get a reaction, the rudiments are out, period! Very quick way to find out if your rudiments are straight. Very, very quick.

All right. Therefore, if you've got a part of the 3D package that has been proved out, why you can always find out if the rudiments are in or out and you can always find out what the rest of the package ought to look like. Well now, will you please get clever and when you're nulling a list down, look for the reaction of the proved-out part of the package. Where is that reaction on the list? Don't be a knucklehead! See? The thing has a tiny rock slam and when you're busy nulling a list, you notice there's a tiny rock slam on this and you notice there's a tiny rock slam on that and a tiny rock slam on that – you bleed down the list very carefully, "Are there any more items? No, there are no more items." So, therefore you've got it; it's in one of those rock slams. Go ahead and null out the list, but you know what it's going to be before the pc finds out.

Then you're proving by nulling. You're not finding with nulling. You give me the original list of a couple of 3D items, I can run down them with an E-Meter, with – if I've got one proven item and I can tell you what it will be. It'll be that one or it'll be that one and that's it. Won't be any of the others. One of these two is locked on the other one.

Sometimes you're unfortunate enough to have a pc who's so jammed and he's got five, eight, ten items locked on one. Of course, they're all locked onto the Goals Problem Mass. But you have to be awfully close to the middle of it to get an actual, exact reaction to the goal. You got the goal, the goal is a small theta bop, let's say – they seldom are, but we'll say it's a theta bop – and you're going down this list and you see the – "a rat." That goes and "a cage" goes. Well, use your head. Rats have cages; cages will blow off, leaving a rat.

You usually know the 3D item before you've assessed it. You go down that list once – pang! – if you know what your goal reaction was. Now, you don't force this on the pc. This is
just to make you sure. You don't force it on the pc. You don't bother to tell the pc anything about it at all. It's none of his business, after all, it's just his bank.

All right. But there's ways that you can spot this thing. And if you can't wind up with five items, all of which have an identical reaction on your needle, you haven't got a 3D package and that's all there is to it. But let us say we've gotten to that stage by the standard assessments which you are doing and we now find ourselves in this interesting position: Who is what? Which is what?

Now, in some large percentage – much, much better than three-quarters of the cases you audit – you will have no difficulty with this whatsoever. But the remainder have the opposition terminal, is so close to the terminal and the opposition goal is so close to the pc's goal, that these things flip around like a merry-go-round. There's always something happens to destroy the serenity of our ways and that is what is happening at this particular moment.

Therefore, as I mentioned to you in the last lecture, I have been on the track of this and I've gone a little bit further onto the track of this and what I'm – what is not absolute about this lecture is about what I'm about to give you right this minute. Apparently this is the way it fits. Here is a test you can make: You can take the probable terminal of the pc and the opposition terminal, the probable opposition terminal, and you put them down on a sheet of paper and you write down, "You. Term. Oppterm." You see, whatever they are. See, "You, water-buck, tiger." All right.

Now, all you have to do is say to the pc, "How would you – or what would you do to solve problems, or what would you use to solve problems?" And – I suppose, "What would you use to solve problems?" or "How would you go about solving problems?" or "What would you do to solve the problem?" And you write this down under "You," see. And you write down – he'll give you four, five, six, seven, eight, ten of them; we don't care how many.

All right, and then we take the terminal and then we say, "What would a waterbuck do to solve a problem?" or "How would a waterbuck solve a problem?" Whatever registers so that you can get Prehav level-type words out of the pc and we make a long list: eight, ten ways the waterbuck would be solving problems.

And then we take a tiger. Now, "How would a tiger solve problems?" And we make a long list here of how a tiger solves problems.

And then we've got three lists. We ignore "You." That simply made it interesting. We put it in there so the pc will start differentiating amongst these things, don't you see? This is – it's a very good auditing action. It's one of these little one-shot things the pc says, "Hey what do you know!" You know? That's the end of it. I mean, it doesn't go any further than that. You don't use these things for anything. You're not making up your Prehav Scale. Don't do that. Because he would never think of the proper words to solve problems. If you ask a pc at any given moment, if you made him memorize the Prehav Scale and then rattle it off to you, he would leave out all of those levels on which he should be run, see? We've tested that. It was very interesting. Peter and Mary Sue – first time I came down with the Prehav Scale for the – for the course down in Joburg – I handed it over to them and they'd remembered it, you see, from something I'd given them the night before and they told the students all about it and they
both left out Protect. Isn't that interesting? Both had left Protect out of the thing and Protect was hot on both of their cases.

So this is no action, then, by which you get a Prehav Scale. You could probably blow it up to that point with a meter bleed and you could be very, very upset. And I imagine some place if you found yourself in Arcturus and you didn't have a Prehav Scale and no textbooks and that sort of thing — you did this to several people, and bled them — a meter down each time or strained at it terribly, you would finally wind up with something like a Prehav Scale — an auxiliary Prehav Scale. That would be one way to get one.

But let's look this over now and let's find out that the pc's terminal is the lowest on the Tone Scale; not the highest, but the lowest.

Now, the earliest work I did in Routine 3 is quite interesting in the way the assessment is done and you still have a relic of this in some of the early descriptions of assessing. And it says you go up the scale until you start to get a rising needle. Remember this one?

*Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.*

You go up the scale until you start to get a rising needle and you come back down again because there's no sense going any higher.

Now, that one is quite interesting. Because the oppterm is always higher-toned. The tiger, to your state of mind, is a ravening, treacherous, lousy, verminous tramp, see? But to the pc, the tiger is knightly, charming, beautiful, sleek, lovely ... What would a tiger use to solve problems? Diplomacy. [laughter]

And it, frankly, will be at such variance with anything. You might have a proper picture of the beast and you also might have a proper — improper picture of the beast. Who cares? But it's just very high-toned.

Now, I found this out empirically. I've looked around and I've — I've gotten some of the reactions on it and they're always very high-toned. The oppterm is high-toned. That's very interesting, isn't it? I'll tell you the why of this in just a moment. But it's really crazy.

You have the — it doesn't mean that it's a higher-toned terminal. That is to say the oppterm might well be a drunken bum on skid row, see. That doesn't prove anything by the name of the terminal. But a drunken bum on skid row — how would he solve problems? By being sweet to everyone, by being friendly, by being interested in other people's problems. And it'll be a wild show, let me tell you, man. It's going to be high-toned. This is an empirical guesstimate right at this time, about how this thing goes.

All right. And the pc's terminal, a waterbuck — a waterbuck uses treachery, meanness, sets traps, is socially unacceptable in general. How does he solve problems? How does he solve problems? By being vicious. By biting tigers. [laughter]

Now, you'll be peculiarly struck by the fact that these three lists are so different. And that is really what makes the Goals Problem Mass, a Goals Problem Mass. Because these terminals, as you first look at them in the pc, are in violent disagreement and remember that a meter reads disagreement. So a Goals Problem Mass, of course, is piled up because "you" doesn't agree with a waterbuck, because a waterbuck doesn't agree with a tiger, because it's all
a complete mishmash mess. And they use – and the first indicator is, is they use entirely different mechanisms of solving problems, so of course there's no agreement amongst them at all and you'll see that mirrored in those three lists. It's a – quite an amusing action.

It is sufficiently amusing that the beginning of your next session I'm going to ask you to do this little action, just for fun, if your pc is being – has got a 3D package or even if the pc only has a terminal and an oppterm as part of the package. Do this one and you will see what I'm talking about. It'll sound goofy, even to the pc.

So there's the methods of solving problems.

Now, the pc's terminal is the one the pc has the most reality on. Now, this has gotten mixed up over the years and some of the data given out by Routine 3 about the terminal being highest-toned should be interpreted this way: The terminal is higher-toned than the pc. We don't know what the pc is.

We haven't got a clue what he means by "you." And he sure hasn't either. "You" is just something which is just up in seventh cloud nine. It – it's a some kind of a combination of terminals or something or other, but it certainly had nothing to do with the thetan. It doesn't mean "you a thetan." It just is "you." Lord knows who "you" is. It's some kind of a crisscross combination and a mishmash and a saintly idea of what he should be doing or shouldn't be doing.

But the thetan actually is on the minus Tone Scale. Otherwise, he wouldn't have a false identity sitting in your auditing chair, called Bessy Ann or something like this, see? That thetan wouldn't have a false identity, if he weren't on the minus Tone Scale. He would be standing up throwing flitter around the room. That's about that.

A thetan who could be interested would be pretty close to visible. That's very high, see. A thetan, who all by himself without any dependency on any MEST or anything else could exert control directly, hasn't been seen on the track since Merlin. See, so your pc is lying actually, as a thetan, is down in the minus Tone Scale. And the pc goes up scale as you run the Goals Problem Mass out and the pc's terminal goes down scale and the oppterm tends to remain more or less the same. The oppterm is simply the oppterm and it doesn't have too much to do with anything. Except it sure has an influence on the Goals Problem Mass. Now, we'll go into that in a moment.

I'll give you some more of this conjectural material. The height on Tone Scale, then, is we know the thetan is going to be on the minus Tone Scale, so we're not going to worry about "you" because that doesn't mean anything. But as far as the terminal is concerned, it's going to be fairly low on the actual Tone Scale. The oppterm is going to be fairly high on the Tone Scale.

Somatics: If you run 3D levels on the pc and you are running the pc properly, as his own terminal, you are going to develop somatics. Somatics are going to develop – rough ones, bad ones – enough to make any pc cut and run. It may take him a long time to move up to the point of feeling that much, but he's going to feel them and they're rough. Well, why are they rough? Well, that's the reality of the case. That is how come the terminal is fixed there.
The terminal is fixed there because any time it shifts, it hurts. So the pc doesn't let it shift. So he holds it in place. Because if it ever moved, it'd hurt.

Now, in view of the fact that he doesn't want this to hurt, some pcs would rather not run their own terminal. You get a condition there of a pc rather protesting against this and not really wanting to run his own terminal. Because it hurts. He'll scream like a banshee on the thing.

Now, the somatics are developed out of masses and these masses may at first be invisible to the pc or not really directly sensed by the pc, but are actually resident inside the pc's body, because they surround the thetan. The thetan is a mass of energy and mass. That's why he can't go anywhere and why he can't do the things anymore. He's in a trap of his own making and this we call a valence. But it is a mass package. And as you run the person, this somatic area should move closer and closer in to the body and finally take up residence in the body. It gets worse before it gets better. Believe me, running a Goals Problem Mass always gets worse and worse and worse before it gets any better. The pc, then, healthwise, does not necessarily appear to get better at all, but on the contrary, appears to get worse, but they're more cheerful about it.

All right. Now, that is an indicator. Now, if you're running – if you've chosen the opposition terminal and you're running the pc as the opposition terminal, the pc appears to be blown upon. The pcs sort of – well, their eyebrows sort of tend to vanish, you know and they sort of so on and they get watery-eyed and so on. It doesn't mean that they won't get roughed up running their own terminal. They're going to get roughed up badly. But it's a peculiar – peculiar set of things. A great peculiarity is connected with this. Because it's something out there which is pushing them here.

The winds of space – a very good, descriptive thing. Because this could be – well, it starts to make their body disappear. Let me tell you – let me say that. The front of their body starts disappearing, as far as the sensory perception goes. I know that occurs. Instead of getting somatics in their body, their body starts to vanish. There's a different sensation involved in the thing and when you get some reality on it, it's better than my describing it to you.

The next thing is the Sec Check responses. Oh, you didn't think that one would come up and root. If you look over the old seventy-five hour Sec Checks of the pc, the pc is always answering on the mores of his own terminal. That is a little law: When sec checked before 3D is run, the pc only answers on the mores of his own terminal. And you can look that over and decide whether it's the – whether the – you've got a waterbuck. Well, has the pc been giving you the mores of the waterbuck or has the pc been giving you the mores of a tiger? And you can look that over. You could also differentiate the goal and the oppgoal the same way. These – this requires judgment. But it is a check. You can check up on this and you'll find it is an interesting thing to check up on.

You'll find that uniformly, this pc has been telling you now, "I'm a tiger! I'm a tiger, that's what I am, of course! Us tigers – us tigers always are very, very rough people and I am a tiger and there's no doubt about this." ... [laughter] Well, if you miss the fact that his head is being pushed off, backwards – if you miss this fact, because it might be missed by you – you
can look it up on his Sec Checks. Have his crimes been the crimes of a tiger? Or have his crimes been the crimes of a waterbuck?

You'll find that it's very hard pickings and so forth, but once you get the pattern and once you get the thread of it, now that you know these two terminals – you wouldn't be able to make any sense out of it before that. But you know you've got two terminals. You know you've got one as an oppterm and one as a terminal. If you go through their old Sec Checks you'll find that their Sec Check answers agree with one of the terminals. And that is the pc's terminal. That's quite fascinating. If you look that over and I think you'll find out that's – that's more or less correct. [laughter] Quite amusing.

They would be giving you the kind of answer, while they were being sec checked, that that terminal would give and they won't ever give the oppterm kind of answer. They just won't ever give it. You just don't see it. I'll tell you why that is in a moment, too.

Next: The pc doesn't like his terminal. This is quite normal. At first the pc is very intrigued and very interested, and thinks this is fine. But on a careful check of this type of terminals, you will find there've been periods in his life when he didn't like this terminal. That is fairly true. Now, more importantly, as the pc is run, the pc will get into a giddy hatred of the terminal. They will think that terminal is just something they want nothing to do with. That terminal is just no good. That is the end of that. The terminal just isn't worth beans or buttons. They don't like it.

Now, it depends – the degree of overwhelm has a lot to do with this, but sooner or later, either at the beginning, with very little overwhelm, pc says, "Well, all right, so I'm a waterbuck. All right, yeah! Well, that's very interesting. Waterbuck. Well, thank heavens we got it straightened out. Yeah, I always have been, sort of prancing around." [laughter] "Yeah, yeah, I always have. Always – always was interested in a waterbuck," so on. It's fine, fine, fine. He'll run it. Everything's fine.

Session – first session, "Well, I don't really think much of a waterbuck, you know. I never have, you know."

Well, the auditor could be shaken at this one. Says, "What? This person is a waterbuck and doesn't like waterbucks. Well, that doesn't make sense." But he goes on and he runs it.

Few days go by, at the outside with any terminal and the pc says, "This is a lousy terminal, you know. It is just no good! A waterbuck – this is no good! They go around drinking water, drinking water, drinking water. I don't think they're so hot, myself!" He'll finally come up with this as an adjudication.

Now, it sometimes runs through from the beginning and sometimes sets in after several sessions. But at some time or another this one sets in and it's quite normal for them to have no real reaction toward the oppterm. The oppterm is just something that is there. It is – just is. But they have no real emotional reaction. Oh, they've been mad about oppterm; they've been upset about oppterm from time to time. "Yes," they'll tell you, "that's my whole trouble – the oppterm!" and then never amplify it at all. It's the most amazing thing you'll ever listen to. "Yes, that's my whole trouble and that's all the trouble I had been in and, yes, I've been ter-
ribly emotional about this oppterm. Tigers have just been the bane of my existence since time
immemorial. That's right! Okay!"

You put it in the auditing commands, they never make any comments on it at all. You
get some kind of an auditing response like, "Tell me a problem with a – with a tiger (the opp-
term)."

"Oh, how to find a place to sleep!"

"Well, how might you solve that problem?" You know, whatever it is. "Thinking
about it," or whatever the level is. That's it, that ...

There's no emotional adjustment over here in the area of the oppterm. But the water-
buck goes up and down.

"All right. Tell me a problem about a waterbuck."

"How to kill one of the goddamn things!"

"All right. How might thinking about it solve that problem?"

"Well, I'd get him thinking about dying and he'd die! He-he!"

"How would a waterbuck – what problem would a waterbuck have?" Whatever it is.

"Um, well, sitting feeling lonely someplace and how to have friends."

You're getting emotional changes on the terminal. So you can – you're running a pc on
the wrong terminal, you're going to get – you tend to get a monotone response. You know, no
– no real change of emotionalism on the subject of the terminal. All the same kind of prob-
lem, all about at the same emotional tone. That's just a tendency. But, the terminal – the opp-
term doesn't shift around. But the terminal sure does.

All right. The next item here: If you're running the pc on the oppterm, you get nothing
but motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator. You just get
motivators, nothing but motivators. They've never done anything. They've just been run over.
You're running this guy on a tiger and I tell you, tigers have just been eaten up by waterbucks
and they've been shot by waterbucks and they've been scalded by waterbucks and they've
been dragged all over by waterbucks and it's just terrible what those waterbucks have done.
That waterbuck is just the lousiest brute that you ever heard of and he's specially mean to ti-
gers!

And that's kind of going to be your response level. Now, that isn't any lead-pipe cer-
tainty, but it's an indicator if you've got that responses.

All right. Now, why would a pc give you the wrong terminal? Now, let's get into the
guts of this situation. Why would the pc give you the wrong terminals? You got the oppterm;
he says, "That's my terminal." Well, the pc attempts to withhold his terminal and there is a
large secret contained in it all, it all, it all and that's why you find the terminal last. It's best,
actually, to find the terminal last. Because the pc tends to withhold his terminal and I'll go
into more on that.
Isn't withholding the oppterm, but is withholding his terminal. This is why Sec Checks are so vital as preparatory maneuvers. It tells you at once why you should have Sec Checks, because, what is it? It's giving up withholds, giving up withholds and if you've got a person who's obsessively withholding, they will cover their terminal.

All right. Now let's go into a long, drawn-out story of what it probably is all about, huh? Well, once upon a time there was a thetan and he – trying to do something or other and had some kind of an activity going. He got tired of standing outside certain types of clouds looking at the change of light colors in them. He began to think that was dull and he found there was something wrong in the universe. And that's his terminal. So he up and decided to make that thing right and he decided to eradicate that thar item and he decided to make nothing of it like he was and he decided to abolish that terminal.

Now, there's probably a little prior step to all this. Before he started to abolish it, he probably had a common goal with it. He probably had some association with it of some kind or another that was a very pleasant association, before he decided it was all bad. That got him pinned in good. But we won't bother with those – the early history of that for the moment. We will just say that he did decide, because man is basically good, that this thing was basically evil. And that he must end it. So he went on a career and he has had a career ever since of ending this terminal.

And, of course, the more overts he got against it, the more he got away from it, the more he snapped into it and he eventually wound up with a complete O/W package and a total interiorization into the terminal.

Now, it works like this: That thing which you have overts against, you must originally have had some basic agreement with. So you were pals with this thing at some time or another, but you weren't it. But you could coexist with it very nicely and then you developed a bunch of overts on it and differentiated from it and you committed overts to ensure your differentiation. You began to be worried about being it. You decided this thing was pretty evil, so you developed some overts and you did overts to differentiate, so that you could get away from it.

You decided this was the bad thing to be, you didn't want to be around it anymore and you decided to kick it off and skip it and so you developed overts. You didn't just do this, just accidentally, for the hell of it. You really started developing overts and that made you move away from it. And that, at one time or another, on the past track, was the method how you didn't become something. See, that's how you prevented yourself from becoming something. You developed some overts and you withheld from it and that differentiated you from it.

Well, that, of course, was a cure. And as we always have cures for cures for cures, what happened after that is, is after a person had done sufficient overts and sufficient withholds, he snapped into it and became it. And that is the exact cycle: agreement with it, overts and withholds against it to differentiate and when differentiation could no longer be totally established, snap into it and become it.

Now, that is the condition the pc is in with regard to, apparently, his own terminal. It is the one thing that he has the most overts against on the track. Man, there are times when he has walked up and down Main Street of Hooklaville, carrying banners, saying, "Down with
waterbucks! Down with waterbucks! The trouble with this whole civilization is totally assignable, only and entirely to waterbucks! I can prove it to you conclusively. In fact, we've got one in captivity over here." So he goes over and tortures it to death. "Bum, bum thing, these waterbucks!" He's going to fix everything up!

Well, so he's gone on a kind of an in-and-out cycle on this thing. And it depends totally on the individual how often he's gone into it and how often he's come out of it and how often he's decided, "Now, if I – if I pick up a body in Northern Mongolia where there aren't any waterbucks of any kind whatsoever and if I carefully don't think of waterbucks at all, I will be all right. He'll get to that stage, you see. And then the war comes along and somebody drops a magazine out of an airplane and there's a picture of a waterbuck, see? There's all – and suddenly he feels sort of strange; he feels sort of more massy than he did before. But he can't tell what it was. Hadn't anything to do with that, see. It's a totally unknown situation.

See, his withholds against it amount to withholding it. He's trying to keep this thing from operating. So he's withholding it. So he's withholding it from operation in life. He's withholding things about it. He's withholding things against it. He's doing overts to it. He's differentiating from it. And eventually he gets to a point where he withholds it and he doesn't even remember it and is it, all the time. Some kind of a horror story, you know. You could – this thetan has finally wound up – the one thing in the universe he wanted nothing to do with, he is. Quite a game.

So, anyway, at the other end of the spout, you ask him for this thing. One of his first reactions may be to withhold it. So "I'm a tiger. Us tigers, us very noble tigers, who are so calm and serene and who are always right." Well, now, why does he do this? The oppterm is actually the ally of the thetan in the destruction of the terminal and that's what makes the package look so dizzy. He is not the oppterm, but he and the oppterm, at one time or another were pals. But then because he's used the oppterm to destroy the terminal – see, he's used the tiger to destroy the waterbuck so often he also has trouble with tigers now. So he has trouble with waterbucks and tigers now, when you pick him up, see?

But him and tigers have tried like mad to destroy waterbucks and he is right in there pitching on the subject of tigers. He'd hate to see tigers wiped out because they really do a nice job of destroying waterbucks. You let a nice – nice lot of tigers loose and they'll destroy an awful lot of waterbucks. But at the same time he's saying, "Waterbucks should be protected from tigers," because he is a waterbuck. So what a dizzy situation.

Now, that dizziness of that situation is why it makes it difficult for you to pick out the waterbucks from the tigers. But, of course, the oppterm is the pc's strongest ally for the destruction of the terminal. And don't think at any time the pc has any other goal than the destruction of the terminal. The terminal, however, has so overwhelmed him that some of its goals and thinkingness towards survival have overwhelmed his desire to destroy it so he goes on a flicker-flicker.

He comes in for a session, "Well, let's wipe this waterbuck out this session, you know? Rroww! Let's get in there at it. Let's damn waterbucks, and so forth. Let's get in there, and square it around, and so forth!"
He comes in the next session, "Us waterbucks, boy we've gotta get those tigers. It's pretty sad, but we've gotta get them."

The last thing in the world the pc will do is wipe out the oppterm. So you're just in for the – it won't necessarily damage the pc. It'll blow his head off and ruin his eyesight and a few things like this temporarily and upset him and so on, but the main thing you're doing is just wasting auditing. Because he isn't going to do anything to the tiger. He isn't going to do a thing to the tiger!

Tiger is going to stay right there. When you finally get the Goals Problem Mass all torn apart, that tiger is going to be in the same state he was in before you started auditing a waterbuck, which is quite remarkable. In spite of all the questions you have about tigers in your command sheets, just realize that those questions are going exactly no place except to straighten out waterbucks. That's the only reason you brought the tiger in there at all, is to straighten out waterbucks.

Now, if you know that anatomy of the package, it'll make more sense to you about all this. But him and the oppterm is really pals. They're bosom buddies. In spite of how he natters about it.

You can take – take a period in his life – this pc's life – or her life, ten years ago and you'll find her in a tremendous amount of trouble with tigers. Tigers were offensive. Tigers were upsetting. Ten years ago. They were very upsetting. They kept picking on her. Always motivators. Tigers picked on her. Tigers upset her ten years ago.

You can take a period in his life – this pc's life – or her life, ten years ago and you'll find her in a tremendous amount of trouble with tigers. Tigers were offensive. Tigers were upsetting. Ten years ago. They were very upsetting. They kept picking on her. Always motivators. Tigers picked on her. Tigers upset her ten years ago.

Yes, she's very happy to have run this terminal, tigers. Because they were so upsetting. All during her early career tigers, day and night, nag, nag, nag. If it hadn't been for tigers – if it hadn't been for tigers! – she'd amount to something today. "See these long scratches? Look at that. Look at that, see? Now, how could I have won the Miss America Beauty Contest with these long scratches? Hm? Answer me that!"

You're talking to a hundred percent waterbuck. [laughter] That's all. You're not talking to the pc.

Next day the pc has kind of gotten up a little bit, you see. Get an entirely different story about this thing "Damn those waterbucks!" And we don't hear anything about tigers at all, see. Never hear a word about it.

So, they oscillate between being their terminal and damning their terminal. And, of course, while they're being their terminal, they're against anything that is against that terminal. And while being themselves, they are against the terminal. Now, you have to sort this out, that's – it's all, because that's it. You're trying really, on the sheet – the 3D form – apparently to find the opposition terminal. And if you haven't got the reactive mind straight and what this is all about straight, you of course will think you're asking for the opposition terminal to the pc. See, that's a vastly different thing.

The opposition terminal to the pc is the pc's terminal. No, the opposition terminal that you want to get hold of is merely the opposition to the pc's terminal. The pc is hardly there at all. But the pc has a long history of the destruction of waterbucks. And man, can the pc find
problems and incidents on the subject of waterbucks and let me tell you, they just run out of answers on the subject of tigers, just *ththah*.

"Problem with a tiger? Well, problem with a tiger – find a place to sleep. All right, that's good. Yeah." They'd think about it, "That's right. Good. Well, problem with a tiger, well, um – how to rest more." They'd think about it, "Yeah, that's the answer."

That's the way this foolishness would run, see? But you could actually, on the 7 December commands, while running it, listening to the pc's answers, eventually decide, "Hey, wait a minute. I've got this thing all backwards!" You could eventually come a cropper, straight into it. Because you've got pc versus the oppterm and pc versus the term all in there.

And the pc says, "Ohh, uh – problem about a waterbuck, *uhn-uh-duh* – waterbuck. Uh – how to knock one off a cliff. Yeah. You get him to thinking about something else. That's right, and he wouldn't watch where he's going, and go off the cliff. Ah, yes! Yes! *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh*! That's nice! Splash!

"That's very nice, that's good, all right. All right. Now, I'm talking about a tiger. Well, how to pare his nails. All right, good. And he'd – you'd get him thinking about his appearance, and that'd make him pare his nails. That's right.

"All right. Now, a problem about a waterbuck. Problem about a waterbuck, problem about a waterbuck. Well, uh – how to dry waterbuck meat. Yeah, how to dry waterbuck meat, yeah ... You get some very bright man thinking about it and he'd figure out a way to do it! Yeah, I got that one, all right! Now, problem about a tiger. Well, how to uh – how many stripes he has."

And you listen to this and you'll realize that you're looking over at some... This is a vast, calm vista that has nothing to do with the pc. The oppterm is some vast vista, has nothing to do with the pc. But every once in a while the pc will give you a nice answer like, "Problem about a waterbuck? Well, how to just get him eaten alive by tigers, you see?" Because that's actually what he's been trying to do for trillennia. He's been putting up this waterbuck and saying, "Tigers! Any tigers? Any tigers? Here!" [whistles] "Waterbucks! Look! Waterbucks!" You wonder why deer manage to grow white tails that make themselves very visible across the landscape. Well, they're a 3D package, too.

Well, now this gives you – as another aside, as part of the story – it gives you a very, very interesting view of humanity. All of the people they natter about are their best friends and they're trying to destroy themselves. And that is not a cynical, but quite accurate picture of man.

Why is it that all you have to do is put up a recruiting poster and have just millions of men swarm in for no pay, volunteering to go up against electronic cannon, dive off to other planets, plunge to the bottom of the sea? Why? Why? At no pay, so on. Should tell you, should tell you a lot. It has puzzled greater men than we, because Edward Gibbon says, "Courage must be the cheapest possible commodity in human values, because it's so easily hired in such vast armies, so quickly." Well, that's a paraphrase. It – he actually missed the boat. He didn't even get down – he not only didn't drive onto the dock, he didn't even get down near the pier. There wasn't even water, where he was! Had nothing to do with courage.
It had to do totally with self-destruction. You advertise a war, all the waterbucks take those waterbucks up and put them in uniform and take them right over there and give them a firing machine gun someplace. They'll just stick that waterbuck up and they'll say, "Well, here I am, dying in the service of my country... Well, they're missing me! I may have to move over there." [laughter]

A thetan is basically good. This is a good action which he has undertaken. All the way down the track this was a good action. He's been trying to rid the world of these lice! He actually has been working at it very hard and he should get a medal.

But, there it is. There it is. That's man. Not circa now; it's circa then. And back then and back then and back then and back then. He's always been operating this way. Guy joins up – you can always – you can always spot this.

Well, you can spot things like this about men, that – telling what they're doing and so forth. Person's on post. First few days there on post they look all right. And after a few days they start looking sort of dazed and after a few days start developing eye difficulties and after a few days more they – a little cough in the chest, so forth, huhrrmm! After they've been on the job three or four months they look like something's been parting their hair with a bullet, you know? They've been hired, see, by their opposition terminal while being their terminal. But occasionally they're their terminal, so they're on the side of the opposition terminal, against themselves. You follow this out?

They're on the side of the oppterm. See, what they did was join up and are continuously confronted by their opposition terminal. See, that's the corporation. Let's say they got a job in a corporation; their oppterm, maybe is corporations, big businesses, see. So while they're there, they turn the winds of space on themselves, you see. They've just got it turned on to a high roar and at the same time they, of course, had joined the corporation in order to destroy whatever terminal they are being. So, while they're being the terminal, they are fantastically destructive to the corporation except on the end of the week, at which time they are the corporation being fantastically destructive to terminals – to their own terminals, see.

So much so – so much so that you possibly could go into some large corporation, call in a large number of employees, look at those that look rather flat – whistle up those that look pretty flat – and say, "Would you like a reduction in wages?" "We'll sign a contract by which we guarantee to reduce your wages and in two and a half years you will go broke." And those people would sign it. And they wouldn't sign, "Now we're going to pay you ten thousand pounds a year and so forth." They wouldn't sign that contract. They'd sign the other one.

Everybody thinks wages are striking for – I mean, unions are striking for higher wages and shorter hours. No, unions are striking in an effort to wipe out working men and if you give them a good opportunity they could wipe out working men. You wouldn't have a sane employment union, organizational, structural picture at any time, ever, until you got all the 3Ds out of all the employees and you got it all straight. And then all of a sudden, why, it'd all straighten out and it'd all run all right.

Up to that time it's going to be this weird one of this fellow who has every reason in the world – you keep looking at it this way – you say, "But he's got every reason in the world to do his job and mind his nose – keep his nose clean and mind his own business, and so
forth. He's got every reason in the world to do this and every reason in the world why he shouldn't go in the opposite direction." Yet there he is in the opposite direction.

You say to people, "Now, take this crosswalk with the white lines on it. Now, you always go across the street at this white line." And then they're going to walk down the street half a block and go across where there are no white lines, even though it's out of their road. You stand and watch a white-line area sometime. You'll see people pass by the white line and go down the street, about a quarter of a block or half a block and wait until the traffic is good and heavy and then without looking to the right or left, cross at a slow walk to the other side. They got a waterbuck! They're going to say, "Who wants to hit him?"

And it's always such a shock to the thetan to find out that it hurts them. See, this is an awful shock to them – that they didn't kill a waterbuck, they killed themselves. This is always the surprise. If you catch a failed suicide, he is always in a state of fantastic surprise.

You get a fellow who almost made it, you know and you got him just by the last beam as he was departing from the body and stuffed him back in his head again or something of this sort and you'll have somebody who said, "But why did I commit suicide?", you know, and "Life is so wonderful and so beautiful and so forth," and they go through some kind of resurgence of some kind or another. Well, of course, what they found out is that they didn't kill their terminal, they killed themselves and this was a vast shock to them. They're always getting shocked this way and always getting upset this way.

But anybody who has a terminal has been trying to get rid of this terminal for a very long time. And you can say that his basic dedication and mission on the whole track was to dispose of the thing which you're going to run as his terminal.

And, of course, if you get the terminal, he'll cooperate like mad. And if you run the oppterm – if you run the oppterm, you're not going to get cooperation, you're not not going to get cooperation. They're just not going to, not not. Why, what – what's this? Well, it's all right. He'll ride along. He feels safer on that side.

So there's every reason in the world a thetan would give you the wrong item. But let's go back and look at what was true about it and we find out that the oppterm is usually the high-high on the Tone Scale (higher than the terminal), that when run, the terminal – if the pc is run on the terminal it turns on somatics. The Sec Check responses always agree with the terminal, not the oppterm. The pc shows a reality and a like and a dislike and a disgust and a this or a that or the other thing – he's got some misemotional connotation with regard to his terminal. And when you run the oppterm, you get the winds of space. You get no real somatics; you just get a discomfort. You get a kind of a disappearance of the pc. Of course, it's the – it's the thing which is versus the terminal, so then its mission is to make the terminal disappear. So of course, you do get a kind of a disappearance of the mass and everything else, if you're running on the wrong side.

And if you run the oppterm as the pc's terminal by mistake, they give you just motivator, motivator, motivator. "Look at what those waterbucks did to us. Look at what those waterbucks did to us tigers, man!"
Now, you cannot decide on the basis of what you think is good or bad, because the pc may have entirely different ideas on the subject. What you think is good or bad has nothing to do with it. This pc has a terminal called "a bum." So there are two items here. One is "a bum" and the other one is "a saint." And you say immediately, "Well, naturally, the pc would dislike a bum more than he would dislike a saint, so therefore, by the quality of the item, the pc's terminal is 'bum'."

Oh, man, that just does not work. If you put "a bum" and "a saint" and "you" down on the Tone Scale and "a saint" was the pc's terminal, you would be absolutely fascinated at how saints will solve problems. They solve them by chicanery, treachery, by knifeing people ... They're really characters, man, these saints. Huh! But a bum – he's nice, he's sweet, he never gets in anybody's road, he never bothers anybody. That'd be the kind of a weird – it just – it just doesn't add up, see.

So it isn't the quality of the item and I think, basically, most of your trouble comes, perhaps, from deciding that you can decide which this pc is. Is he a bum or is he a saint? Is he a waterbuck or is he a tiger? Because he's got the attributes of both. That's what makes it all so goddarn, confoundedly confusing.

See, he's in – been in the middle of this fight so long that he's allied himself to the oppterm and he's been against the oppterm and he's always been the terminal, but he's sometimes been for the terminal and sometimes against it. He's just all mixed up, see?

So, the goal that you get for the pc could turn out to be the opposition goal and the pc's terminal could turn out to be the opposition terminal and the pc's modifier turns out to be the modifier for the opposition goal. And it's just all thu-thu-thu. So getting a 3D package doesn't mean that you've got a straight 3D that you can run at all. You now have to set that 3D up and set it together and you have to use certain adjudications by which to do this.

Now, you are not going to hurt a pc by running the factual and true 3D package on the 7 December command series. Why? If you look it over very carefully, you'll find out there's as much oppterm in it as there is term. It'll be a little upsetting to the pc and so on, but it will run. It will run.

And that could fool you, too. That could fool you, too. Because it won't run anywhere near as well as if you have it in the right direction. But it's not going to damage the pc. You're going to get something done. You're going to get something done, one way or the other, because you've got that command package, which is designed to take care of this error.

But, because the command package is designed to take care of the error, you can of course make an error. You could be fooled, because it's running well, into believing you've got it right and sooner or later it's going to be all wrong. And it just isn't going to run right and the pc isn't going to make good gains and so forth. Now, you can run the 7 December 1961 3D commands and actually wind up with all of the needle phenomena that you wind up with, with the proper terminal, while running the oppterm. You can run the oppterm as the pc's terminal and you can have the tone arm go up stick and so on. So there's nothing to adjudicate on the meter. It'll run the same way. But it won't do much for the pc. It won't do as much for the pc, not by a long ways. So it's a good thing to sort it out.
Now, in the first place, a pc who is running wrong-way-to is running under a miscon-
ception and sooner or later they're going to find out that they are telling themselves lies. And it's the way they're lying to themselves that damages them, rather than the commands. They keep saying to themselves, "Well, us tigers – us tigers – and them waterbucks – and us nice tigers – and those waterbucks ..." And this is the other thing that is wrong: You get the wrong level chains.

Let me tell you something about wrong levels. If you were to carelessly jump a level and without getting levels in sequence, if you were just suddenly – skip a level and run some-
thing else, you know, and just make up your mind, suddenly, without assessing it, that the pc's trouble was "drainage." And you say, "How might drainage solve that problem?" It doesn't register on the meter or anything else. You run the pc on this for a little while and the pc starts getting pretty upset. It will turn on the pc's psychosomatics, as opposed to the soma-
tics. If you run the wrong level on the pc, you turn on the psychosomatics of the pc. Now, what is a psychosomatic? That is a chronic pain which amounts to a physical illness with which the pc has been afflicted for a very long time. They turn on and they don't turn off. Now, that's what happens when you run the wrong level.

So let's say we just picked it out of our head and said, "Drainage." And this pc is – has had a peculiarity – they've had a susceptibility to sties and as we run this, they're going to get sties. They're going to get sties. That's all there is to it. So if you run the oppterm, you turn on the psychosomatics of the pc. You tend to turn on the psychosomatics of the pc – you won't necessarily – because you're running wrong levels. You see, you're assessing the oppterm and not assessing the terminal and the terminal goes by a different series of levels.

If you don't believe this, take your pc at any given moment and assess him on the Pre-
hav Scale or some little section of the Prehav Scale. Assess him on the terminal and then as-
sess the oppterm – don't use it – and you'll find out it'll come out an entirely different level. So you can run wrong levels doing this.

Now, running the terminal doesn't turn on a psychosomatic, which is a chronic pain which amounts to an illness or a rough thing with the pc that the pc has always been afflicted with. That isn't what does that. You get another thing here; you get another thing. You get brand-new somatics. And if the pc continually gets brand-new somatics and the somatic pic-
ture is different and the things the pc has never had before are turning on and the chronic so-
matics may be flickering in and out, but aren't necessarily getting very much concentration, then you're running the right levels and you're running the right terminal. But it's – the only thing that would be upsetting to the pc is if you run the oppterm on the 7 December 1961 commands, you of course are running the wrong levels on the pc, because it's – it has entirely different assessment value.

It isn't that it's going to kill the pc but it's not going to make very much fast response. You get a pc; this pc is always, always, always ...

Oh, I'll give you a good one: The pc years ago got rid of their terror stomach. Got it early auditing, did a good job, no terror stomach and they haven't had a terror stomach for years. That's one thing that they're cheerful and happy about. And you're busy – you're busily happily running the terminal, see. You're running the terminal. They haven't been bothered
with this for years, see. And you run the wrong level, see. You just pick out "drainage" at will, see. Nothing with any response; it shouldn't have come up at this time; you just, "They're going to run 'drainage'."

And the pc goes for this because, you see, "drainage" – that explains a great deal to them. That's where you got it off of; the pc's been selling you "drainage," you see. And you run this and their terror stomach comes on. They say, "But I got rid of this years ago!" Mind you, now, you're running the terminal and everything fine. You're just running the wrong level. A terror stomach comes on and till you go back and get the right level and bring it on up to date, the terror stomach tends to stay on and then the terror stomach fades out and washes away. You see that is an experimental action. That's an experimental action.

All right, so therefore, running the oppterm, of course you're getting the chronic somatics on but you're not getting new somatics on.

Now we're running the terminal and we're running it by proper level. The pc remembers having had a neckache, when they were sixteen and haven't had much of a neckache since. And now they've got a neckache which is maybe in that place and maybe in a different place, but it's one awful, horrible neckache. And they don't remember having a neckache exactly like that neckache. And it turns on and it's much stronger and it's much harder than they ever had a neckache on before. And before you have a chance to sympathize with them very much, why, it's all changed. You ask them toward the end of the session, "How's your neckache?"

And they say, "Neckache? What neckache? Oh, oh, what neckache?"

"Well, just that neckache that you had early in..."

"Oh, that one! Well, that wasn't anything. God, you should feel this backache!"

You're getting a changing somatic pattern. So running the oppterm you find the somatics and they stay on, the same, session after session after session or intensify or increase. And running the terminal, you get a shift, shift, shift, shift. Now, you can normally expect the somatics to materialize inside the pcs' bodies and at the back of the pc's body – particularly at the back of the pc's body – in the back of the neck, in the back of the head and inside the head and inside the stomach and all that. You can expect somatics to materialize in the most unlikely places. That's running the terminal.

And running the opposition terminal, you tend to get fixed somatics. It's on – you only get the fixed somatic because you're running the levels out of sequence. That's the only reason I'm stressing running levels out of sequence. It isn't that you're going to find a bunch of bum levels for the pc. You can get – you can get a level that's a little bit corny or a little bit off, or something like that, and your pc isn't going to get into any trouble on it. It's picking out something like, "I know what's the matter with this pc! 'Drainage'!" You know? And you run "drainage." "Yeah, that's what's the matter with the pc." That's absolutely right! That is so true! Only it belonged twenty levels up the line, and you picked it now. See, you've jumped it wildly out of sequence and it'll turn on the pc's chronic somatics, the like of which you never heard of!
And if it's a good level – it really applies to the terminal that you're running, you see – the oppterm or the terminal – really applies, if it's a good level ... This is very logical! Boy, it'll pull that Goals Problem Mass just – oh, man it'll just rip it up, and ... Marvelous! You know? Leave the pc sitting in somatics that then don't move. Until you catch up with them with proper assessments.

So you've unnecessarily put your pc in misery for a couple of more weeks than you should have. That's what happens when you run an out-of-sequence level and that's what happens when you run the oppterm. And that's all that happens when you run the oppterm.

Now, what I've been talking to you about is in the basis and state of flux. A lot of the – this material however was based on very good observation and I give it to you apologetically only for this reason: Is I have not had time or the data to codify you up a perfect card which, when you put the pointing arrow to zero, it says down at the bottom, "waterbuck, terminal; tiger, oppterm." And, I haven't been able to do that. But I have, I think you will see, accumulated an awful lot of indicators which can serve you very, very well.

They are quite true indicators. But you have to know the story of this and you have to know it very well. You have to know what the thetan was doing and how the thetan got into this horrible mess. This thetan may be sitting there, telling you – trying to be proud about it all – but telling you, "Well, I've been a waterbuck for a long time. And us waterbuck, we're really, really quite the thing, you know, us waterbuck are. Except sometimes. Uh – and uh – I seem to keep remembering shooting a waterbuck one time or another down in South Africa. I mean, we kept shooting waterbuck and yeah, we just slaughtered waterbuck all over the place. Yeah, the river was just running with waterbuck. Oh, waterbuck. Boy, there were a lot of dead ones, see? There ... Shameful, isn't it?" [laughter]

You have to realize that he's of a mixed mind. That he must preserve this thing because he's been overwhelmed by – because of his overts, and he must get rid of this thing and his attention is so confoundedly fixed on it that he isn't going to get his attention on much of anything else. Not in life. His thinkingness and educational restrictions, by the way, are all contained in the terminal.

You say, "What – what skills – what skills are you mainly – how – what skills do you really consider yourself good at?" And this is another test, by the way. I just happened to think of this one. You could say, "What skills are you really good at and what can you really do? And how does that compare to waterbuck, the terminal?"

And, "Uh – let me see. A tiger. What skills could you really do with a tiger? Well, I don't like to spring. Don't have too much to do with springing and so on. I don't like red meat, I never eat any red meat, as a matter of fact. Um, and so on. Don't uh – I sure don't like sleeping in wet woods. No, I've never been able to do that. And springing – in high school, the broad jump, I never – just could never pass the broad jump. I just never could pass the broad jump, and so on. Yeah, just don't think I'd have too much to do with tigers. But I can swim. I swim very well. And I'm pretty good at dodging. Dodge extremely well, yes. Remember playing football. Used – that was what I was really good at – dodging! Yeah, I was really good at dodging. And swimming, swimming. Yes, I was captain of the swimming team. Uh – yes, as a matter of fact got the state-wide medal, till I broke my neck, so forth."
It'll be that kind of a story. His skill pattern will also fit with his terminal and will not fit with his oppterm. You say, "Well, what kind of a tiger would you make?"

"Me? Tiger? That's a new thought. Oh, well yes! I'd make a very good tiger! Always have been very, very good as a tiger!" Doesn't mean anything at all.

So the only real danger you're running is the running of a wrong level and the only thing that will do is give you another package that you'll have to run at some time or another on the other level. So it is not killing the pc.

Now, you think it might become clear on auditing. But it very often doesn't. Now, how long does the pc dramatize his terminal during a run? How long can you expect a pc to be dramatizing his terminal or his oppterm or his goal or his oppterm or his oppgoal, or something like that? Well, I can't give you any figures, but actually, it's – it's a couple, three weeks of auditing, anyway. Auditing on levels. They'll come up with – because, what the devil, you've got the whole educational pattern of the pc, the whole experiential pattern of the pc, and it's all composed of these various factors. So they'll keep manifesting themselves.

But the pc will try to withhold his terminal as you're auditing him and that's what makes your rudiments go out. The pc will become very sensible during a run of – all of a sudden, "Oh, wait a minute. That's a skill of a waterbuck. I'd better not do it. See, I'm really not a waterbuck." And the visible withhold of the waterbuck comes up and makes the pc stack up withholds and then the thing won't read. You won't get a read on the thing. All the pc's doing is withholding his terminal. Because that's all the pc has been doing for trillennia, is trying to withhold this terminal from action.

If this pc could go off in a corner someplace and be absolutely sure that never thereafter would a waterbuck ever breathe or jump on Earth, the pc would probably sit there for millennia, perfectly happy in accomplishment of having utterly restrained this waterbuck from ever functioning again and his mission would have been totally complete. He wouldn't be happy sitting in the corner, but his concept of good and his duty and that sort of thing is sufficiently high that that is exactly what he would do. He'd feel very self-satisfied about the whole thing – withholding his terminal.

I would say offhand that the terminal is not necessarily harder to get than the opposition terminal, but the terminal is more chronically withheld. You're liable to find the pc in the present life associating with his oppterm on a friendly, scratch-the-eyes-out basis – actually very closely associating with his oppterm, but not associating with his terminal. You won't find him very often associating with his terminal. Kind of wanting to be his terminal, had goals to be the terminal and so forth. But if any – anyone stood up – he – he'd be more likely, if the waterbuck walked in the room, you know, he'd say, "Well, I guess I'll be going now. Guess I'll be going now. Didn't realize you had such low taste," – to the hostess, you see. Sort of to himself. "I didn't realize you associated with criminals of this particular type – waterbucks."

No association with the terminal. Association with the oppterm. Close association with the oppterm. Intimate. Always swinging into its perimeter. Hate like hell to be there, too, the whole time. Horrible, you know. That's something – something we wouldn't associate with if we possibly could help it, so we associate with it all the time. But actively not really
associating as a general rule with the actual terminal. Actual terminal is something else and it is over there and we don't have too much to do with that kind of person, do we?

If the pc had children, you can just hear the pc say, "Well now, that's fine, but let's not go off in the direction of studying waterbuckery. For myself, of course, I could – if I had to, I could study waterbuckery. I could, and so forth. I've, as a matter of fact, often been active in that particular field. But not – not you children. Not you children, no. That's for us hardened sinners. That's for something else. But, of course, I never would be one, you understand that!" [laughter]

Those are the general attitudes and I hope – I hope in some way that helps you sort some pcs out. Maybe we'll have a little indicator that we'll pin on the side of the E-Meter someday and you feed the terminal in on a slip of paper and it instantly comes up – if it's blue – if it comes out blue, it is correct and if it comes out red, it is incorrect or something of that sort. We don't happen to have that gimmick right now, we have to depend on you and your good sense.

If your pc is running painfully, you are probably right. If your pc is good and in pain, and is miserable, and it's terrible, and the tone arm is going up and hitting, clank and so forth, it's probably all right. On the other hand, if the pc is just getting sort of invisible and getting nowhere and they don't have any somatics, except their chronic somatic of the pain in the end of their ear, or something is now on much harder than it's ever been on before and they've had that pain for a long time, and so on, and they just ... And they're running lots of motivator, motivator and so on. Well, with the data I'm giving you today, you should actually be able to look at your pc during a run or after a run or something like that and be able to tell whether the pc is running the right terminal or the wrong one.

But right now, I tell you, it's in the lap of the gods and the judgment of auditors.

Thank you.
ANATOMY OF PROBLEMS

A lecture given on 14 December 1961

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And he says, "Comment?"

"Gare Nord."

So I create something that threatens to become a problem and I make him solve it. I
show him we have a communication in common, which is a mean thing to do, you know.
There he is sitting there recovering nicely from his bottle of vin rouge for lunch, you know,
and so on. And you put him to work. And he says, "American tourists," you know, "heh!"
[laughter]

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

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

I say, "Taxi? Taxi?"

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

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

And he has to agree I've said a railway station and takes me there. How would it hap-
pen otherwise? I had to demonstrate to him there was communication. It's very interesting
Very interesting.
In a line of work which I have followed from time to time when there was low periods of employment, two armies mucking around and milling around and they don't speak the same language and the countries kind of in dispute and I'll tell you, they'll just maneuver forever. They will just maneuver and maneuver and maneuver until one of the generals gets very enthusiastic and fires a shot at the other one and that they can understand. That they can understand, you see?

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

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

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

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

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

Now, where you see an argument, there must have been an agreement. That is – that is just ne plus ultra fact. Where you see an argument, there must have been an agreement. The agreement could have been a very light one, but then there wouldn't be much of an argument. If the agreement was very light, the argument must be very light.
There must have been a fantastically heavy agreement to cause that much war. Now, I
will give you a little – few cases in point. Some of the goriest wars which have ever been
fought on the soil where we are at this moment had nothing to do with Napoleon and foreign
invasion and all of that. It had to do with domestic issues. Man, they have really mowed 'em
down. Civil wars of various kinds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

See, what everybody neglects on the German-French wars is the fact that the French are Germans. Everybody neglects this. The name of the country isn't France. I was a Roman too long to even much refer to it as France. It was called that after the Franks who came out of the woods just like the rest of the Germans, only they went a little further. And the ruling classes of France and the ruling classes of Germany ...
You know, some of these wars we used to have around here on both sides of the channel were some of the most interesting wars you ever had anything to do with. Everybody that was on both sides was related to everybody else. There was hardly anything like nationalism. It hadn't been much invented yet. But there was certainly family. And you would find yourself lined up and all of a sudden there was your wife's brother, you see, in the enemy ranks.

Something like that. Well, this was liable to go one of two different ways, you see. It was either liable to be terrific hate involved and you'd go for him at once, depending on how good the domestic relations had been, you see? Or in a lull in the battle, you'd see him over there and you'd say, "Hi ya, Joe. Bessie's okay these days," and go on your way, see? [laughter] That was real mixed up. It was real mixed up.

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

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

Now, as I was suddenly brought up short and given a blast of my own lectures – received a letter from, of course, it would be California – and somebody said, "Hey! What about games? What about the old rules of games?" I was very obliged to that letter because it's time I was reminded. Saved us a day or two. Because you remember about games. You remember about games? The fellow was on both sides of the game? The pan-determinism, selfdeterminism and other-determinism. Remember these? You should. They're all over the place.

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

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

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

Where 3D is concerned, you always have to have somebody standing outside who has no interest in either side. That's the auditor. 3D, of all things, is one of the roughest to have anything to do with on figuring it out yourself. I have absolutely no business to tell you that as a carte blanche fact because I myself, of course, have had to figure it all out myself, see? But I had to have outside help to the degree of somebody reading the E-Meter because – "Oh, wow, ooo, no!" – I couldn't even pick out the elements, see?
In other words, it was so involved, everything was so involved with everything that it was all self-determined or all other-determined with no pan-determined factors at all. Any time you would have shuffled me a card of – let's say, the forty or fifty items which inter-locked on other 3D items, would have been the first view, you see. Actually a 3D looks to the pc like a minimum of fifty or sixty items before it's ever been assessed, you see? Nothing has ever been knocked off. No edges have ever been knocked off. Nothing has ever been unshuf-fled.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, there's another one, see? He says, "I'm a waterbuck. They are waterbucks. I'm a waterbuck. They are waterbucks." He just does a flip-flop. See? You talk to him three seconds after you've assessed the item. He says, "That's right. That's absolutely right. That's right. Ab-solutely. I'm a waterbuck. That's it. No doubt about it whatsoever."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"I really am something else, you know. I'm actually something else. There – there are the waterbucks and there are the tigers and I'm not either one of them. And uh – uh – that's right, I must have some other 3D element. There must be something else that I am, 'cause I'm obviously not a waterbuck. I'm obviously not a tiger. Sure. Must be something else. 'Cause I'm a... just impartial. I can get the point of view of a waterbuck. But why should I? I can get the point of view of a tiger, but why should I? I'm something else."
And he comes down and he sits down in session and he says, "Well, there's something about my 3D setup I meant to talk to you about," when you get withholds, see – you get the withhold. "There's something there I want to talk to you about," and so on. "Oh, no, no. There – there isn't any. No, it's just that I was thinking about it and I didn't – didn't quite see how, but I – I see now very clearly I'm a waterbuck."

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

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

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

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

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

You'll find out that there are levels to be considered here. Now, if we were going to run out the whole package on just one side, this would then be very important, wouldn't it? And it would be absolutely vital that we get the right side right now and that we run just that side and everything's going to go Clear on just that one side. Well, don't let me kid you about this. It could be that running the right side and the right levels and so forth, you don't get a chance to really clear the person because he goes Clear. You don't get a chance to work at it, you know? The needle goes up and sticks and goes up and sticks and blows down more easily and goes up and sticks and blows down more easily and is more easily and more easily and you go up and you try to make the thing stick and you can't make it stick and you can't make it stick and it just seems to blow down. And the first thing, you know, you can't read the meter. Well, I think that'd be a pretty horrible thing to have happen to anybody because you would have cleared somebody by accident. You wouldn't have had to work at it. But you can't always expect that to have happened.
The worse a pc is pushed into this Goals Problem Mass and the harder he is immeshed in it, the less distinct it is to him that either side is real or he's liable to be tremendously fixed in one side and not at all fixed in the other side. And as you run him along the line he just has an awful hard time of it. That's all. They all have hard times of it and somatics at first, but this person just goes along for an awful long time before anything sort of busts up or surrenders.

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

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

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

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

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

Everything either party said, for a long, long period of time, was in total agreement with the other party. See, that was the first condition. And then the game? Why, they were in total agreement on what game they were playing, too. There was still agreement in that warfare they were fighting one against the other, you see and that existed for a long time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You ever stop to think of the fantastic now-I'm-supposed-to's connected into animals? Absolutely crazy. Once in a while you see a cat that won't wash its face. But it's very rare. That's very, very rare.
The now-I'm-supposed-to's. How did those now-I'm-supposed-to's get there? Well, they were specialized forms of self-determined survival that had nothing to do with pan-determinism. They had a great deal to do with other-determinism.

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

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

You're already building up fabulous now-I'm-supposed-to's. Children are not supposed to look at cars, see? They're not supposed to. They're supposed to look up and down before they cross the road to see there are "no cars." See? In the absence of cars, they act. In the presence of cars, they mustn't act. I mean, we're building up quite a hierarchy on the thing. And it's not a very good one. It is pretty wowzy.

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

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

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

So you're looking at a pc whose now-I'm-supposed-to's are shook up like a dice in a box or like Elvis Presley.
These things are just bzzzzz already, see? No, he didn't have any doubt in his mind before you started this or before he was ever audited – if you take a period long before he was ever audited on anything. Auditing in general does these things. And just examine what his conduct was, if you could get a clear picture of it after you shook it up.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But we know for certain one thing about it. That they've got a now-I'm-supposed-to that at a certain season of the year after so many years they're all supposed to go down to the beach and go into the surf on the compass point of north-northwest or something and start swimming and just keep on swimming. Or the butterflies are all supposed to do this or they're supposed to do that. And it doesn't matter how suicidal this thing is. They're all supposed to do it. Well, it's part of some old problem and earlier than that some old game of some kind or another and earlier than that some old agreement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You get the – you get the difference of view here? That's about the – that's about the best breakdown I could give you on the conditions of the problem. Of course, I give these to you in relatively comprehensible attack-defense-retreat lines. But you can easily send a pc up against a job which looks sufficiently big to them and sufficiently impossible to them that all it looks – although it looks not dangerous, it's just too big. And they'll go ahead and work on it and they get no place and you don't make much of a gain and so on.
The odd part of it is, even so, if you kept attacking that particular tremendous amount of spires and everything else, something would happen. You can't do nothing about it. I mean, something will happen. It just won't happen as fast, that's all. It's going to be uncomfortable and it's going to be unreal. And you're going to be provoked because the pc is liable to ARC break more easily. He knows he's being sent up against too many piles of manuscript paper. You know, he, "Yeeeeeex," looks pretty terrific to him. But he'll sit there and go along with it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, in view of the fact that there are confusions back on down the line that tend to bang the pc up on the anatomy of problems, you know, you find the prior confusion to the problem, you tend to move up into the problem. Well, you keep auditing this thing, you keep hitting prior confusions of one kind or another and it tends to bang the pc up toward present time. So the track to him for a while looks shorter and shorter and shorter and shorter and he thinks maybe he was only a waterbuck for one lifetime, you know.

Well, maybe last life he was a waterbuck. Yeah. Only once. And then again this starts to broaden out and he cycles back on the thing. And the next thing you know, he's telling you, "You know, I think I was a waterbuck before they invented this universe." See, you get a variation of the two extremes.
Well, there's no doubt his having been a waterbuck for a very, very, very long time. There's no doubt about that at all. But there's also no doubt about the fact that he might find this too beefy to attack.

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

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

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

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

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

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

"All right. Let's date it."

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

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

Teaching you how to date? Sometimes when I have tried, I think it's impossible. But that's just me being snide. You could learn how to date rather easily. Most of you know how to date on an E-Meter. But I'll tell you, years ago in teaching people how to date on an E-Meter laid in enough overt's and withholds on my part, you see, that I get a weariness when I think of going into it. I think of some student coming here who doesn't know anything about dating on an E-Meter and I think of having to put him through all of the ropes of dating on an E-Meter with his own bank in the road and it makes me tired, that's all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The pc gets this wonderful problem, you know. He's sitting there, he's very happy. He gets this wonderful problem. "Yes, well, how to take the throat out of a waterbuck the most painfully. Aaaaah, yes, as I think most painfully."
And the auditor says, "How might smell be a solution to that problem?"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I can tell you a gimmick, now, which would be an interesting gimmick. If you made a list of the number of goals which the term and oppterm had in common, see – if you just listed that. Or on what points would the terminal and the oppterm be in complete agreement? See, that would be another approach. Or what game – and this would be a latter, more complicated thing and is probably your best entrance because it's more complicated and later, you see. After you're done with solutions to the problem and so forth, if you suddenly said, "Well, now, what game would ..." – it'd be some process which would amplify this, see but – "What game would a waterbuck be likely to play with a tiger and a tiger with a waterbuck?" And you just keep the guy listing games and game situations, of one kind or another and eventually you'd run the center of that track out.
In other words, these are all approaches to shorten up the run on the Goals Problem Mass. But they all presuppose that the thing has already been straightened out and that Prehav runs have more or less got the thing fairly well into perspective for the pc and the pc has gotten over his worse somatics on the situation and the hardest part of the road has already been traveled. Those things presuppose, then you have these other approaches of this particular type.

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

You're trying to establish the pan-determinism of a thetan who has gotten so biased that he can't tell a good action from a bad action because the now-I'm-supposed-to's all fit in this exact pattern and he has some game running here which has amounted eventually to an insurmountable problem which has given him his total package of now-I'm-supposed-to's so that he can't breathe. And hardly anybody has pointed out to him that there haven't been any waterbucks and tigers having a game for some time in these particular climes or that it isn't much of a game or it's a very serious game. And you point out to him, "Well, yes, that's a very interesting game, but I understand you haven't played it for eight lifetimes."

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

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

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

And I could say this state of confusion is well worthy of being straightened out. I think that in itself is a big game.
But these things, when properly found, make up, first, a problem ... You see, of course, a solution when you first look at the pc. Everything he's doing is solutions. You don't see any of the problem. He's solution, solution, solution. And the next thing you see is problem. Problem, problem, problem. And when you get the problem peeled off, what are you going to see? You're going to see game, game, game, game.

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

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

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

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

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

"I went to bed and went to sleep."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.
3D PACKAGES

A lecture given on 19 December 1961

Hi today.

_Audience:_ Hi.

Is there anybody alive? [laughter]

_Audience:_ Yes.

Okay. What's the date?

_Audience:_ December 19.

Nineteenth Dec. Christmas is on its way. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course '61.

Now, there are many vagaries and upsets which you are going through in pursuing your course through the knothole. The course known as from normal up through mere being in hell ... I think Dantes wrote a book sometime or another – a comic book I think it was [laughter] – and he wrote this thing, and apparently they came up through seven levels, and processing wasn't so good in those days. [laughter] And the levels that we're going through – from normal up to merely being in agony – have to do with, well, first hearing about Scientology. That's, you might say, a step. And that's quite an adventure to some people. After they read the RC's accounts of Scientology in Australia or the psychiatrists' ravings over TV on the subject, and so forth. That is a tough one. And that is the period of "Does it exist or doesn't it exist? Is it true, is it not true? Is it a fraud, isn't it a fraud? What is all this enthea I hear? Is there any facts through it?"

Now, factually, for some people, this period – because it matches up with their oppterm and their terminal so nicely, you see – I mean, you got messy collision with these things – this period isn't over until really they hit the Goals Problem Mass with a thud. They're still wobbling, you know. They're still wobbling. Some raving maniac comes along, you know, with his hair standing on end, you know, still with the electrodes from the insane asylum, you know, trailing out behind him, wearing some weskit. In other words, an authority. And he says, "Hubbard is wrong! Ha-ha-ha-ha." And they say, "Well, maybe he is. Maybe he is."

You know, this horrible thought strikes the person, you know? And "This is all a fraud!" you see, and "Maybe it is," you know. And then you read in the newspapers how we have just overthrown the North Pole or some other ridiculous statements, you see?

And then the next co-audit session or something, you get a little somatic, you know.

Somebody says, "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting," you know, or something like that. Something goes *tst*, you know. It's the somatic one's had for some time, you know.
And all of a sudden one remembers some small period of one's life. You know, yesterday, something like that. [laughter] And this is such a startling reality and is a reality of such magnitude that our next and immediate step, of course, is to say, "It's true! It's true! It's true!" You see? Until one hits the next "maybe" in the case, you see?

And all of this is all part of going Clear. Let's just accept it as a fact. As you see people around Central Organizations, PE Courses and your private practice and so forth, just accept it as the fact that they're going to wobble on and off and on and off. There's a great wide plain. They don't know there's any road across it at all.

Of course, it's all marked out. It's got verge, and it's got center lines, and there are lights and traffic signs on it. But they walk along, and they walk straight over the road, and they wonder if there's anything there, you know. And they get off on the plain on the other side, and they don't know if anything is there, and so on.

Well, that's basically because they're searching for themselves. They're not searching for Scientology. Look, they wouldn't stay around that long if they were really doubtful. That's what's interesting, you know. The doubt is mostly verbal.

It's in only a minor percentage expressed physically. Somebody usually succumbs when his family have decided long ago – their option, you see, is a boy or something like that – and they decided long, long, long time ago, you see, that he should go the road, their road. You know, the rougher, the better; and the crazier, the more satisfactory.

In other words, they run a "make fail" on him of great magnitude, you know? And they've always been doing this, and he collides with that one time too often and actually knocks off and doesn't get processed again or something like that.

You can see people disrail this way, but it takes a considerable amount of force and duress to derail them. And all the ravings of the RC and their companions the communists, and other people of this character deter them not at all, really. Some of the biggest upsurges some Central Organizations have ever had is immediately after one of these blasts, you know. And the favorite red rag comes out and says, "The E-Meter is a pile of junk." The subhead of the title should be "Boy! Do we have withholds!" [laughs, laughter]

And this comes out with a crash, and sometimes it has an adverse effect. Sometimes it has no effect. *Time* magazine – I wrote them one time, just to give them an estimate of how well they were read and believed, that as far as I could tell on reviewing Central Organization figures of preclears and students and mail, that not one blast in *Time* magazine had ever affected the Central Organizations of Scientology, plus or minus, by as much as one letter. I thought I'd give them a win. [laughter]

They never answered the letter, you know. They usually do, but they never answered that one. And once here in London somebody came on ITV.

For some years, we have pursued this program. Every time we hear it's going to be shown someplace in the world, we clobber the station and tell them we're going to have thousands of people in their area turn off their sets, and they always buy this and never show it – if we hear of it coming on.
And some psychoanalyst went nattering around one way or the other on the thing – and it was momentarily destructive; for one week nobody walked into the London front door – and then it all came back again. I think you had something to do with that. I mean – and it was all supposed to be in the best of all possible guises, you see. I mean, that was good publicity and it recoiled. Relatively speaking, it was good publicity. But nobody walked in the front door for a week.

But a recent blast at the – in Australia, the recent blasts are so important that students all over the campus – their university paper having published a blast on Scientology – are phoning the Central Organization apologizing for their newspaper. And the person who wrote the article, or one of the people who helped write the article, has been in and signed a full confession voluntarily, and so forth. So that was getting no place.

But their PE has been full to the rafters ever since the stuff appeared. So it doesn't have too much to do with it. You start worrying when there isn't any comment anywhere. That's when you should start worrying, see. Think of the number of philosophies and ideas and thoughts. Think of the number of wild Indians that have come out of India and sat cross-legged in the middle of Times Square in the last eleven years, and we don't know any of them.

You know, we never heard of any of them. Nobody's cussing them out. Nobody's mad at them. They're not getting anyplace, either. One of the penalties of popularity is dodging bullets. And one of the penalties of advancing truth into this aberrated society is dodging avalanches. They'll throw brickbats, pots, pans, and everything else at you because everybody who has a pitch and a curve sees at once his vested interests threatened.

What would happen, for instance, in all hospitals if the public suddenly, en masse, demanded effective medical treatment in every case. Think what would happen. Oh, man! They'd have to sack every medico in the joint. Because they can't deliver.

And so, of course, when we come along with a philosophy of saying everybody should be helped, ooohoo, we're advancing a very hostile philosophy. Very hostile. Because their philosophy is "If we can have an out, we're all right," you see. And one of the reasons we're advancing is we left ourselves no out.

So remember, it's this kind of a society in which the person who first hears of Scientology and goes through his first stages of processing lives in. It's this kind of a society. He's surrounded by people with a vested interest in keeping him crazy, in making a fool out of him, and so forth. He's surrounded by these people.

He also has been many times defrauded. He has parted with money – "Hypnotize yourself and become popular overnight: grow green hair," you know? Or anything like this. So he doesn't know.

Well, don't expect him to know very fast because after the environmental upset goes out, then his own immediate invalidation – which is his Goals Problem Mass – starts going in and out, in and out, and it monitors, to a large degree, his attitude. And his attitude is very definitely monitored by this. I'm going to tell you some more about this. It's quite interesting to you technologically how it does monitor.
But anyway, there might be a long period of this, wishy-washy, "Maybe it's here, maybe it's there, maybe it isn't, maybe it is true, maybe it isn't true. I hope it isn't true, I hope it is true." This might go on for a quite a long period of time before somebody seriously sat down and began the fateful seventy-five hours of Security Checking, Problems Intensives, and things of that character which will lead up to an assessment.

Now, during that period, he wishes to God he had never heard of Scientology. That's one of his frequent reactions. He says, "Well, I just won't be able to tell the auditor in the morning."

He's forgotten this withhold. He's forgotten it utterly. It had never preyed on his mind. All of a sudden the thing has leaped into view, and there he sits with it. Half an hour after the last Sec Checking question, he has suddenly remembered it. It's going to be something on the order of maybe fifteen to twenty hours before his next session.

During those fifteen or twenty hours, of course, he goes through numerous cycles of, "Well, I'll just ... I'll just sit down and I'll just own up, just like that." And then he says, "Oh, but I don't know. I don't know." [laughter]

And there's the question, of course, of what will the auditor do with this. Yes, and other people will hear about it, and so forth. Well, of course, I could answer this from my viewpoint.

I have ceased to worry about anybody talking about my withholds. You know why? Lots of people invent so many withholds for me that I have... [laughter] It's very remarkable, you know. I'm the best-supplied person with withholds you ever heard of. If they only knew what my actual withholds were, their hair would stand on end, probably. [laughter] But it's almost pointless my trying to tell anybody my withholds.

And we used to notice this in the old days, way back, six, seven years ago. Somebody'd come in and he'd sit down with the D of P -- "I see in the Auditor's Code it says that the pc's secrets and so forth... Are you sure you're not going to ... Because I don't want anybody to learn about my flat feet." [laughter] Time after time, you know.

And just in the course of old-time Class I-type processing, day after day, being chewed at one way or the other by this idea or that idea or this mass or that mass, something of the sort, whatever it was. And after a week, two weeks, something like that, the same pc comes in, she sits down, and she says, "Well, my flat feet are certainly hurting these days, you know!" She can be heard out in the hall and upstairs and everyplace else, and she couldn't care less. It's a very remarkable change that they used to experience.

That was my first noticing of this phenomena. Whenever we did have them super-secret, if we were doing a good job of processing them at all, why, they would wind up in a few weeks, they didn't -- couldn't care less.

Now, of course, that period is passed during this seventy-five hour preparatory period. Now, I'm saying seventy-five hours just to give you a unit of time. I don't mean seventy-five hours. Two hundred. Five hundred. Fifty. It depends to such a tremendous degree upon the expertness of the auditor and it depends to an enormous degree upon the depth of curve of the pc.
And remember, you are sec checking up against a Goals Problem package. You've got that package. And if that package has a holder of secrets versus a person who punishes people with secrets, everything that you say to the pc is to some slight degree being interpreted as coming from the punisher of secrets while the pc sits there and flips easily into the valence of the holder of secrets, you see.

So you're going upstairs against this package, anyway. And that could make a long haul. That could make a long haul out of this.

The expertness of the auditor is another factor. An auditor who says, "All right. Now, what have you – what have you – what you have done, here, is the question here, I guess. Print's rather small; can't see very well. Let me get some light on the E-Meter. I don't know if these – this instrument really works. Uh – uh – uh ... Let's see now. What – what's the question here? Have you ever – well, have you ever picked any cherries? Yes, have you ever picked any cherries? Well, have you ever picked ... It says right – right here. I'm not asking you – it says here, so uh... Have you ever picked any cherries? It says," and so forth.

And the pc says, "Well, I knew somebody one time that picked some cherries, and so on."

And the auditor says, "Well, that's good. Thank God that question is clear. Now, let's go on to the next one."

That's going to take a long time. Because part of the long time it's going to take is the number of times the person has had withholds missed on him, has blown, and then has had to get ahold of himself by the collar and bring himself back in and decide that or some other auditor can continue to sec check him. You get the idea?

And he has to face up to it. And do you know that there could be a period of ten years intervening in that seventy-five hours? And I've already seen several years on some cases intervening. You know, they just disappear and go over the hills. And next thing you know they turn up again and say – sit down rather – with a desperate look in their eye. And that time they don't stay either. They disappear again.

And this kind of fluctuation all gets into that seventy-five hours, so it's not a little thing.

All right. They get up to the Goals Problem Mass. Now, how long is it going to take to get a Goals Problem Mass? At the moment that they get all of the elements, they're in better shape than they have ever been in. They're in better shape they've ever been in at the time they get all the elements.

When they got their first level and it's half run, or their second level, and it's all run, they're in worse shape than they have ever been in. It goes from the sublime to the ridiculous. That's such a roly coaster, up-and-down dive on the pc that it's quite remarkable.

And if he's unlucky enough to have these, his oppterm and his term, of fair equality, that they are not too great a difference in them so that you can't differentiate too well between these two things and you have to run it experimentally to see if you turn on somatics, and that sort of thing, or if you do something of this character or you test it out by processing... You
shouldn't have to do this, but frankly in some cases there's no other way. And you test it out by processing, and you run him on a level just to find out what level he's going to come up with and what's going to turn on, of course, he feels horrible if it's the wrong side. He just feels terrible. It doesn't kill him. So what?

But he sure feels bad. And that'll make him feel even worse than running the right side. And he goes on up the line and I would say his first fifteen levels are the hardest. First fifteen levels are the hardest, and then they begin to bite. He doesn't mind, however, when they are biting. It's when he is fighting the shadows that he doesn't like it.

And where he goes from there and how long it takes him to come up at the other end again has a lot to do ... Is he run on these levels? Is he run on these levels with the rudiments in or the rudiments out? That's important because that tells you how long.

How many times is he going to have to retrace these levels? Because you don't run them just once. You get up to a certain number of levels like a dozen or something like this, and sometimes if a case is not progressing too well, six, something like that.

And then you'd assess the levels again. You don't do a new Prehav Assessment. You go over the run levels and find out if any of them still tick. And if that one still ticks, you re-run and flatten that process, and you'll find that button has come up again. So you can continue this rerun process as you run the levels forward by Prehav Scale, you also rerun levels. And you'll every once in a while find that your pc is feeling kind of goofy because the level – that two levels ago – has come alive by virtue of having run the one you had just run.

It wasn't that it wasn't flat when you ran it. You did. You ran it to a flat point, but now you've opened it wide up. And there it is.

It won't assess, particularly, if you go down the Prehav Scale, because it's too weak, but it's still run. And now you have a pc running on one level while another level is alive. And that is what makes a pc feel spinny. Nothing else in 3D makes a pc feel spinny but running on one level while another level which has been run is alive. That's what makes him feel spinny.

He – "No." He wonders if you got the right button. "Is – is – is it the right... Well, I don't know. Isn't there a button on the Prehav Scale called apprehension?" You know, something like this. "Uh... terror maybe. Maybe it's terror. Maybe – maybe the auditor's got the wrong button." Well, it's not "apprehension" or "terror." It's "withdraw" and "communicate" are both alive, and the two between them make, of course, a sort of insanity ridge. And one has come alive after it's been run, and so you've got buttons in that shape. So that particular thing we can take care of. The rest we don't care to take care of except straight on forward.

Pc starts to feel spinny. In a 3D run, you simply reassess. You don't assess for a new level. You reassess the existing levels and find out which one – any one of them, then, that needle reacts at all, you rerun – in sequence. That's the rule.

You don't assess them out for the one that reacts the most. You take them in sequence every time. You go back over and you find out the third level you ran is now getting a stick. So you rerun that level to a stuck. And you find out that the fifth level you ran gets a little, tiny theta bop. Sporadic theta bop. Now it bops, now it doesn't bop, now it bops, now it doesn't bop – something like that, you see. You rerun that level, and then you come back up and
follow them all the way through. Every needle reaction, you flatten the level, and then reassess on the Prehav Scale and continue your run. And all of a sudden it goes much more smoothly.

You eventually get up to the point, regardless of how many levels have been run or how often they have been rerun, or something of this sort, you get up to this point of the thing goes up to stick, but the pc wiggles his nose, and it goes down to Clear read. And then eventually you can't make it stick anymore. Then it just won't go up and stick. It'll just go down to Clear. And from there on it goes out to a float.

Now, there are various ways to accelerate this, and I'm working on some of those accelerative methods, and you are dropping out Security Checking, of course, during a 3D run which is in violation of the basic design of packages, see. Your pc should be getting security checked. But the only Security Checks that will do the pc any good of any kind, whatsoever, of course, are on the terminal and the oppterms.

I was clever enough the other day to dream up a process, of all things, which security checked the terminal and oppterms and the pc, and I'll release that to you. That's an interesting round of roodles. That's basic — it's a — you remember the old mutual motion process which I gave you much earlier?

Well, it's "What's the mutual motion of the terminal" and "What have you done the terminal wouldn't like," and mutual motion of the oppterms. Oppterms, terminals, see? "What is the mutual motion of the oppterms. Well, what about that motion? What have you done that they wouldn't like," you know?

What you're doing is kicking together their moral code. And then, "What's the mutual motion of the terminal and the term?" And "What have you done that they wouldn't like?" And then "What is the mutual motion of you and others?" And "What wouldn't the terminal like about that?" And "What wouldn't the oppterms like about that?"

And that is your formula. That's the extent of the formula. Of course, it goes round and round, and it's all balanced into flows, and it runs off the exact moral codes of the term, the oppterms, and you. Don't you see? So it gives you in essence a Security Check.

This is under test right now, and I don't know quite whether to run it in every other level that is run or every two levels that is run or in a special period, or something like that. I'll have some more data on that and release it very shortly.

But anyway, that gives you a Security Checking boost which should run the run faster. And anyhow, you would have to run it before the person was released off of the thing because it would take all the remaining bits and pieces of the 3D — original 3D package and blow it up on a Goals Problem Mass. It's quite fascinating.

There are a number of these little boosters, by the way. One of them — perhaps you haven't quite understood this. That your Problem Solving Survey — which is what you might as well call this thing, I've had to write it on so many reports that I eventually had to get a name for it to tell the auditor to do it — a Problems Solved Survey is simply "How would you solve problems? How would terminals solve problems? How would oppterms solve problems?" And did you realize that if you kept going on this, and getting a list for you and a list
for the term, and a list for the oppterm, and a list for you, and a list for the term, and a list for
the oppterm, and a list for you, you realize that if you just went around as though it were a
process, you would be running a tremendous differentiation on these three items, and the pc is
never really run on this. And I think you will bear me out in this.

A pc can't have any kind of ... Well, he finds ten or fifteen ways to solve problems that
"you" would solve problems, ten or fifteen ways that the oppterm would solve problems, ten
or fifteen ways that the terminal would solve problems. And you come up at the other end
having had one of these run on you with a better idea of the differentness of these three
things.

And I think you've already experienced that. Well, you keep that going for a little
while, they just tend to shred apart. Because what essentially does an E-Meter register? An E-
Meter registers disagreement. And what are these but disagreements? It shows the basic dis-
agreement between "you" and the terminal, and "you" and the oppterm, and the oppterm with
the term. And it shows these disagreements. It shows wherein they disagree. And that the dis-
agreements are very large, you develop a mass. So if you take anything as massive as the
Goals Problem Mass, you will, of course, wind up with a disagreement as the basis of it, see?

Now, you also ask what goal do they have in common. Here's another one of these
stunts. "What goal do – does 'you' and the terminal have in common? What goal do you and
the oppterm have in common?" What – and you've only run it so far. "What goal does the
terminal and the oppterm have in common," see? Or "What goal or goals do they have in
common?"

When you run this for a little while, you're liable to throw the package. The package –
all of a sudden the pc's attention goes over for the next couple of levels you run almost totally
on the oppterm. Or it comes back very harshly on the terminal. But it dislocates the status
quo. It shakes up the mass, in other words. It gets some more differentiation going and some
recognition of what the mass is all about.

These are two stunts by which that can be done. The Problem Solving Survey and the
goals in common. Now, you also have actions in common, and so forth. And you have this
other one, which is much more important than those as a process which gives you these vari-
ous overts, really overts and withholds from the mores, the exact mores of it.

This is a great gift to you as an auditor because if you were to sit down, you'd take the
pc's terminal – you just never happened to have been acquainted with a snail – some reason or
other, snails have gone one way and you've gone another. And the pc has an oppterm of a
snail. And you going to dream up all out of your wits all of the overts a snail would think he
was capable of in order to put together a Security Check. You're not going to do it, that's all.
Because those things which you would think a snail would consider overts are very often
quite the reverse. Because you're dealing in a sphere which is very difficult to deal in, which
is to say, the exact ideas of the other fellow's terminal.

Now, we can form our ideas of the other fellow's terminal, but they wouldn't be close
enough for a Security Check because the things wrong with terminals is – is they're so differ-
ent. That's what's wrong with them. They are out of agreement with everything under the sun,
moon and stars and have been for trillennia. They have been ages, countless ages, these things
have been wildly out of agreement. How else do you suppose they'd ever hang up in a thing called a Goals Problem Mass? They must have been a – at a disagreement that whole length of time, so how much understanding of these particular items do you think there has been?

Well, there hasn't been any understanding of them. And now we say to the auditor, "Now, just go ahead and understand a snail and dream up an entirety of the mores of a snail in view of the fact that it's your pc's, not your terminal."

Now, the pc could take a stab at it but would inevitably and invariably miss all of the real overts and all of the real withholds because he would not be able to confront any real part of, except on a gradient, the mores of a snail. Because if it's his terminal or his oppterm, well, I'll tell you, it's there and stuck because he has always violated his mores.

That's why you say somebody who has a terminal as "a wife" is very often a lousy wife. Somebody who's got a terminal of "bus driver" is usually a lousy bus driver, if they are ever luckless enough in life to come along as their terminal. You know, the wheels of time go around – roulette, roulette, roulette, roulette – and one fine day the ball drops in the slot which accidentally happens to be the pc's terminal. And he's right there, and he is it. Oh, there'd be nobody more stupid about it than he is.

He could mess it up faster than anybody you ever saw. Although he would apparently feel fine about it, he'd apparently know all the answers, and it would all feel natural. If his terminal was a ship captain, let me guarantee you he'd spend nothing but tangling himself up in hawsers and getting drowned. He would be able to tell you all about ship captaining, and he'd talk a good ship captain, and he'd look like a ship captain, and he'd act like a ship captain, but he'd just keep getting drowned.

Now, in view of the fact that the thetan steers himself in toward the oppterm every time, and the terminal whenever he can make it, we see what kind of a life he has been leading these last many trillennia. It's been a mess. Because there he was always trying to be the one thing he was in total disagreement with. If he had a total disagreement with it, he was going to try to be that, that was all about there was to it.

All right. Now, as you start walking along this track, running up the line, your pc will be, of course, convinced – your early runs of the 3D package – of course, your pc will be convinced, usually, that it is the wrong terminal. If he doesn't have much of a grasp on the situation, he'll tell you it was the right one at first, and then after a few somatics have turned on, he'll decide that the other one would be much more comfortable. Unless he's got an excellent grip of exactly what he is bucking into, he will try to change your mind as an auditor. That's in a large number of cases. Large enough to be very interesting. It's not 100 percent, but it's some big number.

Now, what's this all about? Well, it's just that the person is disoriented in this area, and he is the worst judge. Now, he might be a better judge of the mores of the terminal or oppterm than you are. But let me assure you, he is the worst judge of which is which and what it is all about and which he is. He is the worst judge.

During periods when you're reading off oppgoals and things like that to him, a great certainty of the beingness of the thing will come to him. During a period of listing and as-
assessment, a great certainty will come to him. And maybe for a run or two a great certainty
will be his lot.

And then, of course, he inevitably starts passing through all the maybes. And I don't
think there's a person going to Clear alive who won't spend some time in the middle of the
night, at sometime or another, wondering if that's the right package or if that is his terminal or
if it is all correct, anyway.

Now, some will do it more than others, but you usually get into a lineup on this. And
you as an auditor should be vividly aware of this interesting fact.

The worst judge in the auditing room is the pc. It is not a case of the pc knows. It's the
case of the pc is something on the order of a roll going through the player piano, and that is
the way it is running off. It all depends on whether the air is blowing through the roll or not,
whether you get any music. Hasn't anything to do with anybody playing the piano. And you
would be very stupid and very unkind and even very, very cruel if after you had determined
by all seven types of reaction that this was the pc's terminal, if you then wobbled off the line
and decided it wasn't.

Perfectly all right to run the other side, you see, and find out how the pc reacts on the
other side, if you're not sure and you can't make up your mind. But it isn't all right for you to
wobble because the pc is unhappy about it. That is the last reason you should wobble. Be-
cause he's the worse judge. Although he has been a snail for at least a hundred trillion years,
although this is his most favorite game, and so forth, until you get him well run on the Prehav
levels, you know, he really knows nothing about it. You could go to the Encyclopaedia Bri-
tannica and look up snails and learn more about snails than he ever could tell you any day,
any day.

But then all of a sudden he passes through the not-know barriers, one way or the other,
and he decides to confront this thing, and then of course he becomes a great authority on
snails, and the Encyclopaedia Britannica hasn't anything in it about snails, that's all. It's just
got nothing in it, hardly a thing. And it's true; he will really know about snails.

And it's early in the run, early in the run, this knowledge may turn on flickeringly and
turn off again, and on and off, on, off, on, off. And then eventually it starts coming on. It
comes on very strong and stays on, and then he knows all about it. And at the time when he
starts to know all about it, he more or less stops dramatizing it. He will eventually recover this
fact: that the one series of skills he could not execute were those connected with his oppterm
and his term. That is one zone of skills for the term and one zone of skills for the oppterm that
he is just about as expert as Charlie Chaplin trying to walk a tightrope. He is from nowhere.
This he knows nothing about. He can't do them.

And he himself will not realize this. For a long time he won't realize this. He'll say,"Well, my terminal is a tightrope walker. And, I remember when I was a boy I used to fool
around with tightropes, and go to circuses; always appreciated tightrope walking. I know a
great deal about tightrope walking."

He'll tell you this. He'll think this. And his oppterm is a ringmaster. Well, he can al-
ways shout loudly, and he knows a lot about being a ringmaster, too. And he's got it all set.
And he's sort of convinced in his own mind, you see, at this stage, you know, that he knows something about this and can do those things. A period will arrive in his processing – as you go running levels on the term and oppterm; running levels on his terminal, of course, and the oppterm coming off incidentally – when he will suddenly realize that he has never walked any tightropes for a long time. For the last million years or so maybe he's never really walked a tightrope.

Yet he thought about walking tightropes. He seems to know a lot about it. Yes, he saw tightrope acts. Yes, all these things are true, but the point is the one thing he would never do is walk a straight chalkline on a sidewalk, walk on the edge of anything, walk at any height close to falling off, you know, or walk any line that was off the ground or have anything to do with people who would do it. And that would be one huge zone of existence with which he has no communication. He only has the apparency of familiarity. Here's this tremendous zone he really knows nothing about.

And that comes on about the same time as he finds out something about it. And after this has been run for a while, of course you have your authority.

At the time he really starts talking about this, unimpressively but happily, with great authority and with considerable knowledge, will be after he has recognized that he is at odds with all of these skills and that they are locked out as far as he is concerned. Life has never really permitted him to do these things.

He's tried to do them. He's fallen off his – more tightropes and more high tents than you could easily count, but for the last – for a long time he hasn't done it at all, really.

Now, when the zone opens up, he recognizes that it was a zone of stupidity, not a zone of knowledge. Now, of course, what's interesting is, the same time this opens up to him, he stops dramatizing it and the information becomes available to him.

And that's an interesting phenomena. The information becomes available to him. After all, he did have the information. After all, he has studied it. After all, he has been it. And you have this tremendous fund of information on this particular subject. Now, he could be it well, and you as the auditor could make a mistake at this point.

You could say, "Well, we've certainly gone on and on and on, here, just to get this fellow up to where he can dramatize because he keeps talking about tightrope walking." No, the guy's now interested in tightrope walking. Never really was before. You've got a tremendous zone of data which has been opened to the pc that was never opened to him before, and of course he's liable to err all – a lot of this data and so on. It sounds like he now has really sunk solidly into the valence, to the auditor, see.

My God, this fellow comes walking in, he walks down the hall on a crack on the edge of the rug, don't you see, and he says, well, it's just to show himself that he could. He feels pretty good about it, you know. And he walks in, and you'll notice him balancing before the session. He balances his chair on its two back legs, you know, and so on. And he does interesting things.

And he'll give you all kinds of data about Japanese tightrope walking. How, that's not quite the thing. You know, that's not quite right because they use these balance poles, and...
they're leaded in the ends, and that's just cheat, you see. See? Because who could fall off a
tightrope with a long balance pole with lead in both ends of it, you see. He'd be very authori-
tative on the subject.

You make your mistake. When the information opens up to the pc, it is not informa-
tion he is longer going to dramatize. The more he knows about it, the less he dramatizes it, the
more he can do it. And you will see all that unfold before your eyes.

But he will actually enter... And it looks like he's introducing some of these things into
his life. And you say, "Well, he's really sunk now."

No, only thing he's doing, he's making up for the absence of them. He can accept these
things along with the other things which he already has had. And it's sort of a beautiful feeling
of freedom to him to be able to string up a tightrope in the backyard.

"Hey, what do you know? Ha-Ha-Ha. I can string up a tightrope. Pretty good, you
know."

You'd say, "Boy, this guy's gone around the bend. There he is stringing up tightropes.
We found this terminal, 'tightrope walk.' We run it for fifteen levels, and here he is stringing
up tightropes, and be breaking his neck and enrolling in a circus next."
No, he won't. He will
neither break his neck nor will he enroll in a circus, but he's liable to put up a tightrope just to
show that he can confront it, you know? Because it's such a pleased, wonderful feeling, you
know.

Or let's say his terminal was a goldfish, and you're liable to find him down at the
aquarium. Going down to the aquarium and saying, "Gee, you know. Gosh, you know. Look,
I can confront the little bastards." [laughs, laughter]

You know, anything like that. But what he does is express relief, and the return of in-
formation is actually return of a zone of activity, return of an enormous zone of activity. And
he has been barred out of it for trillennia, and he has never been happy in it.

And it's a great feeling of relief to be able to get into communication with it. Well, the
case is three-quarters cracked when that occurs. You want to know how fast somebody is go-
ing Clear, well, there is that exact point on any line.

Now as you move up further – it's mostly needle phenomena – but you'll find out that
the pc's intelligence, his ability to inspect and grasp ... I don't care what it reads on IQ sheets.
I just couldn't care less because an IQ sheet is actually too limited to tell you, really, what the
increase of IQ is. His ability to perceive, absorb, and apply information is enormously in-
creased.

You'll see this constant and continuous increase from there on out. That's your next
noticable phenomena. He'll take up studies of some kind or another. He'll start studying
something, and he'll come up with conclusions that nobody's ever concluded before. Things of
this sort. He'll have a better grasp of the immediate situation. And he starts to get busy, he
starts to get busier.

And you'll have trouble keeping the rudiments in all through this period that I'm talk-
ing to you about because he confronts the zone with beautiful freedom, you see, and runs into
something he shouldn't – thinks he shouldn't be confronting, and he doesn't know whether he should or shouldn't. He's falling off of the wagon. He's getting back on the wagon again. He's trying to adjust himself in life and trust himself in the environment in which he lives all through this period.

So the rudiments are, if anything, harder to keep in late in a run. But you won't notice that they're harder to keep in sometimes because they can be knocked in so easily. You get so that you can put the rudiments in more easily and you don't realize how wildly they are going out.

So don't develop any contempt for rudiments toward the end of a run. They have to be put in much more frequently, much more often and much harder. They go out so easily. The person's colliding with life, it looks strange, and it looks different to him, and he is an impact. Not so much here, but if you were clearing somebody in Pretoria, you might find yourself in – well, he's in collision with the society. And society doesn't much like what's happening to him. You know, there'd be a member or two around invalidating him or something of this sort.

It's always a good idea to get possibly – you see, the personnel around the pc doesn't even have to be invalidating the pc for the auditor to take action on it. You recognize that? That it is a fruitful source of upset to the pc. So fruitful and can cause an auditor so much wasted auditing time, that an auditor is actually foolish not to make some sort of an effort to get the pc temporarily and momentarily out of an un-restimulative environment while certainly running – assessing and running the Goals Problem Mass. Certainly it's a wise thing to do. And if there are possibly restimulative personnel around, even though these restimulative personnel aren't actually chopping up or doing anything much to the pc, and the pc's case is not going well or something like that, one of the measures you can take is just advise him very frankly to remove himself momentarily from such contact, you see, until he finishes his auditing.

Otherwise, you'll find that toward the end of cleared run you get stalled and you won't be able to tell exactly how you're being stalled. But you're being stalled because his collision with the society, constant comments on people telling him he looks different, that he acts different. He tells them about things they never heard of before. He says, "Well, I remember the last time I was out here, I was with the Mormon army, and we were coming out here," and his lack of caution on the thing has permitted him to say this at a dinner party, you see.

And then he's more perceptive, so at once he realizes that the hostess and three or four other people at the table have realized that he'd gone around the bend.

He doesn't invalidate himself so much, but he becomes a little upset about it. And then he begins to wonder if he could live in this society if he were really sane. And then he invalidates going Clear, and so on. And that, by the way is a good point.

Now, the next thing that you want to take up along this line is the willingness to be Clear. Now, although this might have been cleared up with the pc back during the Sec Check period, the willingness of the pc to go Clear when the first Goals Problem Mass hits the pc is
probably very great because, "Good God, this much mass certainly has been doing me no good," and he gets explanations in all direction, but then he gets a secondary reaction.

He's not quite sure, and that's about all that's expressed. He's just not quite sure. And you'll get invalidations of going Clear off of him. He'll say, "Oh, I'm not quite sure."

Now, there's a bigger one follows this that is a real crasher. And it's liable to happen. And it's probably happened to some cases here, and you should look at – for this rather constantly in running the goals problem thing. Keep alert to it as a factor.

He's not sure that he wants to get rid of this game. Now, I refer you to lectures clear back in June, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, on the subject of "It's the Only Game." And he goes through a period of its being the only game. And, of course, that is what is wrong with him, the idiot. He can't have even that as a game, so he is not in a games condition. He's technically in a games condition, yes. But his actual condition in life is a no-games condition. And he's so fixated on this game of the snail, you see, that he can't conceive of any other game. He has to start sticking his head out of his shell.

And he has arrived at a point where he is not at all sure that there are any other games, but he is perfectly sure that there is a game called being a snail.

And his new reality on this game called being a snail causes him at once to try to put on the brakes and saying, "If I lose this game, I will lose everything because where would you be if you couldn't be a snail," you know. "What if you forgot to be a snail after this? Just what would you do for a shell?" [laughter]

Lots of puzzling things are stirring in the reactive bank at this time.

And you get these expressed as invalidations of going Clear. Naturally, he never sees this other more interesting point. The other more interesting point, of course, is that if he weren't so confounded fixated on being a snail, he could even be a snail. That's what's interesting. He could even be a snail. He's never achieved that yet. So his unwillingness to give up a game he hasn't got is, of course, the purest of idiocy. But it's a reactive combination which a pc goes through.

You'll find almost any pc who is making good progress will hit this thing. And it's so much so, that if a pc doesn't hit this at some time or another, I would start wondering if he was running the right terminal or oppterm or missing the commands, or if I was running it all with the rudiments out, or something. I would start asking questions. It would be one of my indicators as to gain. The all of a sudden feeling of "Oh, I don't know. Just think of that. No shell, you know. You know I'd be awfully unsafe not to have a shell. I don't know if I should want to go Clear or not."

And this varies on the other side of it, "Well, if I run this any further, I might become so free in it that I might actually become a snail, and wouldn't that be horrible?"

That would be the most ghastly thing he could think of during this particular period, you see? What if he did become a snail, you know? And if he takes these withholds off from becoming a snail, of course, somewhere up the track it is a wide open pit hole, you see. He's
liable to just go crawling along and fall right in to it unless he keeps these barriers up, unless his whole life is filled with signs saying "Hole in road," why, he won't be able to live.

But, of course, have you ever tried in one of these one-way-street cities to get anywhere? You know, you drive up the one-way street and down the one-way street and back down the one-way street, and you find yourself on the first one-way street again. And you say, "Well, I didn't intend to be here, I wanted to be at the City Hall." So you'll ask a cop, and you say, "How do you get from here to the City Hall?"

And the cop thinks it over for a long time and thinks over all the one-way signs that are pointing between here and there, and then he eventually looks at you, and he says, "Well, you can't get from here to there."

So here's your pc living this kind of a life, you see. It's nothing but one-way-street signs and on both ends of the block you have signs pointing to the middle of the block one-way streets, see?

And if he didn't have all these, he might become a snail. So it's very important to stay in the middle of the rat race. That condition and consideration hits him rather constantly. It may hit him hard. It may hit him harder than you think.

Now, a piece of technical data is, an invalidation of a terminal or other 3D part reacts similarly to the 3D part. An invalidation may act similarly. The 3D part rock slams, the invalidation of it will rock slam, no matter how tiny the slam is.

So whatever the invalidation is, it's easy to locate because all you have to do is get some part of it reading or just remember how it read, and then ask him for people who have said things about it until you get that little rock slam. And then follow that right on down, and you'll find invalidation of the goal, invalidation of the terminal, invalidation of the oppterminal, invalidation of the modifier – find something there – or invalidation of going Clear. And all of these things will read the same as the package.

Why does it read the same as the package? Because it's activated the package. That's why. So it reads back as the package.

There are only a few things that ever read the same. The six parts of the 3D package all read the same. If you consider that the opposition terminal has its own goal in addition to the opposition goal or six parts.

They will all read the same. They will read equally plus the Prehav level. And the hot Prehav levels always read the same as the package. So all those are equal reads.

And an invalidation reads along with that package. Interesting thing for you to know if you're looking for some guy who all of a sudden has decided he doesn't want to go Clear. All you'd have to do is, "Who said that? Who didn't want that? Who has talked to you about this? What have you hit? When did you think of that?"

And all of a sudden you'll turn on the same needle reaction as the whole package gives, you see, or any item in the package gives. Follow that needle action down, and you'll have the invalidation of it right on the button. Nice thing to know.
All right. Now, with all of these ramifications and rolly coasters and bad spots, and so forth, it is odd that the pc continues to be interested at all. This is remarkable but is part of the package.

His attention is so bound up in the package that he will only get disinterested if his attention is yanked too violently off of the package during session or he is put into braces about this all.

"All right. You're a snail. Well, you can act a lot differently in life. Just look at all this life that is going on around you, and so forth, and we don't care whether you're a snail or not."

Somebody knowing about this and using it in an argument with him, something like that, yanks his attention, rather violently, off of the subject, and so forth. It's attention off that keeps the fellow from going Clear, not attention on. Attention on continues him on toward Clear.

All ARC breaks that you've ever had with a pc is attention off the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, patching up is another phase that is with us temporarily, but there are people around who have gone Clear on 3D. And there are people around who have had their goals and terminals found and who have been partially run on Routine 3. Did I say 3D a moment ago? I meant 3. Excuse me.

And it is necessary that this all be put together on a Routine 3, and I will tell you briefly how to do this.

In the first place, it is probably hard to do to get them to go ahead and get it done. That is probably hard because they feel good, they feel better, and they have had the first blush bloom of interest taken off of it all. They may, if they've gone Clear, have had the whole cotton-picking Goals Problem Mass keyed out, and it's sitting over there half a light year away. And they may not contact it for another century. But there it is, and they think this is just fine, thank you. They're just not interested in anything else happening.

Of course, such a person is a liability. He's a Keyed-Out Clear.

Well, now, how do you put such a person back together again? He's been cleared on Routine 3, and we're going to clear him on 3D. What is going to happen in the process of doing this?

His first goal, you take a piece of paper ... This is the way you do it. I'll just give it to you exactly as I would do it. You take a piece of paper, and you write down his first goal found, and you write down the first terminal found. And you write down the second goal found, and you write down the second terminal found. And you write down any other terminal or goal that was found in the process of cleaning up this case. And you write them all down on the same sheet of paper. You get the rudiments in with a crash. And then you find the modifier to the first goal that is a likely specimen. And if the following, right after this, doesn't happen by reason of having found the modifier, then you take another goal that has been found in the clearing, and you find the modifier of it. And you find the modifiers and repeat modifiers until you've got a nice, sticky, collapsed bank.
And then you check out everything that has been run on the pc until you've got five or six pieces. And then you assemble your 3D package, and that's really all there is to it. Because, of course, the first time they found a goal on him, they probably found his goal. Who knows? The first terminal, if he went Clear, was undoubtedly his terminal. Otherwise, he wouldn't have gone Clear on it.

But the next goal found was very probably his oppgoal or something of the sort. The next terminal was possibly the oppterm, and we don't know what was found from that point on, don't you see? It got keyed out enough so that he could actually run the oppterm off at a far distance and key it out, too.

What you want to assume is, in straightening out a Routine 3 Clear, is that all parts have already been found except the modifiers. So your main task and your main difficulty is getting the needle to slow down and read any and do anything. That's your main difficulty, is getting a needle read. And you do that by finding modifiers.

And they will cheerily give you this modifier or they may not so cheerily give you this modifier. And if you haven't got any slowdown on the needle for that modifier, well, let's take the next goal or some other goal that was found on him because usually several goals were found on him and several terminals. Let's find a modifier to that goal and a modifier to the next goal and a modifier to the next goal until we just slow that thing down to mud.

Then they say, "But that beautiful needle. It was so floating clear and I felt so good. Damn you." You know?

And you say, "That's fine. Thank you very much. It will all come out all right in the end."

Say something platitudinous and hold him in the chair, and you've got a needle that will read again. That's your main problem is getting the needle to read. Now, you've got the thing reading, now take all the parts you've got and assemble the 3D package out of those parts. And you do that, of course, by just checking them across until you get five things that equal read, and so on. And then you find out which he was. And you do a problems solving survey as to how they would solve problems, and this one, you and the oppterm, and you eventually select out your – what would probably be your terminal, and you look for your other indicators. And then you just clank into it and run it.

Now, if you're lucky enough to have all of their records available, you also run that terminal on the first level it was ever run on, but with the commands of 7 December 61. You rerun all the levels ever found on it, too. In fact, your work has all been done for you actually, if you know how to do it right.

Now, you do the same thing in a patch-up of a Routine 3.

This fellow has been running forever on his first goal and first terminal. Well, assume it's probably the oppterm. See, otherwise – otherwise, he wouldn't have run forever, don't you see? So just assume it was. And you'll probably be right, see? It's already been tested by run. Oh, it hadn't done him any harm.
You'll find when you get the Goals Problem Mass, it cleans up faster because it's full of Swiss cheese holes already, you see.

All right. Now, he's also conditioned into running it. Nothing can faze him now. Use that, find the other parts of the 3D package from the first part.

But let me tell you now something about the importance of the modifier. Now, the modifier isn't just found for the hell of it. You will eventually use the modifier. As a matter of fact, I've got a package of commands right now where the modifier is used as one of the commands, and so forth. It hasn't been tested out, and so on, but there are a lot of possible uses for the modifier. But this is for sure the use of the modifier.

You can accurately find your pc's terminal if you've got a modifier because it limits the number of terminals. The modifier – the presence of a modifier tends to limit the number of terminals which follow those exact specifications to the pc. Otherwise, you could have a list of a thousand terminals.

If you have the pc's goal and modifier, you have a list of maybe only ten or twenty, if it's the right modifier, and so forth.

Well now, that's assessment use of the modifier. The next use of the modifier is also in assessment, which is this: If you have the pc's modifier, you must realize that you have in your lap a description of the pc in-session every time the rudiments go out. This totally describes the pc in-session.

Now, if it's a raving mad modifier, you know – "and I'll kill everybody – and I will attack and kill everybody in sight" – let's say that was the modifier. Of course, you are the auditor, and every time you have thrown the rudiments out, he has, of course, instantly attacked and killed everybody or tried to, see? Verbally. True it's only verbal because it now is no longer sufficiently hidden to do it in fact, see? Indifferently in view, one of these 3D parts won't really get well dramatized. But that was his behavior in session.

All right. Supposing you had a pc with a modifier – "I'll cry and cry until they let me have my own way." Wouldn't that be marvelous? You'd have a pc that was always in grief. If the rudiments went out, the pc would go into grief.

Pc comes in with a present time problem, you don't take it up or clean it up, the pc cries. You think you're running a grief charge. You're not running a grief charge. You're running a modifier.

And you could take this up forever because the only thing that'll discharge the modifier is the Goals Problem Mass itself, but that means a whole 3D run. And you're going to run that on a present time problem? Oh, no, you're not.

So the pc... There's the basic rule of this. Now, why? The modifier is that part of the 3D package which dictates reaction to failure. This is how he's going to get even. This is how he's going to react if he fails. This is his conduct in case the goal won't stick. If the goal won't stick ... See, if he can't make the goal stick, he makes the modifier stick.

Now, he doesn't so much dramatize his goals. He dramatizes this modifier. The modifier, if you noticed on assessment, was much more deeply buried than the goal and therefore
much more dramatizable. So if your pc's modifier is "and I'll go straight up in the air and ..." It doesn't matter what it is. The pc is going to do something that approximates that modifier. And suppose it's something on the subject of "and if they don't do it I will just get up and leave and show them." And you'll have a pc that will blow session, walk to the door, show you something, and go out. [laughter] Every time.

And you could actually detect the pc's modifier, but it would be a wild thing to try to get it, and it's no type of assessment, but I'm just showing you the longbow. You could certainly make a good guesstimate of a pc's modifier as to his session conduct. This is the way it happens in session. If the rudiments go out, this is what he does. Therefore, his modifier is: ...

See, you could just say those things just one, two, three.

Well, the misemotionalness of the pc on this subject or the upset of the pc is simply not having been able to make any progress on the thing. And he feels that he's been handed a failure, and he conceives himself up against an enemy. You at that moment are the oppterm no matter what his oppterm is. He's got you identified with it. And he will even in his speech – you can sometimes weed out some of the wild statements pcs make, actually make very good sense after you know their oppterm or their terminal or something. It just makes very good sense. You know exactly what they were talking about now.

"And you can put that in a pot and boil it," you see. "You'd be pretty good at pressing my pants, but you certainly wouldn't be any good" – he's saying this to a male auditor, you see – "you certainly wouldn't be any good at auditing me."

You know, if you had records of all this, you could almost guess at the fellow's oppterm, you see. Oppterm possibly wife or something like this. It'll be some conduct – or cook or something, see.

It's very interesting that session conduct is based on the 3D mass. You'll get very good reality on this. And then you'll get good reality on how this 3D has influenced the fellow's life if even in an auditing session he dramatizes parts of it even after they've been found. Well, that is quite remarkable. That is very remarkable. So the modifier is very valuable to know in an assessment because you can always make the meter read if you can get the modifier repeated.

Now, this is very cute. Now, I give you this weapon with some diffidence because somebody, sooner or later, is still going to shortcut the weapon. He's just going to use the weapon, not get the rudiments in and then use the weapon, you know? You can make anybody's needle read if you know the modifier and if it's the right modifier.

The reason ARC breaks don't register on the E-Meter is that an out rudiments cause the modifier to go into action which then, if it has a denyer, a comm lag, a bouncer, a down bouncer, or anything of the sort, is dramatized by the pc, and he leaves the zone of attention, so nothing said to him after that registers on the meter. And that's the exact mechanic of an E-Meter not registering on a pc. And that's the only instance where an E-Meter doesn't register on the pc is when the modifier goes into action. Well, the modifier goes into action because the rudiments go out. So the rudiments go out, so the pc has been handed a failure.
There is a failure in life. What is a denumerator to the beginning rudiments of a session. Failure in life. Failure at the project that he's working on. Isn't that right?

Auditor's supposed to be auditing him, and instead of that, why, they're talking about something else, you see. And he's supposed to be getting an assessment, and they're doing something else. And he comes into the session and he has a PTP, but the PTP has to be run, and you have to handle the PTP, and you can't help but handle the PTP, and you would be shot if you didn't handle the PTP, but it is an ARC break if you do so because he wants to get auditing

All right. So you go ahead and handle it, and all of a sudden you – you handle it. You handle it all right, but for some reason or other, the thing just disappears, and then the lists are kind of null. And nothing assesses out on the lists. What's this? Well, you didn't handle it all the way. You handled it only up to the point where it kicked in the modifier. And the modifier has now kicked in in its full action, and so the meter doesn't register because the modifier is alive, and that's all you can say about it. Very amusing.

Now, let's give it much more succinctly, you see. The modifier is "I'll leave." Pc has an ARC break, you ask him if he has an ARC break, the needle doesn't register. Why doesn't it register? He's left. Remember you're auditing a theten. You're not auditing a body. This would absolutely amaze a psychologist because, of course, the person is still in the chair. Oh, are they?

Now, a modifier can reactivate the bank in such a way as not-know anything which is a method of leaving knowingness. And actually a modifier can influence the reactive mind. And it can actually influence the E-Meter which is really fantastic. But you would expect things like this if you were handling the package, which if cleared up would clear somebody, or which the person has – which does explain their behavior, sicknesses, and everything else. If all of these things are explicable by the package, of course, everything else is explicable by the package such as their electronic pattern reaction.

Now, a pc who goes out of contact with the body whether by more deeply interiorizing into it, leaving the epicenters, departing from it to a point of nullness in the head, just sort of giving up and going blank – we don't care what – you'll get no activation of the whole reactive bank, which is pretty terrific, to show you the value of the modifier.

So his "I'll leave and never find out about it," let's take a modifier like that. Now, that's really nice, isn't it? It's got a bouncer, and it's got a denyer connected with it, and your meter will go null on it.

So the rudiments are out? So the favorite check for rudiments in of course is to check a 3D item. You want to know if the rudiments are in, check a 3D item. Say his terminal to him twice. Say his terminal to him. "Snail, snail." Got a reaction. Fine. Rudiments are in. That's elementary, isn't it?

So if you really were alert in a session, you'd say, "Well, all right. We'll begin the session now and so on and so on. Everything fine," And go through your ARC break routine. You know, I mean, "Talk to me." "Snail, snail. All right." And no reaction.
Oh, well, brother, let's roll up our sleeves. There's no run today. This kind of an attitude, you see. Let's get this thing back in action. Let's get the rudiments in.

But "snail" reacted? One of the parts of – it's any part of the 3D package, you see. The oppterm, anything. All right. Kick, kick. So you hit the next part of the rudiments, brrrrt, hit the next part of the rudiments, brrrrt, next part. Now, run your bracket commands. Here we go. See, you're to it within a minute. Within a minute after you find the terminal is reading, you should be auditing, because the rudiments aren't out. They're in. You hardly even have to watch the meter to see if you got a knock on the thing.

The thing is sufficiently in to run, so run it. Don't waste any time with it.

But "snail" didn't register. Oh. Let's say you were assessing, and this catastrophe occurred. And you did have a part. You had already found the oppterm, so you said to him – this was a snail, you know – and you said, "Snail, snail."

Well, now, let's go to work and find the ARC break and find the havingness situation, and let's find the present time problem, and let's get it all squared around. And let's see if we get a read that way. If we do, we're good. Pat ourselves on the back. We're pretty good. We're pretty good. Because we got the rudiments in, in spite of the modifier which we know very well was kicked in.

And if we don't have the modifier yet, we better look for it. We better get the goal and get the modifier. Old 3A style if this kind of – if this is the kind of assessment that is going on. Let's get the modifier as soon as we possibly can get the modifier before we monkey with anything else, because it's going to take us forever to get other things.

And after we've got the modifier, we're looking for the oppterm. Or we're looking for the terminal, let's say. And we're looking for the terminal, so we say – we've got the oppterm – "Snail, snail." No read.

But we found the modifier which was "and get the hell out of here." So we say, "Snail, snail." No reaction. No read. Let's get the rudiments in as very best as we can. Let's take it up. Let's get the pc willing to talk to us. Let's get all the rudiments in and then let's throw him a real curve.

And let's say to him, "And get the hell out of here. Thank you. And get the hell out of here. Thank you. And get the hell out of here. Thank you. And get the hell out of here. Thank you." Your needle will be reading. Elementary, my dear Watson. You kick out the bouncer.

But remember the bouncer won't kick out if your rudiments are out. If the rudiments are severely out, you've actually got to get the rudiments in before you can kick the bouncer out. But it's just that last little touch that brings the needle back to a hot read.

Now, let's say we're assessing very well, and we've just had a beautiful mark here, and this one was live, and this one was live, and this one was live, and they were all live.

And we go back over the top of the list again. It was only ten items we got there, and that's awful easy and we go over the top of this thing again. And we say, "Snail, waterbuck, izzard." Whatever it is, you know. And wait a minute. There were two of them there alive and they're now null. And then we say, "Lion. Tiger. Waterbuck." They're still all null. Well, we
either have the thing, and we've either knocked it in so we finish the rest of the list. And if they all went null, well, it either isn't on the list or the meter's gone null. But any time you think the meter's gone null, quote a known, tested part of the package.

You already found the oppterm? All right. "Tiger. Tiger. Tiger, tiger." You get a kick? Rudiments are in. No kick? Oh, well, here we go. And if we were reading along nulling list and we just didn't have time to clean up rudiments, we would be tempted, of course, to say to the pc, "And get the hell out of here. And get the hell out of here. And get the hell out of here. And get the hell out of here." Kick, see. "And get the hell out of here." Needle kick. Finish the rest of the list. Crude but effective. Best thing to do is to get the rudiments in and then do it. But this is why people's needles go null. And that is an important piece of technology for you, a auditor. Very important.

I think you will find this bears out very, very well, bears out extremely well over a long period. The trick is, do you have the right modifier. Now, if you've got the oppgoal and you're calling it the pc's goal, and you get a modifier to the oppgoal, and then nothing happens with this trick, it's the oppgoal. There is probably something wrong with it there. Because it doesn't have the effect on the pc. And you could usually prove out a modifier: Is this what the pc does when he has an ARC break in session? That kind of proves out the modifier. Does the pc show any shadow of this? Is there anything like this around?

All right. Well, that is the way you patch 'em up when you've already got 'em, you got parts of it. But your interest on the thing is to keep a person who has started in with Scientology and into auditing going. And the best way to keep him going at this stage of the game and today is, of course, to tell him the truth. Tell him where he'll wind up and where he's got to go.

And you'll find people will believe the truth if it's the truth. Not to kid him along or cajole him along. Just make a good statement of where they're going, and what they'll probably go through and what will probably happen to them, and what probably they will – and how they will wind up. Give them some kind of a notion of this.

They get a reality on that because it is the truth. That's the most reason they get a reality on it. And you'll find that trying to soften the track for a person, trying to soften it all up and say, "Well, it isn't very tough, and there isn't very anything. It's very easy, and all you have to do is push button A and then you get button B, and so forth. All you've got to do is this and this and this. And that's very simple. There's nothing much to it. That's all."

You give him a lose. You better tell them the truth in the first place.

The truth about Scientology today includes this interesting fact. Johannes Q. Glip comes in his wheelchair into the front of the Central Organization, and he says, "Well, I don't know. That last auditing wasn't any good. I still have the pain in my head."

A truthful auditor would say, "What was your last auditing?"

"Well, I was being security checked, and I had a Problems Intensive, and that should have taken care of the whole thing"
Tell him cruelly but very truthfully, "That somatic in your head? That isn't going to clean up until you're Clear. We can make it less. We can make it more comfortable, but it will turn up higher than that before you're Clear. Only one known way to take it away forever, and that's to clear you. There isn't any way else. We can key it out, but we can't guarantee that it will stay out. It could go out and go in. We can make you feel happier. We can make you feel better. We can get you over having an itchy tip to your nose, or something like this. But you're worried about basic and fundamental problems such as weight, worried about problems such as migraine headaches. We can key these things out. We can make you feel much better, but it'll probably turn on again before you're Clear. And the only time it'll ever turn off is after you've gone through the Goals Problem Mass."

They'll say, "What's that?"

"Oh, well, that's what you go through that you would feel many times while going through it that you would be better off dead. And it's probably true."

You needn't be quite so cruel, but you could err on the side, "Well, it's very simple, and there's nothing to it."

Then the person's expectancy isn't up to what he meets.

The Goals Problem Mass gives you many interesting phenomena. The story of the amount of phenomena which turns on during a Goals Problem Mass is a long story. There are many weird phenomena, such as when you're running pictures and engrams, of course, you're supposed to sit there seeing pictures and engrams. And the person running the Goals Problem Mass doesn't see enough pictures to put in your eye on the first dozen levels.

And then he keeps telling you, "Well, I don't get any pictures," and then you find out he's been getting entirely different pictures on his last two levels than he ever got before, but he can't see them very well. And he's giving you the same problem over and over and over on question one. It's always the same problem no matter what he is running. It's always the same problem. And after you've run fifteen levels, he all of a sudden comes up with a different problem. Well, what do you know? You've had a change.

And these black masses all of a sudden turn into pictures, and different parts of the track suddenly start appearing that you've never seen before. Various tricks of mass, cold waves, somatics, pains in back, various other types of things that turn on – all quite standard. And I'd say to this degree that if they're absent, there isn't anything happening.

But actually the phenomena of all of this is quite a story in itself. I could talk for quite a while on just the phenomena connected, and sensations and that sort of thing, with Clearing, and those indicators.

That wasn't what I've been trying to tell you about in this lecture. I've been trying to tell you the person's general reaction and pattern and ways and means of steering it off or anticipating it while they were going through from the first contact with Scientology and through Clear. And I hope I've given you a little data on this which can help you and possibly, in looking at yourself, you get a better reality on what people are going through.
And people going through this line, if you understand what they are going through, will have a great deal more confidence in you because you're telling them the truth rather than patting them on the back, and so forth.

Don't ever try to lighten it up. Play it on the other side if you have to. Don't rave about it and scare them to death. Every once in a while you have a pc sit down in the auditing chair. And he's very worried. He hasn't got all of his Goals Problem Mass yet. And he's auditing somebody on it, and then he comes around and starts to go through it himself, and he gets apprehensive.

Or he has had no familiarity with it, and he gets his whole package, and he thinks everything is fine, and then he is almost eaten up with apprehension about it. He doesn't quite know what the devil he's going to run into next. He expects everything will happen at once. He's usually quite disappointed that it takes many levels before very much happens.

His somatics are slow and painful and crummy, and he gets up in the morning, and he looks in the mirror, and he looks like the same person. Trouble is he can't look in the mirror on Day 1 and Day 10 as a consecutive look, see? If he did that, he would see a difference. But instead of that he looks on Day 3 and Day 4. He looks no different that he can tell. Same hollow-eyed, baggy, his own old self. [laughter] But the expectancy is quite high, and what is viewed is this and it's that.

But you're on a road which the further you advance on it the better reality you get on it. There isn't any question in your mind but what you are going someplace, and that something is happening, and so on.

And then, of course, there's those four levels where all cognitions turned off. Not a single cognition for four consecutive levels. You didn't even think of a thing, after absolutely just thinking your brains out for several levels, marvelous, you know, marvelous. Then four levels just plug, plug, plug, and then nothing happened. And then all of a sudden on the fifth level, why, it's all cognitions again, you see. And it's all different.

Change is the main thing. Does the person change as he goes along? Does he make gradual progress forward? My greatest test for whether or not the person is on the right road: Are they looking better and feeling worse? [laughter, laughs] If they're looking worse and feeling better, I get suspicious. We must be running the wrong side.

No kidding, though. Appearance to me is my best test because I'm pretty good at observation. I can usually look at a person and tell them they're running the right side or the wrong side. And then they expect me to give them fancy reasons why, so I fool them, I tell them.

I tell them some reasons why, but it was because I looked at them. That's why.

I say, "Uh-uh. Uh-uh. Uh-uh. No, no, no, no. No pc of mine ever developed a brilliant green skin." [laughter]

Well, anyhow, that's the way it goes, and that's the anticipatory line, and you yourself add a great deal of subjective reality to this particular item and these various items. But it's a road which is now a pretty well plotted road and which I hope many can travel. It's not a sim-
ple road. It requires much greater technical skill than we have ever before had to deliver and much upgraded from anything we ever had thought necessary.

Well, it just makes it tougher on the auditor. It just makes it necessary to do more teaching. It makes it necessary for all of us to be more careful as to who uses it. What audits it. What audits what. You got the idea? And that we get this thing lined up and get its ethical level fairly high, and stamp like mad on illegal uses that will louse up people – which they can easily do with these processes, and we just have to be more alert to that – and we'll all make it one of these days, I think. You're teaching me that everyday, for which I thank you.

Thank you.
I think that was a very good way to start this thing. Hurry up and get your Class IIs. In fact, some of you could even get your Class Is. [laughter] I won't say that. I shouldn't say that. That's cruel. Actually, I don't feel that way at all.

Now, I've practiced enough for the Washington Congress, so I'll sit down. 20 Dec., AD 11. Shortly be AD 12. Time marches on.

Now, I told you everything there is to know, and there's nothing new that you don't know, and you've got it all taped now and straight, and you're right up there.

Now, the dynamic principle of existence – I'll tell you some data you're not familiar with – the dynamic principle of existence is survive. The cycle of action is create-survive-destroy. Axiom 1 is ...

[laughs]

Now, a lot of things come up in running of 3D and the handling of 3D, and the first and foremost thing that shows up on the handling of 3D is the lack of basic skill. That is the first thing that will startle you. And therefore, I'm going to talk to you today about the handling of groups and the training of auditors in an area, the handling of auditors in Central Organizations, and so forth. In other words, upgrading auditing. And that would be, I suppose, an appropriate title of this lecture – is "Upgrading Auditing."

Now, the first thing we have to realize is that most people have a considerable diffidence about tampering with the human mind. This is the overall majority of Homo sap today, is oppressed by a feeling that he must not inquire into the other fellow's wits. This effectively keeps him imprisoned and in the bird cage.

No better mechanism could possibly be devised to keep a race enslaved than: "One must not tamper with anybody else's thinkingness."

In other words, take no responsibility for anybody's thinkingness but your own and take no responsibility for that, and then you will nicely stay in every implant you have ever been handed. And all of your now-I'm-supposed-to's can be counted on to function and particularly, and may I give you a little slice of galactic council thinking, then and only then can you be absolutely sure that no revolt or menace will ever come out of a planet. If you can make these things stick, then no planet will ever give you any trouble. They will be in constant trouble themselves and they will be in a horrible mess, but no threat will ever come from one.

This is the principle of the boxer. It's thinking of this type: If your opponent is knocked out and sprawled on the floor – you don't want to be guilty of murder, you see, so he should be breathing faintly – but he's perfectly safe, isn't he? He's perfectly safe. I mean, that's
a condition to have an opponent in. Except for this: there's no fight, there'll be no gate, and there'll be nothing if that is all that ever happened. No game is extant.

Galactic council reasoning – and by that term I don't mean some great hierarchy which ruleth this parteth of the universeth; I simply mean the supergovernments which do exist and which come into existence and which fade away and which do carry, on the whole track, the most powerful monitoring effect upon civilizations, because their civilizations are done by slide rule. It's a slide rule civilization. They just figure it all out, and "This is how nobody will ever give you any trouble," is one of their main things.

When thetans have battered themselves up to this particular status, that is to say they have banged their way up the line, they finally made it stick on the basis of space fleets and planets and confederations and crisscrosses and that sort of thing, they are, of course, at the mockery of a no-games condition. They're not in a no-games condition at the top end of the scale, they're in a no-games condition at the bottom end of the scale. And they don't want any game.

So their idea of the perfect game is they sit there and know all about it, and nothing ever happens, and they can be absolutely content that everything is going to be just fine throughout the entirety of the empire. Which is to say, things will be barely breathing, and nobody will ever get out of the hoosegow.

Now, when you've got populations which are in essence concentration camped, you have, of course, an ideal situation from one viewpoint – the viewpoint of somebody who doesn't want any game.

Now, Hitler didn't have any trouble with a large section of his population. He just put them all in concentration camps and that was it. And it's that kind of a game if you want to look at it. It's not the game of government and who will we elect and democracy über alles, or something – it's not all that kind of a government. It's just the kind of a government, "Well, there they are nicely out of the running. Everybody is out of the running; isn't that nice. And things are just barely ticking over, and we're not going to be troubled by those fellows from the 18th Panzer Division that put up such a hell of a fight on Exnoo. We're not going to be troubled with them anymore because we got them implanted very nicely, and they've all been sent down to Earth, and the mores of the society there will take care of everything. And they will never be in circulation again as space jockeys." It's that kind of thinking, you see?

"We got everybody in jail, so now we're all set." I might as well level with you on this kind of an action, because it's something that I happen to be an expert on.

Now, what would you do if you wanted to create that kind of a condition? The first thing that you would do would, of course, be to never let anybody monkey with anybody's mind. You have psychiatrists. Ah, ha-ha, they're the boys! Ha-ha-ha, yeah. All they'll do is implant people further. All they'll do is immobilize, immobilize, immobilize, don't you see?

But if you put this in as a kind of a stable datum along the line, that it was all secret and private and one's thinking should never be invaded and so forth, then you can be absolutely sure nobody will ever as-is anything and throw a monkey wrench in the works.
You won't ever have the captain of the 28th Panzer Division suddenly appearing again saying, "What the hell do you mean doing this to my men," you know? He won't cause any trouble. I mean it's just, you know, quiet now.

And this sort of a graveyard peace is a highly desirable thing, and if you want to know what thinking is on a galactic government basis, that is the pattern thinking. A graveyard quiet.

So little gimmicks of this character are considered rather valuable. And one of those gimmicks is to never let anybody ever interfere with anybody else's rights. Rights. That's the keynote. That is the way you get the thetan to accept it.

You get the guy to get the idea that he has rights and that these rights are the rights of privacy. And then having worked it out so the rights of privacy are paramount to all other rights, you have, of course, created a concentration camp.

So now the auditor is going up against this particular gimmick. And very often when you're training auditors, some have it worse than others.

Now, how does it get worse in some people than others? Well, they're withholding their terminals. They have a terminal and they have an opposition terminal and they're withholding both, because they've been thoroughly punished for ever having been it. So they know that the safe thing to do in order to contribute to the graveyard peace, is to withhold their terminal.

See, first there's the vari- the mechanism that one has rights of privacy and rights of never being interfered with and that one must never invade anybody's rights in privacy. And we've got it all set, then nothing will ever be done on any planet concerning a resolution of the problems of life. Because nobody ever dares look in anybody else's mind to find out why – what makes it tick? Don't you see?

It's no accident that 50,000 years on this particular planet have gone by without anybody even coming close to sniffing at the edge of Scientology. That's not an accident. Of course, it's remarkable to do this, and I'm perfectly willing to share any credit given in this particular line, but I must reduce the credit by this degree, by this degree; is that I happen to be peculiarly skilled along in certain lines of control and so forth, and mechanisms.

In other words, a lot of time has been invested in me, here and there in this universe, and I've had my share of all this, so somebody tells me, you see, something like this, like well, "You mustn't, you know, invade privacy, and it's all for the best, and a graveyard peace is the very best possible thing and if you just keep everybody in a concentration camp for the next billion years, then everybody's going to be happy, you see, and nobody will be troubled at headquarters."

Somebody tells me all these things and I say, "Ha. Now, let's turn to page 2 of the rule book."

So that doesn't make much of an impression on me. My credit in this particular line happens to be reduced by just that degree because I have no respect for these rule books. I
think that – I think a prisoner always has a right to revolt. Always. I'll stake my bottom krop- 

tnick on the thing, see.

I mean, if I myself were running a military prison someplace or another and it had a 
hundred thousand inmates and so forth, and somebody'd snarl around about "those damn pris- 
oners, do you know they're liable to kick up a revolt at any moment?" I would be surprised at 
him for thinking that anything else could happen. A prisoner has a perfect right to revolt.

A slave has a perfect right to strike off his chains, because by essence these are living 
beings. And some people are close enough to the edge of that thinking that they say, "Well, 
that's correct. That's correct. People have a right to be free. That is a right they do have and I 
agree with that right."

I don't agree with the right that the privacy of the deepest-dyed criminal should be pro- 
tected by all the forces of the state from invasion. I don't believe in that. I believe that if a 
fellow means to shove a dirk into his fellow man at any given instant and he wishes to remain 
very private so that he can cut throats at will and unexpectedly, I believe that this fellow's 
privacy is the privacy we should invade.

But all galactic thinking along this particular line runs in the basis of, "Well, the way 
to do this is you put him in the electric machine. And you put the handle down to full blast. 
And you give him a nice mass to worry about, and because this fellow has done things like 
that to other people, why, the motivator-overt sequence takes place at once, and the way you 
handle a criminal is to make a piece of MEST out of him, and then don't invade his privacy."

Well, this thinking is perfectly all right, too. Nobody's being too critical of this, except 
that is the most unsuccessful thinking that has ever been thought in this universe. You never 
are able to guarantee utterly that the archcriminal is going to remain a piece of MEST. Fur- 
thermore, this other hole exists in galactic thinking, is you can never guarantee that a planet 
will not revolt. You can never guarantee that wisdom will not get abroad. This cannot be 
guaranteed.

And the only thing that you can guarantee and find any future success in, and so on, is 
this: Man or thetans are basically good and they get all mixed up, and when you unmix them, 
they revert to being good. That is a piece of thinking which is probably not even well known 
in galactic council lines. Because they don't like to believe in it because it makes everything 
so active.

Everybody gets so active, you know? People start thinking for themselves. They stop 
being utterly dependent upon a proclamation put on the side of the post office to know which 
bread they're supposed to cook on Tuesday. And so therefore, although these truths probably 
are not unknown to them, although I don't know that these truths are known to them – the 
basic intent of man and so forth – I don't know that these things are known at all. I think they 
possibly are quite original as a discovery. But that type of thinking that would make slaves 
only guarantees one thing: a miserable mess. That type of thinking which brands every man a 
criminal and says all intentions are bad has an end product of a mess. These are types of 
thinking which do not make people happy.
Now, you could stand by to be able to confront a great deal of action. You start clearing somebody, one of the things you'll be struck by – as I've told you in earlier lectures – one of the things you'll be struck by is the person goes into motion. Not hectic, agitated, undirected motion. No, but very effective motion, and he doesn't happen to realize that he is moving faster and that's one of the peculiarities of case advances.

It's only now and then that you suddenly will realize that you are moving faster than you were. You're doing things more quickly. You walk a block more quickly. You don't consider it's quite as far from here to the post office and back as you did. These are the types of advances which means greater motion and greater movement.

But in view of the fact that that is regularized movement, in view of the fact that it is controlled movement, it is infinitely preferable to uncontrolled movement because movement in the vicinity where everybody is crazy is movement which is never controlled. It is better to have more motion, in my thinkingness, which is controlled by the individual creating it, than to have random motion controlled by nobody.

Now, you can say that's just a matter of personal preference. I can hear it now. I can hear it now across some council table someplace or another. "Well, now, I don't know, ah, I don't know about that. That's just, that's just your idealism. It's never worked. Never worked. Well, just look at it right now. Take system and system and system and system so on and so on, and here's 809,642 million systems and they're all working very, very well on the subject of slavery, and you come along and you want to introduce a wild idea like this. These people, I mean they're getting along all right, and they're just going to pieces routinely, and well, I mean they're – they have hospitals to care for them if they're sick. So if they're sick a lot, why, that's tough. They've still got hospitals to care for them. We're taking care of all these things. Now here you are, here you are espousing this type of idealism which would upset things. It would upset things."

Of course, I can hear the argument that would ensue. Nobody'd win that argument by the way. Neither side would win because where all power is vested on a now-I'm-supposed-to, you're not about to shake those now-I'm-supposed-to's. Don't try to sell the rulers of the universe on the basis of "all they have to do is change it all," because the first thing they would lose would be their own power. They would lose their total dictatorialness, you see.

Yet their power is artificially upheld. Artificially to such a degree that it isn't power at all, and they don't even dare exert it anymore. This is interesting, you see, but these are viewpoints. You're in the field of viewpoint and speculation when you're on the field of the basic ingredient of man.

But you yourselves can observe this. And you could observe that those people who are not quite spun in and who are not quite enslaved are fairly willing, once you set their heads to it, to invade the privacy of another human being because they're not totally mired into the other philosophy. And the other philosophy is, of course, "Now if we just sit very quietly and never ask any questions, why, nobody's going to wipe us out with a spaceship." You see? It's all prevented action. All that type of thinkingness.

"Well, everything is going along just fine." You see war raging, you know. Millions of men being killed, you know, and everything being blown up, and planet becoming a desert,
where everybody – death – death, and nobody's going to be left, and the planet's going to be a billiard ball, all that sort of thing. But they say, "Now, if I just sit here quietly, everything will be all right." You always can go into a belly laugh over that kind of thinkingness, you know? Because he's the first guy that gets shot because it's rigged that way. See, he's the fellow that would have naturally enough overt to receive all the motivators.

Well, your auditors fall into three generalized classifications. One is the fairly free individual who hasn't taken his terminal too heavily, and so forth. And he hasn't totally subscribed to the idea that his natural lot is that of a slave and a dust mote floating unimportantly through the universe. He hasn't quite subscribed to all this philosophy, you see. And you can count on this fellow charging into a case and doing something.

Then you get your next grade. Your next grade is the person who intellectually can recognize that it would be all right for him to invade the privacy of others, and that the only way he could ever set them free is that this sort of thing did occur, but who has a terminal which is peculiarly worded and composed so as to make him withhold it violently. And if he's withholding this terminal very hard, you'll have a hard time getting this person up to Class II.

He's a person who is intellectually in agreement with the fact that man could be freer, and it'd be better to make men freer, and so on. He can intellectually agree to that, but his own terminal gets in his road. His terminal is peculiarly composed so that he has to withhold it hard. It appears to him to be a dangerous terminal. The reason he's withholding his terminal, by the way, it practically proves this theory that man is basically good. It's the best proof of it as an examination of how a person handles his own terminal.

He'll hold it out of action which is, by the way, what makes it go into action. But he's trying to withhold it, see? He's trying to withhold this terminal.

Sometimes when you're trying to run an assessment list on somebody who has one of these difficult packages that's given him a lot of trouble – a difficult 3D package, you see – and you're running down the line and all of a sudden the thing goes null. He's got it ARC broke up in some peculiar way so he'll withhold the terminal because he's actually afraid of releasing the terminal. That is why he does it.

Now, if you had an idea of what his terminal was – just to give you a broad view of this, not this modifier trick which is a perfectly valid trick – but if you had an idea of what his terminal was, just ask him why he should withhold a woman killer – let's say this is his terminal, see – why he should withhold a woman killer from this session. And he'll all of a sudden wake up to the fact that he's doing it, and your needle would read again.

So you can actually turn a read back on if you happen to know the fellow's own terminal. Because what is he doing. He's withholding a woman killer. You're a woman, and you're auditing him. You give him an ARC break, although hell dramatize his modifier, if that terminal is something like a woman killer, he's actually scared stiff that he'll kill you. There's not the slightest possibility of his ever doing so, but just the hint that he might get mad at you causes him to withhold the terminal so hard that everything goes null.

Withhold of the terminal is the key to a 3D package. That is why the package disappears out of sight. Withhold of the terminal. A violent withhold of the terminal. It is quite
remarkable how thoroughly the terminal can be withheld. That you can get to it at all and that
an E-Meter can find it is fantastic. Don't be taken in by somebody saying, "Oh, well. That's
very easy. All you have to do is so and so." Because it isn't. It isn't at all. Because this is the
one thing the fellow was withholding most.

And you have trouble getting withholds off pc A when pc B, you see, is running quite
easily. You can get his withholds off very easily. But pc A, oh, man, do you have to get down
and sweat. You know, the sweat is dropping off of your brow and splashing on the E-Meter
glass. And you're trying to pull a withhold on this guy, and the fellow squirms, and he goes
through misery about the whole thing, you know, and ooooh, you know, "Whew, I don't know
if I better tell you or not."

And then finally why he braves up to it, and you find out that he used two cubes of
sugar instead of one in his tea this morning, which is a departure, you see, and the landlady
has already told him that he had better use less sugar, and it's a big overt.

You look for another overt. No, there isn't any other overt. It's just that what he does
withhold, he withholds so solidly, you see, he just withholds this, he clutches it to his bosom.
Why?

Well, of course the degree of withhold is the key to the degree of withhold of the ter-
minus from action. They are a direct coordination.

So your second class of auditor is intellectually as himself, independent of the 3D
package, and there is some of that showing always – except in the booby hatch. There's where
a 3D package is in total – you've got a condition of a person whose withholds are so hard and
thorough that he believes that nobody should invade that because he's got to withhold it. So
therefore, he is very chary of ever invading anybody else on the subject of withholds.

And you'll get some fellow who will sit there, and he'll say, "Oh, you thought an un-
kind thought. Oh, somebody else thought an unkind thought. Oh, isn't that nice? Somebody
else, ooooh, that was a close one. Well, we'll buy that one. Somebody else thought an unkind
thought. Well, that's good. Well, I certainly got a lot of withholds off that case in this session.
He thought unkind thoughts about other people thinking unkind thoughts. And we got the
unkind thoughts of his Aunt Bessie and his Uncle Bill, and we got the unkind thoughts of his
instructor about him, and we sure got a lot of ground covered in this session."

You just look down the list – he didn't get off a single withhold. He just wouldn't do it.
Now you've got your galactic thinking keyed in here, you see, whereby we shouldn't invade
anybody else's privacy, you know, it's very hard. Except he really thinks intellectually that he
should, you see? And he'll say to you, "I – I – I but I meant to get in there, you see, but I – I –
I – I – I I meant to ask, you see, and I know ... I know it's right, and I know what you're sup-
posed to do, and so forth. And next session I'll do much better."

And next session he sits there, and he says, "Well, all right. Now, did your Uncle Bill
think any unkind thoughts?", you know.

And he says, "No, that isn't right, no it isn't," and he'll just grit his teeth, and grit his
teeth, and he'll finally say, "What have you done?"
And he notices the E-Meter doesn't blow up, and he notices that the pc does tell him something and he gradually comes through this even though he's got a hell of a terminal package he's withholding, you see? You can educate him past the line. That's the second class.

And your third class of person – this is not classes of auditors. Your third class of person. Man, he is just so mired down in that withholds package, the terminal is so lost below withholds, he's so keyed-in on the basis of must never invade anybody's privacy, and so forth, that he could only be audited. He could only be audited. You just never would crack through the barrier.

Now, this is a pretty wild kind of gent. This would be somebody that you – probably never walk into your co-audits, you see. He does form a large percentage of the human race, however. Just because he never walks into your co-audit does not mean, you see, that he doesn't exist. You'll find him, and you're liable to find him in civil positions. Isn't that strange? I think that's very weird. Of course, he's bought galactic council-type thinking, you see, and it tends to make him part of the boys. It's quite interesting.

You listen to some of the political bigwigs of the world raving around and it always gives to me to laugh.

Anyway, there's three classes, three generalized classes of people. One, the first fellow, you'll teach him, or if it's a girl, you'll teach her very easily. She gets in there, and she gets off withholds, brrrrrrr-boom, thud, bang, crash.

"What have you done? All right. Okay. Good enough. Shot your mother. Very good. All right. That's fine. Now, what have you done? Yeah." So on. "What was that? What was that?"

"Oh, well, I didn't mean to tell you about that."

"Well, you better tell me about that right now. What is it?"

You know, it's just going off bang, bang, bang, bang, you know.

And then your second grade, your second class of "I don't know. I'd better come over. The Instructor has said I better ask, and Ron has said I'd better ask, and the Director of Training had said I'd better ask. They have all said I'd better ask and so, so, so, here goes. Here goes: 'Have you heard anybody else thinking any critical thoughts?'"[laughter]

They just don't dare charge the withhold at all.

But out of those two classes, you can make auditors. In spite of that, you can make auditors. That the person will try at all, shows that they're analytically in agreement with it, but their terminal has some peculiarities that forbid it.

Now, it becomes very interesting to us how the terminal package monitors conduct in session. Conduct in session is monitored first and foremost by the unwillingness to give a withhold. That is a pc unwillingness to give a withhold, just can't quite seem to get one out. And the other factor involved in it is the feeling of doubt that keeps coming across it all. Because, of course, they've got the withhold pressed in so tightly that, of course, it's sort of a
pretended know or a not-know has sort of keyed in, and they're very hesitant, and they're very unpositive, and they're very diffident, and they don't give it up well. This all goes with this 3D package.

You'll see this one. I imagine somebody will have a terminal like a "secret hider" or an "archives burier", you know, a nice terminal, you see, something like that. And you'll kick the terminal into action.

Of course, the modifier modifies their actual visual conduct whenever they get the rudiments out. You throw the rudiments out there, they'll dramatize their modifier in the session.

Now, oddly enough, as an auditor – auditors don't have cases. The modifier doesn't much influence their auditing, doesn't really much influence their auditing. It does to some slight degree, but they can override it.

What influences their auditing more – see, pc'ing is more influenced visually. You can see the modifier go into action in a pc – but what influences the auditor is the amount of withhold on the terminal, you understand? And the degree of withholding – it's fabulous.

Now, if you – you'll start fooling around with this sometime in a session, just on the basis of all of a sudden it all went null on somebody or other, and you do happen to know their terminal, see. Well, let's say during level runs, you all of a sudden notice the terminal is not acting. It's not reacting.

Let's say their terminal is a waterbuck, and you say, "Well, what would you be withholding a waterbuck from around here?"

And they say, "Oh, well, now, that you – come to think about it, for the last fifteen minutes I've been keeping him from going and getting a drink."

You don't have to go let him get a drink. Just the realization of this fact alone will get your needle reacting. That's how important the withhold is. That, by the way, is, you might say, the clinical research test of how I've come to this conclusion concerning withholds and that sort of thing. It's experiments of that particular type and nature; degree that the terminal is withheld and review of cases and their behavior in session and all of that.

Now, we've got another factor involved in the plan of auditing. When I tell you that – well, we give this rough figure of 75 hours of Sec Checking and straightening up and that sort of thing before we do a 3D assessment. This becomes very easily understood by you when you recognize that every withhold he has, every single withhold he has is stacked up 100 percent on top of the withholdingness of the terminal. See? He's withholding this terminal, waterbuck. Every time some water occurs, why, you'd think a waterbuck, he'd become immediately a waterbuck, but he doesn't. He withholds the terminal, waterbuck.

All right. So this starts getting – glued on top of this then is every other withhold he has ever withheld since the first acceptance of the terminal, waterbuck. That's a lot of withholds, isn't it? And because present time has a much greater, greater value than past time, present life withholds then have waterbuck glued down to a point where it's practically unassess-
able when you first grab ahold of the person, see. So he becomes relatively unassessable because he's got this thing withheld.

And then on top of this, of course, he's got all of his withholds. And the withholds are right in with the waterbuck.

So in order to loosen up the 3D package, you have to get the withholds off, hence the emphasis on Security Checking. And you get enough withholds off, and all of a sudden the terminal starts to float to the top. If you could get withholds off on the whole track, you could security check the 3D package into the full view, if you could, if he could remember, if you had enough time, if you could dream up that many Security Checks, if, if, if, if, if, see.

But theoretically, if you got off all of the withholds ever since he became imbued with this terminal waterbuck – well, the last 150 trillion years worth of withholds – if you got all of those off, a waterbuck would blow, you see, with all those ifs, ifs, ifs. But for sure, you have to get off the more important withholds.

For instance, the social standing – his social standing of the life he has just got through living is not as important as his present life by about one-thousandth. See, the withholds of this life and then one-thousandth as important as the life just behind this life, and then about a thousandth as important as that life are some earlier lives, you see, and then about a millionth as important as that is some life he lived a hundred trillion years ago, you see – the withholds in that. Relative importance goes down with great rapidity from present life back is all I'm trying to say. So you have to get off this life's withholds and by doing that you make the package that ... It isn't that these withholds are what is holding down the package. It's just that these withholds have to be gotten off before you can get the package. It does enough to un-burden it so that the package becomes visible.

But everybody's going around withholding their 3D package, and the basic thing, of course, which they withhold in the 3D package is the terminal. You could almost say that the last terminal to come up – this is not true because of the methods of assessment which you're using – but if you had – if you could measure the relative difficulty you had in getting items, you would get items that were closer to the terminal. See, the terminal is the bottom of a package.

Of course, you're so rigged in assessing that it crosscuts, so this rule doesn't hold. But if we were dealing with some other system – if you were dealing uniformly with some other system which unstacked it to the degree that they were withheld, you would find that the last thing to come up would be the person's terminal.

The first thing to come up would be the goal. And the last thing to come up would be the terminal, and other things would be mishmashed one way or the other in between.

This is very, very important to you in the handling and training of auditors. Extremely important to you because it gives us a very rapid estimate of how long a person has to be worked over before they can be assessed.

You will get to this point where you could look at somebody being security checked, and get some kind of a vague estimate of how long it would be before somebody who couldn't assess very well could do an assessment on them. You could make an accurate estimate.
Here's this person sitting there saying, [in a murmuring voice:] "Oh, ohhhhhh. With- holding anything. Withhold. Murder. Murdered anybody. Let's see, have I murdered anybody in this lifetime? I don't know if I've murdered anybody in this lifetime. Yuh, and so on. Let's see now. You say ... What was the question again? Oh, oh, have I ever murdered anybody? Have I ever murdered anybody in this lifetime? Have I murdered anybody? Don't know if I ever murdered anybody in this lifetime, you know."

And you'd say, "Boy, there's somebody that's going to take a while. There's somebody's going to take a while, man. And when we find it, it's going to be one of these plunger-type terminals, like it's going to be a – "a hider", and the modifier's going to be something like, "and never be found out," you know, the terminal more important than the modifier to this degree, you see? But it'll be some kind of an odd terminal like this. It'll be something that wouldn't – would be a secret-type of terminal.

And you see somebody else. He's just taking a medium time, you know, and you say, "Well, have you ever murdered anybody?"

"Mmmmm murdered anybody? Let's see. Mmmmmmmmm- mmmmmm. No. No, I haven't murdered anybody."

What the hell! You mean this guy has to think over whether or not he's murdered somebody in this lifetime? Nuts!

Then the other case – I'll give you another view on the thing – and another case, say, "Well," you say to this person, "have you ever murdered anybody in the present –?"

"No."

He knows, you see. And there's a reversal of this which can fool you, which is the lower scale mockery. You always have lower scale mockeries of practically everything. And this person says, "Yes." Right away he says, "Yes, I've murdered about seven people."

You don't get a single reaction on the meter, the meter doesn't respond in any degree whatsoever, person doesn't care if he's done these things, doesn't make any difference to him. That's your lower scale mockery of this.

Well, this person is not necessarily that much easier to assess. That person is that much harder to assess. Now, you'll dig and dig and dig, and you just never can get him to say "murderer", you know? I mean he'll make lists. He'll make a long list, and you say, "Well, is there anything else on the list?" And you'll get a tick, and you'll say, "Well, what else is on that list?" And he'll say, "Well, there could be a roller skater."

"All right. Is there anything else on this? Is there an ARC break. Is the ARC break what's making this fall?" No reaction, see.

You say, "All right. Well, is there any other on this list?" And the needle will go tick. And you say, "All right. What is the next item?"

And he'll say, "Well, candy maker. Candy maker would do that."

Candy maker is the terminal for the goal, and murder everybody in sight, see.
And after you've done this long, arduous list and gotten clear to the bottom of the thing, practically sheets, you see, he'll come in, usually in the morning after he's had a good night's sleep, and all is well with the world, and he has no upsets, and his rudiments are all just in kind of naturally, don't you know, and he will say to you, "I've just had a terrific idea. Just an absolutely terrific idea. I woke up this morning, and I was thinking it over, and do you know we haven't got some item on that list."

And you'll say, "No, what?"

And he'll say, "A murderer. What do you think of that?"

Do you see the person just doesn't have any recognition of his terminal value of any kind whatsoever. It's just totally withheld.

Now, it isn't naturally true that the more violent kinds of terminals are more withheld or the more secret kinds of terminals are more withheld. You're liable to run into somebody with a terminal "little girl," who is just withholding it like mad. Of course, we don't know what a little girl means to this person. See? That's what it takes. What does a little girl mean to this person? Oh, well, that's another story.

So whatever the terminal package is, it – the way to understand it is by the person's reaction to Security Checking and their ability to security check. Both of these things could be used in a monitoring factor. We could say, "Well, this person can't security check worth beans. This person takes forever to answer questions." Well, we'd just better security check the living daylights out of this person, and get everything as clean as we can possibly get it in all directions before we begin to attempt an assessment.

And as far as training is concerned, we're not going to hope for much from this person before we get an assessment completed, because they're going to goof. As an auditor, you see, we're just not going to hope for much. Oh, we'll let them audit. We're not going to push them. We're not going to spend much time sweating over them.

We'll spend more time sweating over some other auditor making him good enough to assess the one who was dragging up the rear when we finally get up to that. It's that kind of thinking which pays off easier than taking all the dunderheads who can't pull a withhold, who won't give a withhold, stacking them all up together and saying, "Now, you're the only people that's going to audit anybody. And you easy sec checking people over here, well, we're not going to run any 3D package on you. We're not going to find anything or anything. And we're not going to work very hard to train you. We're going to work on this tough group." You know, the way they teach modern schools. They downgrade the whole class to the only idiot they've got.

Now, there is nothing disgraceful about having long comm lags on withholds and having an insufferable terminal in Scientology. There might have been out in life, and on the whole track and that sort of thing, but we consider there's nothing disgraceful about this. But we are permitted to curse about it occasionally. I think we'd be permitted to do that once in a while.

We finally get it totally unburied and we've practically sweat our skin off our brow, you see, trying to get this thing and get this thing security checked and so forth, and we fi-
nally get down to the lower end of the thing and find out that the person's terminal that was causing us all this trouble, you see, was a "never knower."

Now, we're permitted at that time, "Well, I'll be damned," you know. We're permitted one of those. Even tell the person that. The person never appreciates it though. I've said this to a person or two, "Well, now I know why we've been having so much trouble." And you know, they never appreciated it at all. [laughter]

Now, this is an interesting thing that you happen to be dealing with live, living beings with a very live, real and factual science. Our science is not a theoretical, interpretable science. Scientology has about the same delicacy as a pickax right now. I mean yeah, you could be pretty adroit, and you can handle people pretty adroitly and that sort of thing, but it's very direct.

What we know that is important about life can be instantly and immediately applied – instantly and immediately. And applied in certain direct ways, it'll arrive at certain direct places. It's like taking a dry box of matches. You take a match out of the box and you strike it on the striker of the box and the match lights. Well, I'm teaching you to please have the frame of reference of only be surprised when the box of matches doesn't light. And look twice to find out if it was a match you took out of the box and not a nail or something. Because it runs off just about like that now. I mean we've got it running off with just that degree of accuracy.

As you finally wrap your wits around this to a full embracing of it, you'll get to this point where somebody does something in a session. They get mad at you for instance. You don't say, "Gee, I certainly wish I could audit better, and if I just possibly could audit a little better, maybe the person would never get ARC broke, and what is wrong with my auditing, and the person has a perfect right to cuss me out."

We don't go through this player piano piece, see, because there's no facts in it. We have learned to this degree that if a person got mad at us in session that it's one of these things: We missed a withhold. That's the most probable. Other rudiments are out and the modifier has kicked in – has the high probability of it. And we've missed a withhold and the modifier has kicked in. Or we have missed a withhold or the modifier has kicked in by the other rudiments being out, you see?

And then you have another choice. You've missed a withhold and the modifier's kicked in. That's it, you see. You don't spend a long time going quietly off to your room where you can be quiet and breaking out your violin and tuning it up to a low pitch and saying, "Oh, God, what have I done? I have probably ruined him." you know.

In other words, you're looking at what is and finding it out, it is what it is. You see, your certainty is totally based on whether you can do something about it or not. And if you have certainty you can do something about something, you don't worry about it very much.

You know the least hysterical people around a fire – let's say a warehouse is burning down – oddly enough, the least hysterical people there will be the oldest veteran fireman there. Isn't that odd? And the newspaper reporters who are the old newspaper reporters and that sort of thing.
That other people who will be hysterical – you say well a manager of the plant could be hysterical, and quite understandably because his plant is going up in smoke. I don't know that that's understandable. It's all covered by insurance, and he wanted a new plant anyway. He's just not used to fires. That's all. He doesn't know what makes fires tick, and he doesn't know what puts them out, and he doesn't know the inevitability of fires, and he doesn't know this, and he doesn't know that.

And all those not-knows add up to an hysteria. Worry, concern, hysteria. Those are the things which are going about it. And the local dwellers in the immediate area, they've never seen a fire before. They've gotten up every morning and found out the world was there by looking over and seeing that that plant was there, you see? And what's disappearing on them is a stable datum and they go into fantastic hysteria on the subject because they don't know anything about fires either. But if you left it in the hands of the manager who, of course, himself, is accustomed to running that plant and is a very expert man in running of the plant. He's no expert in handling fires. He never handled one before in his life.

So if you turned it over to him and the local dwellers in the area, they wouldn't even save a shed. Man, I mean to tell you the whole plant would go and probably half the surrounding countryside, too. Because they'd be, "Ahhh, oh, and what do we do now," and they'd pick up a fire hose and then throw it down, you see, and then turn on the water and decide that was too much water, and go and turn it off again. They didn't have enough water, and then they'd go start up a truck and move it some other place, and change the fire lines, and then watch a wall come down, and well, that's just because they don't understand fires, you know. So they can't do anything about it.

Now, you sit there and watch a pc burning down, you'll stop him burning down to the degree that you have a good certainty on what makes pcs burn down. You'll see those first smoking embers go up long before anybody else would detect them. What makes me cross occasionally with an auditor is that I can actually detect an ARC break or a blow about an hour and a half before the average auditor can. And I don't know what's wrong with them, you know?

I say, "Arrr-arrrr-arrrr-arrrrr! What is wrong here?" I try to teach them this, you know. I say – I've done this in HGC, you know – "Now look, now listen. The reason why Smith keeps blowing up is because you get something out at the beginning of the session, and then this multiplies, don't you see, and it gets worse, and then he blows. Now, actually, the blow is detectable to you, certainly a half an hour before it happens. Now, please detect the incipient blow and the ARC break long before it happens."

They say "okay," and they go back and this time they catch Smith just as he's leaving the chair. And then I have enough reality to appreciate the fact that they did catch him just before he left the chair.

See, I'll argue for the moon and settle for a round of green cheese, but this is the way the thing is, you see? And I'm actually happy that they get that far. I'm not saying how bad auditors are or how good I am. I'm just giving you the level of expectancy.

All right. But it's rather unreasonable of me with terrific familiarity with pcs over an awful long period of time to expect every time that an auditor will recognize that small wisp
of smoke long before the building starts burning down and simply walk over, and put his foot on it, and go on with the session, see? That's unreasonable of me to expect that an auditor will do this every time. So, I'm unreasonable. You should be able to do that.

Right away you say, "Well, what have we now, here? This person's being cross? This person's being critical? Not able to get this in too good? Day before yesterday I had some kind of a question. Maybe I didn't get it flat. What was the withhold I missed day before yesterday, if I did? Oh, yeah. That's the one."

Bang! He gives you the withhold, and that's the end of that ARC break, the end of the out-rudiments, and your session goes on. It took you all of thirty seconds. You recognized it, you caught it, you pulled it and you're on to the next action, see? So I'm unreasonable. So do it.

Now, in training up auditors, you have no other choice than to follow through a pattern of training which has emerged over a long period of time. People are so diffident. Anybody is rather so diffident about reaching into anybody's mind that you have to start them out on some kind of a gradient. And don't go and abandon every process that has ever worked on Class I, because a lot of those processes have served their purpose in that they conditioned auditors to being able to sit in an auditing session.

They've made pcs more confident of being able to ask questions, and they have even advanced cases to a remarkable degree, more than anybody else has in the past. So don't be afraid to use these old processes.

Let's get somebody auditing before we get them reaching right into the core of the fellow's mind and picking out a handful of brains, raw and bleeding. I think that's a rather unusual thing for you to demand. You start training an auditor, you sit down and you say, "All right. That's an E-Meter. And when the person gets an idea, why, the needle moves. That's all you need to know about that. All right. Now, ask him if he has ever done anything that his mother would be disappointed in him for. That's right. You ask him that right now. And clear the question good, and I'll come back in a half an hour."

You come back in a half an hour. There's the auditor lying there in a secondhand heap in the middle of the chair with the E-Meter busted over his head, don't you see. And the pc has just caught a plane for Canada. Probably the results as dramatic as that actually almost could exist.

And you just haven't realized how far you've come on the line, that's all. You haven't caught the gradient at a small enough gradient. And you'll find that, some of you, teaching in an Academy or teaching a group of people to audit, and so forth, will encounter that exact phenomena.

Sooner or later you're going to take your finger off your number, and you're going to say, "Well, that's an E-Meter, the needle wiggles. Now, you know all about that. You saw that film, we made the other day, and got that. All right, now just find out what this person's withholding, and get them straightened out, and get them straightened out for an assessment, and that's all you need to know."
The auditor will sit there and — "Huh-huh, no, huh-huh. No, I don't think this is for me."

You've just said, "Well, there's the Empire State Building. Now, take a — it's just an easy jump. Just crouch down now, and spring, and land on the top of the building. Now, there you are."

And what have you asked him to do? You've asked him to invade somebody's privacy. And he knows that Galactic Council order number one says, "Thou shalt not invade privacy and the rights of thy fellow being, you slave."

You've just asked him to violate it without any conditioning of any kind whatsoever. He knows better than to violate it. That's kept him a slave for years, so it must be stronger than he is. Years? Kept him a slave for trillennia, so it must be stronger than he is. See how it works? So, you just violated that wildly. Well, there's dozens of things you can do. The smartest thing, if you were going to train somebody up, is to take an E-Meter, a perfectly valid E-Meter, not a dummy one, tell him to be very careful of it, not to drop it, hit people with it. Of course, if you've got any Mark IV's and do that with it you'll regret it because students rather chew up stuff.

I tell you, if you got any old squirrel meters or anything like that, you use them. Oh, no, that's bad. That's bad. That's bad, too. No, no, do it with a regular E-Meter, and then call it to one student's attention, "The reason you can't use your E-Meter is because you have been eating sandwiches – keeping your sandwiches in it for the last two or three ..." [laughter]

Start up a repair service. Anyway – taking old sandwiches out of it.

But you run a Comm Course? Then you're really going to teach somebody to audit. I'm not talking about a public brought in to run a Comm Course co-audit, see. I'm talking about you're really going to make an auditor. Set him down in a chair, give him an E-Meter whenever he is the student in a student-coach situation. He sits there and holds the E-Meter with the thing plugged in, and nobody holding on to the electrodes. See? He just sits there. You don't care whether the thing is plugged in or not, or he puts them on the other fellow's lap. We don't care what he does with that. But he sits there and holds the thing. And you teach him his Comm Course that way.

Get him up to a point of familiarity because even this slight familiarity gained through a Comm Course is valuable. Every time he's sitting there auditing, well, he knows he's supposed to have an E-Meter in his hands, and he will get familiar with the thing. He'll get familiar with its mass, and it won't start bothering him.

All right. Push him through a Comm Course in that particular fashion. Never let a coach have an E-Meter. Fellow's coaching, no. Fellow is being the auditor, he's got the E-Meter.

And your next stage up the line — now, he's going to run this very difficult process of "think something". Give him an E-Meter. It's an exercise process, see. Give him an E-Meter. And make the person he's (quote) auditing (unquote) hold the E-Meter and he'll see that the thing is wiggling. And that will be very strange to him. He will be able to read all sorts of wild significances into the fact that it's wiggling.
He'll ask you all about it. He'll say, "You know, all the time that that was wiggling there, all the time the person was running it, do you know, the needle was moving, but after awhile it went over to the side of the dial and didn't move anymore. I just thought I'd let you know because I like to keep you advised about these things."

So all of such basic processes, "something you wouldn't mind forgetting," all that sort of thing, he isn't doing anything with the E-Meter at all. Just don't give him any- but just scold the living daylight out of him if he ever dares sit down and audit anybody without holding an E-Meter on his lap. He's not doing a thing with it, don't you see? But he'll eventually find out, "What do you know." I mean, as the fellow goes, you know, "To make the thing center, you have to come over here and move it there. How interesting. You have to move it there in order to make the thing read center. I wonder what that means. It's gone up to 6 now. I'll have to ask the Instructor. Does that mean he's Clear at that point?"

"Oh, here we've got a fellow. He must be almost Clear. He's reading 1." [laughs] Let him go through all that. Let him be totally baffled. Who cares? As long as they're doing their practice, their practice oddities, just little, little runs. Anything except a CCH type process. Anything except that. That alone is exempt. They don't do the TRs of Upper Indoc, of course, with an E-Meter, and they don't do the CCH Processes, they wouldn't do Op Pro by Dup with an E-Meter. But anything else they sure do it with an E-Meter.

All right. They get up the line on this, give them some talks on the E-Meter. They name the parts of the E-Meter. Show them exactly how it's set up and how it's turned off and how it's turned on. Anything, training materials you have on the subject, and demand that they study E-Meter Essentials and take an examination on it with a grade of 70 percent. You're just going to ask for a grade of 70 percent. And before they are permitted to run an HCO Information Letter type Security Check on anybody, they have to have gotten a grade of 70 percent on E-Meter Essentials, have had some lectures on it, and so forth.

See how downgraded that is. Really downgraded. And you don't let them, at that stage, run anything but the most innocuous type of Security Check, such as, "Have you ever put on shoes?" HCO Information Letters have some on it that are quite beefy, but there are also several innocuous ones that came out which are good student training checks. There's even some with kind of a motivator side of the thing, "Have you ever resented an Instructor speaking to you?" you know? It's this kind of thing – nothing. And they can detect those things, and make them security check that, but only after they have attained this grade.

It's actually, you call it Class I grade if you want to, but they've attained this grade. They aren't a Class I at all. So it's just – just a – they're just a student grade. They're permitted to security check. They passed E-Meter Essentials by 70 percent and they've had some training on it and already they've been holding it in their lap for a week or two, see?

And they've had some demonstrations, and they know what it's all about, and then you let them struggle, and these are very innocuous, extremely, extremely, extremely innocuous Security Checks. It doesn't have any meat in them at all. And it'd be a wise thing for an Instructor to go down over the type of Security Check they're using and take out anything that'd ever had a real punch to it to any student. Just thread it out. Just scratch it out. Alter those checks all you want to, but make them innocuous.
Well, "Have you ever returned late for lunch here at the Academy?" You know? That would be just about the upper limit of severity that you would permit on one of these checks, you see?

"Have you ever disliked the color of a dress?" You get what I mean? I mean, these are almost average, everyday situations. And you'll find out they'll get a read. They'll get reads on these things, and they'll be able to "clear" them (quote) (unquote).

But what is the final gain here? I mean, the fact that you've got somebody who can handle the thing, he finds out it operates, he finds out he can security check.

All right. That would be your next stage. That would be your total stage there of training on the thing, he's using them. And he continues to use them for any other auditing, but he also actually runs these innocuous-type Security Checks.

Now, we make this fellow actually pass the examinations of a Class II auditor: Hundred percent grade on _E-Meter Essentials_, demonstrations, tapes, anything else, any materials on the E-Meter, has to pass them a hundred percent, and then we let him use the Joburg, an HCO Policy Letter form type check. And we won't let them touch one of those forms until. Otherwise, you're going to have mangled masses of auditor lying all over the floor and people acting as pcs blowing for the North Pole as a routine action.

Why? Because it's just going to cause the most fantastic amount of randomness in an Academy. Missed withholds by the ton. Well, you can pick up this missed withhold, which is a training withhold, "Have you ever been late for lunch while you've been at the Academy?" See? So somebody missed that withhold. Oh, well, so somebody missed the withhold. He realizes he's being checked by a student and it's all kind of funny anyhow and fuzzy, and it isn't very important, and you're not going to give him randomness.

But you ask, "Have you ever raped anyone?"

The meter falls off the pin. Got a person who spent seven years in prison on three different occasions for rape, and feels worse about it every minute, and then the student says, "Well, isn't that the lunch bell?"

Well, the guy goes out, puts on his hat, catches the plane for Canada. He might as an afterthought come back and shoot the student who did it. But this would simply be the mechanisms, the mechanisms which you would restimulate by not following such a policy.

So these are the stages of training. Now, the mere reason of having passed a Class II classification in an Academy or in a field auditor's training unit or in a special course out in the field someplace, that doesn't make anybody a Class II Auditor. It just permits them to use HCO Policy form Security Checks. And they shouldn't be permitted near one until they can pass those qualifications as stiff as a Class II Auditor. Don't you think that's wise?

_Audience_: Yes.

All right. Now, Academy training and training of people will begin early to give you a good insight into what kind of an auditor this fellow's going to be and which way this fellow's going to go, and what this fellow's going to do, and what this fellow's not going to do. You
should be able to catch all that up rather, rather quickly. You should take a pretty good estimate of the situation.

But the length of time in training can often be slowed up. But remember that it isn't going to do you too much good to suddenly say, "This student is not learning well and so we'd better send him over to the HGC, or we better send him over to an auditor; I'd better audit him, find his 3D package, and then he will learn better."

You haven't speeded anything up. Instead of getting trained then, he is just going to get audited forever. You're not going to find his 3D package. What's wrong with him?

Well, he needs all of his preparatory work. You could send him over to an auditor or send him into an HGC or something like this to get his 75 hours preparatory done. Oh, yeah, well, that would be quite wise. Nothing wrong with that. But you would not be able to go this other route and say, "Well, we just – all you have to do is find the fellow's 3D package, and that's it. That'll change everything around, and instantly he'll feel better, and he'd be Clear," and so on.

Going on the basis of training Clears would be quite interesting, only you would very rapidly run out of auditors to clear auditors. I don't care if we were five years up the track, with a Scientology population of Earth of fifty million people. No, you'd be running out of auditors all the time. That is a course which runs out of auditors.

In other words, if nobody can be trained until they have been cleared, that you will find will never work. You see, because you always got that many more people being cleared. It's almost fatal, you know, to clear people. You disseminate Scientology. So it defeats itself at once. How would you like to be the only auditor in Egypt with training up against this one basis, that we musn't train anybody until they're Clear. Well, that would be great, wouldn't it? That would leave you auditing everybody in Egypt. Well, maybe this would be all right, but I don't think it's a very optimum solution. Certainly never train any auditors because you'd never get around to clearing anybody either. You'd have maybe fifteen people on the auditing lineup and about three years later, you would have fifteen Clears. But you still wouldn't have any auditors, would you?

So, now you would go out on the basis, don't you see, of clearing up some more people and it would take you another three – . You know, you get the wild nonsense that would go on on such a program. You'd just better make up your mind to it that there is no other solution than to train uncleared, unprocessed people. That's all. This other one is an ideal piece of nonsense. It arithmetically breaks down at once. Actuarially it becomes utterly unfeasible. There isn't any way it could be done. So, you'd just have to go ahead and train uncleared auditors, that's all.

Therefore the subject of training uncleared people becomes quite a technology in itself, because it's nowhere near the same technology as training people who have been cleared. That's an entirely different training technology. You give them something to memorize, and they memorize it and you tell them how to apply it and they apply it and they think that's fine, they go on and do it and they do a perfectly good job. So what? Then the pc gets in desperate trouble and they've never been trained or audited by a bad auditor and they can't understand...
why. Then they begin to think people are unreasonable. And that would be the end product of that – would be a total breakdown all the way along the line. That's right.

I was auditing somebody not too long ago, and I – suddenly dawned on me that this person audited rather poorly because they had absolutely no experience of bad auditing, and they didn't think – person perfectly reasonable – but they didn't think any one of these parts of anything were important. Never happened to them. So therefore it couldn't possibly be important.

There's nothing that makes a citizen out of you like being run on a level – I'm not saying that everybody should have this happen, but it certainly would make an awful citizen out of you. Wow, would you really, after that, become absolutely savage on the subject – let somebody assess you on the Prehav Scale and then run it, leave it unflat, assess a new level on the Prehav Scale, run it, leave it unflat, assess a new level on the Prehav Scale, run it and leave it very unflat, and then try to function. That's an absolute sure way of feeling crazy.

I know of no better way to make yourself feel crazy than to have that happen to you. You know, you feel uuhuhh. You're not sure whether the world is still square or not. It gets these must-reach-can't-reach ridges, you see, all in restim. Well, if you – that would be a severe thing and nobody is going to do that particularly just for the fun of – it feels so nice when you stop hitting yourself on the head with a hammer, you know, I mean.

But somebody sits there and their TRs are horrible and their metering is fumbly and that sort of thing – well, it sort of gives you the idea that all of that could be improved. And it gives you a certain perfectionist attitude toward training. And that perfectionist attitude will disappear if everyone was perfect before you started making auditors out of them. You'd no longer have perfect auditing at all; you'd have rather sloppy auditing. In a very short space of time the whole technology would get lost in the slop of it all. It's an interesting viewpoint.

There is a value in having been aberrated, and don't you ever forget it. It has given you a wealth of experience which you can attain in no other way. That that experience is at this time, more or less unavailable to you and has not been used by you, has nothing to do with it. As you go on up with case progress and so forth, you'll find a tremendous amount of experience there. And remember it was, every single bit of it, the experience of a knucklehead. The way you had all of this experience was by being a damn fool. You were a professional. That's about what it amounts to – a knucklehead.

Now, that doesn't mean that all of your experience should be that rough.

But you will find out that eventually you will remember something or other. I think a trillion and a half years ought to be, or two hundred trillion at the outside, I should think would be long enough for a person to get enough experience on the subject of knuckleheadedness. I have faith in you. I don't think you – I don't think you learn slower than that. And I don't think at this particular time you need any further experience in your terminals. I think you've accumulated most of the available experience. It's very doubtful that anything that could happen to your terminal has not happened to you.

Well, looking at it reversely, I think you should get some experience in other lines for a change. Broaden your view, you know. But you'll find out that it's peculiarly a parallel with
auditing, that life, when it does follow to some degree (this doesn't have to be exaggerated) a
pattern from a highly aberrated to a rather sane state – when you're going in that particular
direction. The best way to accumulate experience in that direction is by taking a person when
they're aberrated and teach them something and improve them at the same time. It doesn't
matter how gradually you improve them as long as you keep on improving them and they're
learning as they go.

Man, when they get through with that channel they'll be able to tell you things about it
you never realized. They've been over the jumps. They know it wrong side out now. They
know all there is to know about it. You never look upon misadventure as being much of a
teacher. Well, in the final analysis if you've got to learn by experience at all, it is only misad-
venture that will teach you. The greatest successes in the world can go unremarked if you
have nothing with which to compare them.

Now, you realize that getting somebody sane and walking straight and their psycho-
somatic done and the person back in action and all of this kind of thing happening, you real-
ize, you have a pretty good idea that, one, it takes a bit of doing, and two, it is very well worth
doing You've got that as an action cycle – you have a good view of that sort of thing We
could easily lose that.

If all you had to do was say, "Take this pill," and the person takes the pill and the per-
son cleared instantly and they were now Clear and totally sane and they went on about their
business, do you realize that clearing would have absolutely no value of any kind whatsoever.
Wouldn't have any value.

In the old days most of the people who were real worried and plowed-in and so forth,
used to worry about being – all they had to do was unbuckle their pants buckle and drop one
side and have you shoot them in the gluteus maximus and they'd be Clear. They were always
dreaming of something like this happening I never dreamed about it happening. I' let a few of
them be demonstrated to me. But, I never dreamed about it happening. One, it wouldn't be
clearing, it would be total enslavement. Because, what is this? This is just a new overwhelm,
isn't it?

Nobody ever appreciates his freedom unless he has to work for it. And if he does, he
values it and he then finds out that he is free. And we'll go further than that: If a person does-
't work for his freedom, he never finds out he's free. So, there'd be no such thing as a Clear
who hadn't worked for it. You're going to clear people sometimes, that are going to look at
you and say, "Of course, yes, naturally, uh-huh. Fine."

And you look at them and you wonder why you bothered. They have no realization of
anything having happened or anything really having been improved, or that they're going
anyplace and they have no purpose to which they may put this new breath of skill and it's far
more than they need in anything they're doing on this cotton-picking planet. And the net result
is a sort of a odd feeling of lose for you. It isn't quite that grim. They invite you to dinner.
They introduce you to everybody. They're very enthused about you and so forth and they keep
going on to the PTA and sitting there and taking notes and... So why doesn't this person do
something in life? Well, they haven't found out they can.
It's something like a fellow, you've taken these chains off of him, you know, and it's left – and the chains were a little bit rusty and it's left some rust marks on him one way or the other, and he keeps looking at the rust marks and he still thinks they're chains. He doesn't know they're gone. I imagine he could probably go on like that for a century or two and then someday he'd read something in a book or something like that and it'd say this fellow was Clear and could do so and so, and he all of a sudden says, "Well, I think I could do that," and reaches up and says, "What do you know, I'm not wearing any chains. What happened?"

And then go into a total overwhelm and build a stone image with your features. Set you up as a household deity and pray to you every night – as the fate of people who do sudden things that other people never earn or appreciate. Of course, it gives you a lot of heads to go into but they are usually stone.

All right. Well, I just thought I'd better give you a few words on the training and upgrading of auditors and what you should look forward to in that particular line, because I think you'll be needing the information. And I hope the data is of some help.

Thank you.
PROBABILITIES OF 3D
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Well all right. Okay. Shortest day of the year. Dec. AD 11. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. Now somebody wants to know if this lecture's in sequence, they'll have to look up and find out when the winter solstice is and they'll have the date.

At least we have the feeling now that the sun will be coming back day by day and minute by minute into this far northern clime. At least we can look forward now to the days getting longer and a little more sunlight all the way along the line. And I similarly hope that's true of your cases.

Now, today's lecture has to do with, again, suppositional material, which however you will find very valuable. I gave you another lecture of this character.

The probabilities – and I label this very clearly "probabilities." This is based on experience and observations. And whether they are probables or not, you'll find all of this material of considerable use.

Let us take up the Goals Problem Mass head-on and find out what we are doing with. In other words, what is this thing we are doing something to.

It might assist you that the probability of the composition of the Goals Problem Mass is not a single package. I've already told you that earlier. I've said that you've got your most available material, but this has been disclosed to view, and this is very interesting data.

Your first package on this looks like a small circle called the terminal. (Small oval – terminal.) [writes on the board] And now, you have this next circle which we could call the oppterm. And we find that this terminal and all of its peculiarities is a valence with all of its crimes and antecedents and so forth, called the terminal.

All right. This is a whole package in itself. It is a personality. It has idiosyncrasies. It has types of overt. It has moral codes. It has all of these various things. It's a very complex package. It's extremely complex. It is a complete personality all in one fell swoop.

Now, if you were to audit out these various characteristics of that particular personality, and all of the crimes accumulated over the last many trillennia, you would have a very long job ahead of you. And it has constantly been borne in upon me over the years that you audit out the valence. You do not audit out the characteristics of the valence. That is what you are trying to do. You are auditing out a valence, not the characteristics of the valence. That is something for you to remember.

Otherwise, at some fell stage, you can all of a sudden go slightly mad and look at all the characteristics that a waterbuck has and everything that goes into the makeup of waterbuck. And start to audit these out one by one, as an approach route, and you won't make it,
because they are all there because they are a package called "waterbuck." And that is a terminal.

And when you audit out the terminal, all that other material blows with the terminal, you see? This is something on the order of a billion to one, you see? You throw out a billion characteristics and incidents by throwing out one unit, which is to say, a terminal. Now, that is what you are doing essentially.

Now, this opposition terminal is what keeps this terminal suspended in time because it makes a problem. Without this terminal going up against the opposition terminal, you don't have any mechanism that will suspend the first terminal in time. The only way you can suspend this terminal, "waterbuck," in time, you see, is to also have another package of stuff – "tiger," let us say. And we've got this package called "tiger" here and this package, of course, is in itself a complete package. And it also has a billion characteristics and now-I'm-supposed-to's and moral codes and all the rest of it. But being in opposition violently to our terminal, waterbuck, we have then a terrific concentration of attention by which nothing else can get as-ised.

In other words, the waterbuck can't as-is anything else because he's totally concentrated on the tiger, and the tiger can't as-is anything else because he's totally concentrated on the waterbuck. But it's the whole subject, tiger, and the whole subject, waterbuck, that you are trying to audit. You are not trying to audit out the characteristics of a tiger or the characteristics of a waterbuck. But you are trying to audit out these two packages in their conflict, one against the other. And as soon as that conflict is tripped or triggered or imbalanced, it, then, tends to blow and disintegrate. There is nothing can hold it in space.

A problem floats in time. It has its own time track. It floats in time. Everything appears to be "now" about this problem. You get people who have tremendous problems. They have got to get everything now. They can never get anything tomorrow. They can only get it now. They can only be audited now. They can only be cleared now. You see, it has got to be now. You see, because there isn't any time. They know better than to try to clear themselves tomorrow.

Well, what causes this? What causes this manifestation? It is simply the problem characteristic of the oppterm and term concentrated upon each other, floating in time, makes a no-time situation for the pc. So he has no time. He has not got time to walk across the room and pick up a sandwich. He just doesn't have time to do it. The sandwich is over on the other side of the room and there he is, but he can't do it, because in order to progress from where he is to where the sandwich is consumes time.

So therefore, he has to have the sandwich now and he can't get the sandwich because he has to walk across the room first. Now, that's the most ridiculous example that I could give you of it, but we have many of these examples in real life.

And amongst these examples in real life, we come up against the proposition that the fellow cannot possibly ever get a refrigerator next month. He just cannot get a refrigerator next month. And this month work hard to get money for the refrigerator next month. He cannot do that. That is... he is mentally incapable of doing that. What he has to do is get the refrigerator now. He can never get it next month. It's got to be now, now. He can never work
toward getting a refrigerator. The essence of it is, he never gets a refrigerator, or somebody invents hire purchase or time payments.

Now, it's – it's the "nowness" of it all, don't you see? If they can just never have anything in the future, they're all set, because there is no future. All their future is suspended, and it is involved in two terminals, one in conflict with the other. And by that conflict alone, you get a suspension of these two terminals.

So you have the tiger fighting the waterbuck, the waterbuck fighting the tiger. And these two – each one a total personality package – each one a total personality package, is banged against the other one inextricably. So there is no possibility of these things coming apart and you then have something which is floating in time. Nothing gets as-ised. Everything just accumulates. Everything nails down.

Now, when you're taking items off of a 3D assessment list – let us say, like an oppterm or something like that, list – and they null, you actually are pulling these items off their association with the terminal. You are auditing when you are listing and nulling.

When you first looked at it, it was, "tiger, elephant, wild animals, circuses, animal lovers." See, these were all part of the list. And as you go over those things, they actually strip off this package because they're strippable, because they're not the package. But once you get the package down to the package, it ceases to be strippable. And so the thing just keeps on banging on the E-Meter, see? It won't null because that is the package.

Now, if you had to go ahead and take apart every thought and characteristic of a tiger from there on out, let me assure you that if we merely take up the idea of the chemical processes which a tiger must be cognizant of to be a tiger, we have a lot of data. It'd take you many years at a university to begin to learn that they don't know anything about the chemistry by which a tiger would operate. They know nothing about biochemistry – not the way she is really operated. And yet all of that information, as well as everything else – how to hunt, how to track, how to smell, how to do this, how to wash one's face – all these things are all contained in this package.

Now, you don't strip those off. You strip the whole thing off, bang! Because it's only there because it's suspended up against the terminal. All right. So there's the terminal versus the oppterm and the oppterm versus the terminal. And they are suspended because – and this is very important to you and we have tended to overlook this particular thing – they are data of comparable magnitude: You cannot have a problem unless the forces are in equilibrium. You must have these two forces more or less equal. They're certainly very similar in their characteristics.

Now, let's get to the rest of this package. You think that is all there is to this package? No, that is not all there is to this package.

We have here a larger circle and we've got one circle interlocked with the next circle interlocked with a large circle. And this large circle is the oppterm's terminal – the oppterm's oppterm. Interesting, eh?

So we've got this third package and it's a valence. And it's the oppterm's oppterm. And how does that stay in suspense? Well, that stays in suspense because there is a fourth package.
of equal size which is the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm. [laughter] That's right. And that is the "O-O-O," the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm. See? Pretty good, huh? Very interesting And this will get very important to you in just a moment when I show you something about assessment.

And that's all very interesting, but the probabilities are... [draws something, laughter] that there are two more circles out here. This one would be the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's oppterm and this is the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's oppterm. Interesting.

And then when we get out here we have two more. Now, how far that goes is unimportant because it's the road to OT. That's your road to OT, and that's the composite, the probable composite, of this road to OT. This is, of course, to a large degree conjecture. I call it to your attention. But various things support this theory, and we will go into that right now.

That first package is pinned up one against the other simply because they're held in suspension against the oppterm's oppterm. And the oppterm's oppterm is held in suspension because it is against the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's oppterm. And the oppterms that I just mentioned is held in suspension against a next pair, and they are held in suspension against a next pair. And each pair, if you will notice by these drawings, are bigger than the last pair. And that's the important thing – they are bigger. And there's where you can make your mistake on a 3D Assessment package. And where, here and there in this very unit, we have made this mistake.

We get the oppterm's oppterm as one of the units, and the actual oppterm, being tinier, is lost. Remember I used to tell you about two trucks head-on against each other in a field and that there was a lot of mishmash around those front bumpers.

Well, amongst the mishmash in the front bumpers, on some cases you will find the oppterm totally submerged. It is gone from view. And sometimes it's the terminal. So that there you've got the oppterm and then the terminal and then the actual terminal. And they're all kind of mishmashed in there. And you'll come along and you'll pick, with your assessment, the oppterm's oppterm off

How can you tell the oppterm's oppterm? It is higher toned. It is so much higher toned, that it's way up at the top of the scale, and the truth of the matter is that your proper terminal and oppterm are very close to equal on the scale. Now that can really help you to pick these things out.

So your problems-solutions survey that you take, I would say at a guess – and more than a guess – I would say that if when you did your problems-solutions survey and you wrote down "how you solve problems" and "how terminals solve problems" and how (quote) "oppterm" (unquote) solves problems, and then you find that "you" would solve problems by stabbing people in the stomach, and the terminal would solve problems by cutting people's throats and the oppterm would solve problems by stabbing people in the neck. Oh, you're pretty sure that you've got that package, you see? That's a nice, smooth, equality package. Gives you good data of comparable magnitude. It also gives you one God-awful problem. Which is which?
But when you've got it with that precision, it doesn't much matter because you're going to be able to audit both sides of them. And your pc just won't get somatics nicely. And your pc just won't run nicely. And your pc hasn't any real idea of the game that is being played if they're being run on the wrong side. They're going to be saying, "Well, what game is this?" You know?

You're running them on tiger, see? And you're running them on tiger, and their terminal is waterbuck, on the combination waterbuck-tiger. And you're running them on tiger. "I just can't see that there's any game involved. Waterbuck? What problem would you have with a waterbuck? Waterbuck? I had a problem with a waterbuck. Got a problem with a waterbuck. Let's see? How would a tiger possibly have a problem with a waterbuck? Well, a problem with a waterbuck. A tiger would have a problem with a waterbuck. Oh, I get it. Yeah. Well, a problem of a tiger with a waterbuck. Waterbuck would jump across the river and the tiger would have a problem of getting across with his feet still dry. Yes. Yeah, I guess that'd be it."

And you say, "Well, what conflict is there between a tiger and a waterbuck?" – if you ask them this.

And they'd say, "Conflict? Well, you could see there's theoretically a conflict between these two things, but uh ..."" Now you go around and you run the waterbuck. And you say, "Well, what problem – ," in the same 7 December commands, you say, "What problem would a tiger have with a waterbuck?"

"Well, how to get around and jump out of the proper places in order to leap quietly upon one." You know, it's a real problem.

Run from the point of view and with the levels of the waterbuck, he all of a sudden recognizes the tremendous amount of games condition that there exists. So run on the terminal, he gets the games condition, but run on the oppterm, he doesn't get the games condition. Why is this?

Well, this is just because when you're running the opposition terminal, part of the opposition terminal's attention is fixated over here on the oppterm's oppterm. So he has a sort of a split attention on it and he can't quite see it. Why?

Well, the oppterm's oppterm is of enormously greater magnitude. It's the pc that you have him go around on 8-C and he feels all the walls and he does all the commands with equal comm lag and he does it all exactly right and he gets absolutely no improvement at all, because it's a "what-wall" situation. Well, the oppterm's oppterm is quite normally a "what-wall" situation, if you happen to get it into your package. Oh, he can see it theoretically. Yes, he can see this and so forth.

Now, I'll show you how we can get the waterbuck and the tiger and an oppterm's oppterm mixed up. We'll be doing an assessment with our sleeves rolled up and just going along fine. And we're doing an assessment and we have a waterbuck, and we have a god, and the goals and everything all fits in. And then when we do our problems – then we get a package and the package, of course, is a waterbuck and god. All right. That's fine.
And here we are chewing along on this package beautifully, and we do our problems survey. We get it all arranged. We do our problems survey and "How would a god solve problems?"

"Well, a god would solve problems by causing things to happen, by instantaneous combustion, by starting forest fires at a glance, by fixing people into statuesque statues, uh ..."

"And how would a waterbuck solve problems?"

"Well, a waterbuck would solve problems by cheating, and by hiding in the reeds, and when somebody comes down to drink, why, all of a sudden reaching out with his teeth and pulling him into the water. And he'd solve problems by appearing very disinterested and not caring."

Well, let's look this over. Are those solutions of problems in comparable magnitude to this other list that you have of gods? Well, by George, they're not. Well, it isn't that you got your 3D wrong. You've just found the oppterm's oppterm. "Where's the oppterm?" That's your question.

Now, if you look this over very carefully, it will be some segment of the oppterm. So what you do is do an opposition to the oppterm and you get an oppterm's oppterm, see?

Let's do some additional assessment using this high Tone Scale item that we have, see. We got this high Tone Scale item. "How would this thing solve problems?"

"Well, all it would do would be to put out its hand and say, 'Peace.' And there would be peace everywhere."

"And how would a waterbuck solve problems?"

"Well, a waterbuck would solve problems by nattering." And he'd say, "Well, grrrrrr..."

So let's find some piece or opposition terminal to the oppterm's oppterm. What would oppose a god? Ah, fascinating. What would oppose a god? All right. We'll make a list of this sort of thing And there's a ways to do that, by the way. This is quite cute. There are various ways that you could do this sort of thing. This would be more likely to find you the terminal. This would probably find you the terminal. I'll give you a trick method just of – apropos of nothing.

You say, "What have you done to yourself? What have you withheld from yourself? What have you done to yourself? What have you withheld from yourself?" And you'd make a whole list of the answers. And then say, "Who would you treat like that?" And you can get a terminal list. "Who would you treat like that?" That's a very nasty little hook to get in on a line. Now, of course, you're liable to turn up with another piece that you don't quite know what to do with. Only it'll be a piece of comparable magnitude. And you sort these pieces of comparable magnitude out and you have found yourself a tiger. You found a tiger.

Now, you see, you could make a new list of some kind or another. And you could probably find the – prematurely find the pc's terminal and then get opposition terminals to that terminal or opposition goals to it and who would do that goal, you see? Or you could find opposition to the oppterm's oppterm and you could do a list of that. And you could crisscross
this thing, and all of a sudden you're going to find another piece which stays in, which gives you a comparable response to waterbuck.

Well then, what about the god? We found the tiger. What about this god? Well, that's all right. Leave him there. Put him on the back shelf. Wait for the next run around when you get out – the first part of this package going, you're going to need that. You're already a leg up on your next package, see? But it is out of the order of comparable magnitude to the terminal. So one of your tests – I can tell you here in conditional data on it – if you've got two pieces now that you're running on your pc, terminal and oppterminal and one of those is saying, "How would it solve problems?"

"Well, it would solve problems by pervading all with peaceful feelings."

"All right. How else would it solve problems?"

"Well, it'd solve problems by putting together several armies and having them descend on the city and crush it."

"All right. And how would the terminal solve problems?"

"Well, by running fast."

"All right. How would the terminal solve problems?"

"Well, by swimming long distances."

"Well, how would the terminal solve problems?"

"Well, by – by – by worrying."

Ah, you look this package over. You say, "Now, wait a minute. These two levels of problems-solutions survey do not compare." Just make up your mind that your pc won't run either.

Oddly enough, the pc will run on it, but all the time you're running the pc on it, you're putting the oppterm, the actual oppterm, further and further on automatic. And it'll all of a sudden start coming down on the pc with a crash. And you'll notice the pc sitting there answering problems. He can't get much reality to it. It doesn't make much sense, this thing "Waterbuck jumping the tiger" – this thing "Waterbuck jumping the tiger," well, and so on.

He's just never interested in the other side. When you get to those questions which are there, they're just not quite real, and he's not quite interested in them, and it just doesn't quite do. And he can tell you intellectually how it would all be, but there's no umph. There's no gut aches in it either.

And when you get this thing sorted out – you've run it for a while, let's say, that's perfectly all right – you possibly will have freed up the oppterm so it's now well in view.

Now do a reassessment on the thing and you'll find the oppterm's oppterm will momentarily drop out. It'll cease to register as soon as you get the oppterm registering. And the oppterm will be something much smaller than a god, you see.

But all the time you're running a "waterbuck" versus a "god," your pc will be sitting there, and you'll notice the pc frequently in sessions just going [demonstrates something] –
and his claws are getting longer, and he's started to grow much longer fingernails. And he will be caressing his fingernails, and then all of a sudden he gets a rather happy look at you, you know, and looks at you as though you might be edible. And you say – well, one of the test questions is – "All right. How does this make a game?"

That's one of the test questions. And if your pc can't tell you, you either flagrantly have a wrong piece in your 3D – I mean just that; I mean it's – so on – or you've got one of the items, really, is the oppterm's oppterm. You've got the extra wheel, and you haven't got an essential item.

So the first motions that you take in making sure that it's all right with your package – your pc's package – is you go across this thing and read out each item and make sure that you get the identical needle pattern. All right. That does not guarantee you do not have the oppterm's oppterm, but it guarantees that your pieces are correct. See, it's still part of the package, but it's a little bit more distant part of the package. It's the next item you've already got.

So let's look across this and find out they all register, and now ask the pc how this would be a game. Have him explain to you how this would be a game. And the pc says, "Oh, yes. Well, oh, yes, a game. What are you talking about? Are you kidding?" And you go ahead and run him and the pc develops somatics and so forth. Well, you're off to the races.

And it'll all look all right, providing your problems-solutions survey doesn't contain this ingredient of noncomparable magnitude. And if that contains a noncomparable magnitude, the highest one of the Tone Scale is the oppterm's oppterm and is not part of the original package.

So you want to do some more assessment. Now, mind you, it doesn't matter a darn if you run the oppterm's oppterm for a while. You could run it fifteen, twenty levels – I can tell you that – without the pc going off the deep end. But the case would becoming less and less satisfactory. The results are less and less satisfactory. And if you remember earlier, he got some awfully good answers that made him kind of... He started talking about his case. He started getting very interested in it, maybe earlier on.

And he says, "You know, I just," random comment, "you know I just feel like roaring all the time. I could just roar with laughter about everything. I just feel like roaring. I mean, I go out and – it'd be nice to go out and have a good roar." You know, or something like this. And he's made some comments of one kind or another. And then he hasn't made any comments – anything about anything – since. And it's just all settled down to a long haul and he isn't cogniting or anything else.

Well, you go back and look, and you'll find that one of your items is way uptone and the other item is way downtone. And they're not comparable and you're probably running an oppterm's oppterm and the thing to do is to compile another list and see if you can get another item that will stay in of comparable sneakiness to a waterbuck. That will be your missing item.
Now, you have to decide again which is which. Once you've done this, you have to re-
arrange the whole package -- which is the pc? But if you've got the two of comparable magni-
tude, frankly it doesn't make all that difference. It isn't all that important.

You can actually run for test. You can run on one side, no somatics, no interest and no
games condition. On the other side, you run it, you got somatics and you got a games condi-
tion. Well, that's the terminal. I mean, that's what you'd call crude testing. That is the crudest
testing there is. The right side gives you somatics. And the pc will know how goofy it is, too.
It's real goofy.

But that is all very important to your assessment of a 3D, because I have now found --
not very many -- but I have found that we have assessed here and there an oppterm's oppterm.
See, very neatly and pulled it in, and so forth.

Now, I was wondering about height of assessment and trying to make good sense out
of height on the Tone Scale of assessment. And I've suddenly found out that the only error
which you can make, apparently, is to have too high a height for one item and not the same
height for the other item. And you've latched on to the oppterm's oppterm, as we will theorize
at this stage, and you've got an extra piece of your 3D. And you don't happen to have the right
terminal or oppterminal. And it doesn't make a package and it doesn't make a game. Mind
you, there's only one item out.

Now, the funny part of it is the oppterm's oppterm will go out very slowly once you
have found the right item. Well, you'll continue to read for quite a while, six 3D pieces, when
you only had five, you see? You'll continue to read this for quite a while. You say, "God,"

Oddly enough, if you keep this up and go to null terminals occasionally and keep your
rudiments in and so forth, eventually -- eventually, after maybe a half an hour or an hour of
knocking at it and going around -- and by the way, pulling the pc's invalidations off. Very im-
portant. His worry about it, his invalidations have all got to be relieved to make a package
read nicely. You'll get into a situation there where god just disappears and this leaves you
with a tiger. And now tiger. Now waterbuck and tiger are operative, and so forth.

But, if you accidentally, somewhere along the line, happen to test god again, you
might find it reacting. Why? Because it's part of the package. It's the oppterm's oppterm and
you've got the next pair.

Well, that's great if you've got the next pair. That's three cheers because if we ever
have to audit the next pair, we certainly have something. All we have to say is, "What would
be a fitting opponent to a god?" you see, or something like this. And we've got a fitting oppo-
nent to a god right now, and so we get these two, and we've got our next package. Now, we
get their goals and their opposition goals, and their modifiers, and the pc's goal that matches
up into all this. In other words, you put together a 3D package and we're off to the races on
there.

This gets to be rather easy because the realest part of the ball-up of existence will oc-
cur in the pc between the terminal and oppterm.
Now, he knows he's nuts. He knows he's nuts. When he's hit this, he's hit things in it that have told him that this isn't quite fitting. This just isn't quite suitable. One would ordinarily not do these things.

Now, one can be terribly submerged in this and have his critical faculties kind of knocked out, you know? So he has to be run for a while until he finds out that running around and stabbing tigers in the back was not the best of all possible bests, you see.

Dawns on him, you know, he says, "I have this horrible, gleeful feeling across the front of my face. I wonder what that is? Waterbuck, tiger. Who knows. Of course, a waterbuck has to go around – what else could a waterbuck do but go around and put poison in all the water holes? Have to, obviously. That's absolute necessity, perfectly normal and natural. Naturally all the other animals that come down there to drink, they get poisoned, too, but you still occasionally get yourself a tiger. And that, after all, is the important thing, isn't it?"

Then all of a sudden he goes kind of over the border. He may, and he's – "Well, you know, I don't think that is quite the right thing to do. Snare, yeah. But not poison in the water holes." And he starts falling off of all of these overts, and this overt picture starts shifting. And his pattern of overts shifts, which is a test of a case running well.

Now, your opponent's opponent has been included in very few of those packages present. But there's a possibility that it is, and you should make a reinspection of this and it will tell you why the pc is not running with any great reality. The pc's running with a poor reality.

The odd part of it is, the techniques and 3D in general are sufficiently powerful that even when you're running the terminal versus the opponent's opponent with that middle part missing, the fellow's making some gains. The pcs will make gains. He doesn't make them very rapidly. He makes them rather slowly, but does make gains up to a certain point. And then he's sort of standing out in the middle of space going nowhere. He doesn't quite see where this goes.

See, the terminal obviously has something versus the opposition terminal. But you will find out the pc, if he's running these – between them, will eventually come to a point of total agreement between the terminal and the opponent's opponent because they, of course, are the harmonic of each other. So you get to a point of total agreement. There, you will – there you will be sitting there – total agreement.

He agrees with everything the opponent's opponent does. And you can't then – because the pc isn't all the way out of the mud yet, you can't quite see, if it's in total agreement, why it shouldn't blow, because he must have come to the basic resolution of the package, mustn't he? No, he's come to the basic half of the package. Only he's got his terminal and the opposition terminal, of course, are blood brothers. You'll find in this case the opponent has as an enemy both the terminal and the opponent's opponent. It's a three-cornered fight there.

Now, this can actually ball you up like mad in trying to assess. You can get a three-cornered 3D. You can get a piece which is – apparently looks like this. And here's a piece here that is violently opposed to what you are calling the opponent and violently opposed to the terminal; is not a friend of either one of them. And you'll say, "What in the name have I got?"
Well, it's very easy. What you've got is the oppterm. Because here's the way it is. What you're looking at here is you're looking at – the oppterm is, of course, fighting the terminal and the oppterm's oppterm, both. So you find an item that is dead against gods and dead against waterbucks. You say, "What's this? It's an opposition terminal to the oppterm we have found, and it's an opposition terminal to the terminal we have found. What is this?" It's the oppterm. That's what it is. And you've got the oppterm's oppterm as part of your 3D package, which you shouldn't have. You make careful note of it, however. You put it on the 3D. You put it on the 3D form because it's going to come in handy. You've got part of your work already done.

But you understand that these problems are so mishmashed, how anybody can make any sense out of all of them is, of course, pure genius, but... [laughs, laughter] But you've actually got a situation here that no pc could ever explain this to you, which is quite interesting.

You would actually have to have run them on this package before they could explain their package to you, which is something that you as an auditor should remember. The one person that doesn't know anything about his package is the pc. But why? He's right in the middle of the whirlwind. Well, that doesn't mean you should cut comm to the pc, sneer at all the pc's opinions, because they can help. They are assistive. You couldn't get any package at all unless you had those.

But at the same time, the pc insists absolutely – "Well, it's a god and that is all there is to it. And that is the opposition terminal to a waterbuck, and I know that's the opposition terminal to a waterbuck because waterbucks have always had trouble with gods. Going out in the middle of the plain and praying and that sort of thing. I can see that in a minute. Yes, sir. It's the opposition terminal."

Your problems-solutions survey says gods handle problems by obliterating planets. And waterbucks handle problems by nattering at daffodils. And, by George, it's not of comparable magnitude. And in spite of the assistance of the pc, you go on assessing. Now, naturally, you want something that is against gods and against waterbucks. So that should help you out immeasurably.

"What would be against a god and what would be against a waterbuck?", if you ever happen to come across this situation in a package. And of course at that exact crossroads you will find the terminal. And it'll be so obvious that the pc'll wonder why he never thought of it and why you never thought of it either. There it is.

Now, as you go up the line on this, you will find that pcs run well on the 3D or run poorly on 3D. If a pc runs poorly on 3D, there's nothing wrong with 3D. There is something wrong with the assessment, and that has been borne out now and borne out and borne out. If you've got the package right, it'll run.

Now, there's something I wanted you to get out of your 'eads. Having pounded it into your 'eads, I want you now to get it out of your 'eads. And that is simply this: You are not going to damage anyone forever by picking the wrong item and running it. And you're not going to damage anybody forever by running, for instance, the oppterm as the pc's terminal.
Nor are you going to damage anyone permanently by running the oppterm's oppterm as the pc's terminal, but that is the one that turns on the terrific winds of space.

If you've not seen that phenomenon go at a whizzeroo, it's because you've never seen it turned on to an oppterm's oppterm. Then it practically flattens the pc's face and skull like a pie plate. But let me tell you something. They recover. They recover.

Almost anything you do with a Goals Problem Mass assists. Almost anything you do with it assists. You can be a complete knucklehead and make the person absolutely believe that he has been ruined forever, and he will tell you so – that's one of the first things you hear about it, when you've picked wrong items and things like that – but it's not basically true. It's not true. You're taking apart a problem, aren't you? So what you're doing is trying to take it away the easy, smooth, quick, flawless way that only knocks the pcs' heads off with somatics, see. That's the way you want to take it apart. That's rapid. That's accurate. Everybody's happy about the thing, and so forth.

But remember, this is a terrifically expert job of action. This is a nice piece of action. This requires good skill on the auditor's part. And you run into all kinds of little bugs as you're trying to do this. And I can tell you the right way to do all of these things and give you the right course through, but that doesn't mean the odd man out won't all of a sudden come up and present you with a total lemon.

You've got "a Ford car" and you know that's absolutely right because it rock slams, it stays in, and nothing drives it out at all. That's what you've got.

You're all set. You've got it made. And you have a "nymph" and that's obviously there, and it proves out conclusively, and the only goal you seem to be able to find is "to whistle Dixie." Whew! What is this, see?

Well, make sense out of it. What you do, the formula you use, is to get oppositions to what you've got. And you keep on getting oppositions to anything you've got in the way of a goal, and keep working it out, and you're liable to be left with two or three extra parts that you can't quite make sense out of. And then you will eventually discover that every terminal has a goal, every terminal has a modifier, and every terminal has an opposition goal, heh-heh, to every other terminal.

So if you have three terminals in your package (terminal, oppterm and oppterm's oppterm), you would then have three goals – the terminal's goal, the oppterm's goal, the oppterm oppterm's goal. You would have three modifiers – the terminal's modifier, the oppterm's modifier, the oppterm oppterm's modifier. And what do you know? The oppterm has two opposition goals. The oppterm has an opposition goal that opposes the oppterm's oppterm and it has an opposition goal that opposes the terminal. That's getting to be a lot of parts, isn't it?

And do you know that you can also find a very strong goal – opposition goal – for the terminal versus the oppterm. You can find a strong opposition goal, and a weak, flabby, wiggly one against the oppterm's oppterm, which might form sometime a method of proving out that it's the oppterm's oppterm, because you've got the pc's terminal, obviously. He's got horns five feet long, and he's got split – he has – keeps having trouble with his fingers because they
all turn into calcium, and his fingers keep splitting and so forth. And he's going... [demonstrates something, laughter]

And he says, "Well, there's no doubt about it whatsoever. I've always thought of myself as a god." [laughs, laughter] I'm sure he has. It's part of the package and of course he's thought of himself as a god every now and then. Because it's part of the package, not because he's god.

So we get this thing all unboiled on the thing and we find out that the pc will have an opposition goal to a god. And it'll be something like, "To not pay very much attention in church." That's the way you handle it, see. So if you want to test out this thing even further, get the terminal's opposition goal to whatever this high-toned thing is you have and you'll find it's some weak, flabby, little thing that he can't do very much about.

You see, the terminal can do a tremendous lot about the oppterm, see? The terminal can lie in wait and trip the oppterm when he comes down, you see? And actually kind of cut away turf on the upside of the banks, so when the oppterm comes down to drink, a whole bank slides away. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. That's a necessary action. And you've got other little items such as, when it really gets down to a last-ditch fight, a waterbuck's hooves are sufficiently sharp to cut a tiger's hide to ribbons. And you'll find the opposition goal of the terminal to the opposition terminal – they will be good and strong and meaty, "To torture it until it gives up," or something like this. It'll be good and strong, you know. It will have some teeth to it. But the terminal's opposition goal to the oppterm's oppterm will be something real flabby like – let me see – "to take care of them when they show up but keep out of their way." That is how you handle it. This is the opposition, you see.

In other words, the opposition goal to the oppterm is "cut it to ribbons." And the opposition's goal to the oppterm's oppterm is "Try not to be in its vicinity and be very quiet while it is around." And somehow or another, that will take care of it. Somehow or another, that will take care of it. These are just side tests and considerations.

But I ask you, rather than to look at a bunch of tests, to look at the actual package and its composition and what you are trying to find and what you are trying to do and appreciate what this thing amounts to.

This fellow once upon a time decided on a game. And he went up against something, a thetan. And he picked this thing out as the thing. And he just cut it to ribbons and eventually became it one way or the other. It served his purpose at first, and then he had overts on it and then he became it. And then this thing was involved with another thing. And this other thing, he got overts on it as the thing he was being and it's just like making a snowball. And from there on, there's just more and more and more snow clings to it. And there's more and more conflict. And this thing amounts to a central fixation in the being's existence, and this goes floating on down the track.

But remember that it didn't start with the terminal. It started over here, clear over to the right of this picture, with the great big circles we haven't got enough room to draw them in.
This fellow picked out a "planet builder" as his randomity. He said, "That'd be a nice thing to be. I shall be a planet builder." So he went ahead and he was a planet builder. And he just did fine until he ran up against a fellow who was running temples to segregate and dislocate the orbitation of planets. And he was preaching a creed on the subject and we have the planet builder versus the temple. And if you tried to run either of those engrams, they'd just knock your pc's silly head off, if you could contact them. They just won't resolve, that's all, early on the case. They just don't resolve. They're just beyond his reality. He says, "That's fine." He can even pick up somatics off of them, which is quite interesting.

But there he is out there in space fielding bits of an exploded planet. You know, catching them as they whiz by. And they're all radioactive and he's fitting the things together very nicely until somebody from the temple says something to him, and he picks up the whole ruddy mass and heaves it at the person. Nice engram. You'll find it there totally with its radioactive burn and everything else connected with it. And you're asking a person, who now considers himself to the power of one-half of a grasshopper and you're asking him to pick up the Empire State Building with his little finger. And he's not going to do it. That's – you've reached a couple of circles which are way out here to the right of this picture, you see.

Now, he had that game going, and eventually that game blew up, and he got a subordinate game to that and then eventually that game blew up, and we're now dealing with what we earlier called cycles. You know, there were lives, and then there were cycles. Well, one game, one cycle – you can figure it that way.

The games lasted a long time or they didn't last long. And then you got down to, "Find a more finite size game." And then this game cycled over into another pair of terminals which gave you another game and then this cycled over into another pair which gave you a game, and then you eventually got down to your – what you find in your 3D package of term-oppterm. And you've got your term-oppterm and you're at, of course, the easiest entrance to the point. And you can run these things fairly flat.

But they will run endlessly if you don't have the right terminal and the right opposition terminal. And if you're trying to run the terminal up against the oppterm's oppterm, you're up again into the next cycle.

Of course, it'll run because it's a part of the pc's life. But you haven't got the right opposition to it. Something else is hanging off into the wide blue sky. I mean, you might even make it. Who knows? But all the time you're running it, you are ignoring and not getting asised a piece of the Goals Problem Mass known as the oppterm. And there's that tiger and the longer you ignore the tiger, why, the longer the pc's whiskers will grow, until the pc is just about ready ... He thinks it would be just awfully good fun to ... But he knows something is wrong, and he can't quite figure out what is wrong. He'll start complaining to you about what's wrong. Well, what's wrong is you jumped a point of the cycle. That's about all.

Now, in assessing some pcs, some pcs have bigger eyes than thetans. And at the present moment, they would not be capable of running planet builders, but they're going to sell you a planet builder, man. And you might even get it registering. But be aware of this fact that the pc can actually give you too big a piece of the package, gratuitously.
The pc somehow or another got this thing cut in, and it's beautifully restimulated. So they say, "Well, I know what it is. It's a planet builder. And it's a planet builder, and the terminal is a grasshopper. I know. I know what the game is exactly. I've often gone around thinking about, 'I've got to build planets. I've got to build planets.' I say that to myself all the time. I wanted to in this lifetime – I think."

"And a grasshopper – I've always gone out and felt sorry for the grasshoppers. I've always gone out and felt very sorry for the grasshoppers and – poor grasshoppers and so forth. And the grasshoppers – they're very nice grasshoppers, and so forth. And a grasshopper has troubles. You don't realize how many troubles a grasshopper has."

You see, you're off to the races. Well, probably it's a terminal. It's a terminal. It's an opposition terminal or something.

But you see, those two data are not of comparable magnitude. And the pc can actually sit there and force one of them off on you.

Now, you finally tell the pc this isn't it. And this operates as a hell of an invalidation because it is it. It just happens to be in the wrong sequence, that's all. It's up the line somewhere. You'll collide with it by and by. But it's just prematurely offered, and you'll find a lot of pcs have much bigger eyes than they have present thetans, see?

And they'll say, "Well, terminal? Terminal. Emperor. I know that's the terminal. An opposition terminal? Beggar girl." But you can actually wrap your wits around it, you know. You can say, "Well, an emperor, and he could have a game with a beggar girl, and later he'll have a game with an emperor. The Arabian Nights sort of thing and so forth," until you assess him on the problems survey. And then you'll find how would an emperor solve problems. An emperor could solve problems by ordering the sun to cast too much light on his people. You'd say, "What part of the track is this emperor from?" you know? And "How would a beggar girl solve problems?" By picking up apple cores in the gutter and saving them.

And yet it will look all right to the pc because he's got a short circuit through this Goals Problem Mass. You actually realize we're not talking about anything which is theoretical when we're talking about the Goals Problem Mass. That is very factual. And when we say mass, we mean mass. It's electronic standing waves, actually. They usually appear as black to the pc and these become visible. For a long time they'll be invisible to the pc, and then they will suddenly get more and more visible and all of a sudden he can really see these things – rrrrrrrrrrrr. Worse and worse. And they're what give him somatics, by the way. And they're held in place by temperature.

I better tell you something about the Goals Problem Mass as a piece of mass. It's held in place by temperature's absence. It's by an absence of temperature. It's only hung up at those places where it has been in no motion, of course, and where it has been in the most no motion at those places where it was no temperature.

So it is quite routine – and as a matter of fact would be quite surprising, if somebody were audited on 3D and didn't have – didn't run little fevers and didn't feel awfully cold in the head or cold in the back or cold in the stomach. They've had a pain in the back of their head.
for some time, and all of a sudden it turns ice cold and then you'll never hear about it any-
more.

What is this? This is simply the phenomenon of stop. What is the most stop there is?
Absolute zero, of course. There's no motion at absolute zero. Of course, heat is motion. When
you get no motion, you get extreme cold. And when you take masses down in temperature,
you, of course, get them hung. And this is not a warm universe. This is a cold universe. This
is a very cold universe. But it's very far from absolute zero or it would dissolve. There is al-
ways some heat in this universe, even out in the colder reaches of space.

Don't try to tell an old space jockey that there's any heat out in space because he
knows better. He knows better. But at the same time you call it to his memory, he would tell
you, "Well, it's true that you could take a bucket of air and it wouldn't liquify. It's not that
cold. Instantaneous liquefaction. It liquefies slowly if it didn't disperse if you had the pres-
sure. Well, I don't know about that. Well, there are probably colder places. There are probably
colder places than that. But I don't know, out in the depths of outer ... That's absolute zero."

And he'll come back to a conclusion about "Well, it isn't absolute zero, or it wouldn't
be there at all."

The physics of the matter are quite interesting: Everybody has assumed that there's
such a thing as an absolute zero, which would be a no motion, a no temperature condition.
There's no temperature of any kind. There is no motion of any kind. No particles move.

Well, the second you achieve this, there are just no particles, period. There is nothing,
period. And I don't even know that space isn't a temperature phenomenon because it has
something to do with existing dimension. Space has to do with existing dimension. And if
dimension exists, it must be on the time track. And we know that time is a temperature. If you
ever want to have time pass slowly, go someplace where it's real cold. [laughter] Really.

Now, you will, you'll get a mental phenomenon concerning it. Furthermore, people
there are liable to conceive they have problems. See? Time moves slowly if you have prob-
lems. Time moves slowly in the absence of temperature. So anybody who is cold has prob-
lems. So heating becomes one of the rougher problems. [laughter]

Now, a thetan has become conditioned to the motion called warmth. He thinks this is
necessary for his existence. He thinks he vibrates. He thinks he reacts to warmth. Actually, he
doesn't react to warmth at all. The mass with which he is connected reacts to warmth, whether
it's his reactive bank or his body. That mass reacts to warmth, and moves or shifts. And if you
get him terribly cold, if you get a thetan very, very, very, very cold, or he thinks he's very,
very cold, which is up against some very cold mass, why, then he believes implicitly, you see,
that it's a problem to him because things are going very slowly about all this. So he'll make a
problem out of it. But he gets habituated to warmth, and the more habitual warmness of ob-
jects are around him, the less tolerant he gets of it.

For instance, I know myself, in Europe three, four hundred years ago, you used to
walk around in tinware. You know, in greaves and corselets and helmets and things like that
and always be out in the weather. Well, what protection was there, you know?
If you know anything about the European climate, you'll know that the skies are normally wet. It isn't the pounding of guns that causes it to rain in Flanders excessively during wars. That's a big theory. I guess nobody ever goes to Flanders unless there's a war on and they haven't noticed that between wars it rains just as much. And steel is not very insulative.

Now, I'll give you an idea of habituation. Going across areas of Europe, or being in a European climate and wearing, in a racing helmet, a buckle against my chin – just one buckle against my chin – develop a fantastic somatic because of this cold buckle, just a fabulous somatic. And bothered by it, you know, mind it like the devil, till I all of a sudden realized, well, I've been around in this same area wearing nothing but solid steel. Ha-ha-ha. How much conductivity do you suppose was connected with that? Well, there was plenty and there must have been plenty of somatics. But there weren't.

European climate runs around ... You get so you just can't tolerate – if you get too many engrams in a climate of sixty-one or sixty-two degrees Fahrenheit average. You eventually will feel that sixty-one or sixty-two degrees Fahrenheit and you instantly react to calamity. There must be a calamity involved because that's the wrong temperature.

And you can go into old areas where you haven't been for a few centuries and hit their temperatures. And if they're colder than the temperatures you are now accustomed to, why, you'll be upset by the climate. That is why people get upset by climates. Not that thatens require a certain temperature. It's a different thing, see? It's experiential. It's the amount of heat which they think they ought to be having and of course that's usually more heat than they have had before. So you're running some kind of a gradient of thatens have to get hotter and hotter as they get older and older. Otherwise, they don't keep out of trouble.

I imagine right now if any of you ever go back to Jupiter and shop around with ... The seas on Jupiter are composed of liquid air. And I imagine some time or another you might have come in from outer space, you know, and put your hands up against that liquid air and said, "Boy, it's so good to be warm again." [laughs] And now think of how you would react with a meat body. You wouldn't react that way at all. [laughs]

So anyway, these are considerations. But the problem and the temperature are very closely associated. And they're very closely associated to the Goals Problem Mass. So that if you have a problem – where you have a problem, you have a temperature change. Because you've got a timelessness, it therefore must be a cold one. See, if the problem's going to be timeless, it's a cold problem. And when you run it, you will get the cold coming off of the pc. And I'm not kidding you, it will be cold.

Now, nearly all old implants were done by vacuums – the creation of a cold vacuum. I refer you to work done in 1956 while I was up here at HASI London. The coldness of the vacuum. And to maintain a cold vacuum is rather easy because a thaten doesn't want to have much to do with it. So of course he mocks it up and keeps it mocked up because he doesn't want anything to do with it. But it is the favorite method of implantation. And it operates as something that pulls all the pictures in on it. It is just a sponge, that's all. It's an electronic sponge.

You get a piece of warm electricity near a cold vacuum, and the thaten every time will try to pour it into the cold vacuum to dispense with the vacuum. And, of course, all it does is
hang up. Hence, you get a balled-up mass. It's implantation mechanics, is what you're dealing with, essentially.

I'm not prepared to say anything about how you acquired your valences in the Goals Problem Mass. I'll merely tell you that as they come apart, your implantations of people with beingnesses come off and you get these cold waves. And you can also get hot waves. But the heat waves are less frequent than the cold ones. They are constant, the cold ones. And they will come and they will go.

When I say they're constant, I mean that case by case, case after case, they always get these cold ridges. So much so, that if a case is not getting cold ridges, you can say that the case has something radically wrong with the composition of its 3D. And that forms another test for you. If the case has never seen any mass in connection with the terminal or oppterm that you are running, then you are running a questionable 3D package.

If he never sees any black energy at any time along the line, then the package is questionable. Because these things occur routinely and regularly in the package. Coldness, cold sensations and so forth; black masses of one kind or another; and somatics; pain resulting from these things – all of these things are constant in the package.

Now, the responsibility for finding a proper 3D package is, of course, the auditor's. Now, I have assisted you and pushed you around on this and made adjudications along in this line and tried to muddle the thing all out. And in most of these cases, those are perfectly straight. But in some of these cases, they may not be straight.

The pc in almost every case will overpersuade you if he's afraid of some piece of the 3D. The pc will seek to overpersuade you. The pc wants it changed. The pc does not think that is right.

Now, one of the things is, remember, that a pc will withhold withholds, won't he? Well, the pc will withhold terminals as though it were a mass withhold. So a terminal takes some getting at.

It's the responsibility of the auditor to have a rightness about the 3D package. And the 3D package is achieved on a very precise routine. You get a list, you bleed the meter of all additional items, you list those items and you assess them with rudiments in. And when you keep doing this for piece after piece of the 3D, you will wind up – that's a very mechanical operation – you will wind up with the items you were looking for or some of them or too many. And don't be so horrified to find that you have eighteen 3D items. If you suddenly wound up with eighteen 3D items, it'll be quite a while before the pc can tell you which opposition goals belong to which opposition terminals and all the rest of this. It'd take some sorting out.

Well, naturally, in the course of experience, you won't run into that many items. But you occasionally will find an oddball item that you can't quite figure out what in the name of common sense this item is. Well, there are all the tests which I've given you in the past to find out what item is what item and how they crisscross and so forth.

You are liable to be fooled, by having eight items when you're only supposed to have five, into thinking now that you have too many, you must have them all. And this does not
necessarily follow at all. You may have eight items. You're supposed to only have five, but you've got eight. That does not mean that you have reached the limit of your items or even have the right five. Maybe there were fifteen items available and it'll be the last five that are the correct ones. And you haven't got but one, out of the five you've got is correct.

I mean, you could look on it – that would be a very extreme circumstance, a very extreme condition, but remember all the things there can be. There can be the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's goal, which the pc woke up in the middle of the night and suddenly knew what it was. It's printed on the wall. He knew what it was. And he comes in and he gives this to you. And you, knucklehead, didn't try to find out where he got it, what it was, if he'd ever wanted to do it; you simply put it down on the assessment list and assessed it and of course it assesses. And it assesses beautifully, except it's the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's oppterm. That's all that's wrong with it. And you try to run it and it just overwhumps the pc like he was being machine-gunned.

If you ask, "How does it solve problems?" the answer is liable to be something like, "Oh, well, it never has any problems, you know. That's the beauty of it. It just never has any problems. No, I couldn't answer that. It just never has any."

Oh? Well, where do we go from here? Do you know that you could actually use that piece in this fashion: You could find out what terminal would oppose it. And then find a terminal. And then get a goal for that terminal. And then find what terminal would oppose the goal. And then find out what terminal would oppose that terminal we just found. And then find out what terminal would oppose that terminal that we just found. And find a goal for it and an opposition goal. And then find out some other terminal connected with it. And all the time we're coming down toward the grasshopper, you see? We're building down from the Empire State Building to the tool shed in the base of the Statue of Liberty. We're downgrading, you see? We're coming down within the reality zone of all of this, but we actually picked it up somewhere up the line.

It doesn't mean that the parts the pc gives you out of sudden inspiration are wrong. It just is probable that they are in very wrong order. Because the one thing that is common to all Goals Problem Masses is confusion. And who is it confusing? Well, we 'ope it isn't confusing you, mate. Because we know it's confusing the pc.

Now, the pc's advice on what has been troubling him for the last hundred trillion years must be listened to, but is of not much use. The pc goes out a waterbuck and comes in a tiger, and goes out a tiger and comes in a god. And goes out a god and comes in a tiger. And goes out a tiger and comes in a lawyer. Lawyer? Lawyer? Where did that come from? "Yes, I feel like a lawyer these days." Well, if you traced it up, you'd find it up somewhere along the package, totally unrunnable, but there it would be.

All right. There's another problem which baffles you occasionally and that is what you in class have been referring to as "a scratchy needle," which means a constantly operating needle. Always got a little rock slam on it of some kind or another. You can't seem to disturb it. You say something to the pc, this thing turns on. You say something else to the pc, you don't know whether he's reacting to you or reacting to the bank and it just keeps going bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang.
Well, now let me give you the first datum on this. I am aware of this phenomenon and have assessed, because of it and through it, very successfully with numerous curses. Oh, I don't tell you that it's easy, because a pc who's got that, goes null every time they turn around, too. You got a nice, scratchy needle, at least the pc is there someplace. And then all of a sudden you start to read a list and there doesn't anything react anywhere. The pc has bounced in some particular fashion. Something weird or gruesome has happened, and the rudiments have gone out. So you get the pc's invalidation off of what you were doing and you put the rudiments back in. And then you start your assessment and you get four more items on the list read and the rudiments are out and there it is. Of course, you're reading all this time through a scratchy needle. And this does not help any auditor's patience.

In the first place, it means that you are doing something a little extraordinary. It means that you are assessing in absence of adequate Security Checking. And those of you who are doing this on your reports, din this into my ears all the time that the pc should have further Security Checks and a Problems Intensive and a Dynamic Check and a Security Check run on this. And what you don't realize is that I agree with you a hundred percent.

But what you also don't realize is that I think you should be able to do it. I'm merely demanding the impossible. I can do it; you should be able to do it. I think that's a good datum of comparable magnitude.

I'm telling you it's mad. The thing is rock slamming and it's rock slamming sporadically. It rock slams and then it doesn't rock slam for a moment and then it rock slams and then it doesn't rock slam for a longer period and then it rock slams constantly for the next three minutes.

Remember all you're trying to do is get a reaction which disturbs what the needle is doing. And the only confusion you will get into is whether it's doing it because of the circuit going on in the pc's head or because you're saying something. Therefore, you have to test everything about ten times. Where you'd ordinarily only test it a couple of times, when you got a scratchy needle, you'd have to test it about ten times.

And you want to know that if you say the item ... You have to become absolutely certain, no matter what it does to your pc. We don't care if it cuts them to ribbons. [pounding the table:] Never let up on the accuracy of an assessment because you think the pc is uncomfortable. Never do that! That's the wickedest, cruelest thing you can do to a pc, because it might disturb him to go further, or it might knock the rudiments out to be less than thorough. You be thorough!

I don't care if you have a hell of a time getting the rudiments in; it upsets the pc every time you get the rudiments in. I don't care. If you are on the best side of it, you get the rudiments in. Well realizing, of course, that if you stop in the middle of a run – you've completed half of a run in the last session, you're going to do the rest of it in this session, you find the rudiments out in the middle and nothing reading – it possibly doesn't occur to you that it's just because the run is interrupted. And you're actually running another process in the middle of a 3D run.

You could actually, with benefit, simply sit down, say, "The session started," and give 'em the next command of the 3D run, you know? You just could do that, you know, no begin-
ning rudiments or anything. Make 'em run that off. Flatten that level. Now monkey around
getting your rudiments in. You might do it better that way. But at the same time, I'm not going
to find any real fault with you for trying to get the rudiments in in the middle of a 3D run.

Now, similarly, this pc is going out through the roof! You've got some item that you
don't know what it is. The pc is already in total disagreement. It couldn't be any part of the
3D. "Mother-in-law! I have never been a mother-in-law! I don't want to have anything to do
with mother-in-laws and so forth. And you just keep up with this story about mother-in-laws,
mother-in-laws, mother-in-laws and I am sick of it!"

You say, "Good," and go right on checking mother-in-law. Because it is much crueller
not to be thorough. That is very cruel. You be absolutely sure. Never, never give it a lick and
a promise. Never give it a lick and a promise. You be sure. Not because somebody came
along and told you authoritatively, "That's it." You be sure! And you won't mess anybody up.

And if you were doing a thoroughgoing assessment that was cross-checked against
everything, against everything, you would wind up with more excess items that you could
normally count. Well, just do them all on a problems survey. Do every terminal you found on
a problems survey. Take the two lowest scaled ones and that's the term and oppterm. Figure
out which one will give the pc somatics and run it. I mean, that's about – that's the crude way
to go about it.

This scratchy needle thing, this becomes very critical. Oh, you're obviously – this per-
son maybe needs another month, another two months of preparation, of careful work and so
forth, before they're really ready to assess. But it can be done.

But now you've got to be ten times as sure. Man, I've sat there and looked at one of
those things, you know and it's gone knockety-knockety-knockety-knockety-knockety-
knock. And I've said, "Grasshopper," you know, "grasshopper, grasshopper." And then I've
just stopped speaking for a moment and it's reacting exactly the same way I was reacting, you
know? It goes on saying, "grasshopper," you know? Only I'm not saying grasshopper, it is.

So finally I'll say, "Floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor, floor. What are
you invalidating? Have you invalidated any of this?" No, the pc hasn't. Gets a big fall on the
needle, you know? Clean that up. Get the invalidations off of the terminal, the invalidations
off of the in-session, the invalidations off the auditor, the invalidations off of Scientology, the
invalidations off of me – all of which rock slam. This doesn't quiet the needle down any, but it
gets the terminal reading again once in a while.

And then you sit there: "Grasshopper, grasshopper, grasshopper." And then wait until
the needle is not moving very much. It's only a quarter of an inch wide, you know? And you
say "grasshopper," and all of a sudden you'll suddenly realize that when you say grasshopper,
you get a throw. And maybe the thing is getting an upthrow when you say grasshopper and
that is why you were missing it.

The start of the needle pattern for a 3D item is an upthrow and then a down. You get
absolutely sure that if you saying that it is causing it to change reaction and when you're sure
of that, when you're sure of that, you've got your item. But, boy, it takes you a while.
I wouldn't be cross with you for one minute if you sat there for two hours just trying to make sure of one item. Just letting it go by and waiting for the needle to calm down maybe or speed up. And then try to read a couple of items to it and try to get an instant reaction on it and then try to get the invalidations off and try to get it all calmed down again. And then [snaps his fingers] hit the thing again, [snaps his fingers] hit it again. It's not economical in terms of time. It is just that you should be able to do it. It is a doable activity. So therefore, you should be able to do it. It's impossible, so do it. I mean, it's a perfectly reasonable viewpoint.

You know why you should be able to do it? Because you're liable to have a pc all upset in the middle of a 3D run and all of a sudden find out that you've been running a water-buck versus a god. And you've now got to find the opposition terminal with everything upset. So it's a needed piece of skill.

So you sit there and instead of relegating them – because you've made a mistake – back to seventy-five hours of Sec Checking and smooth-out and get all of the auditing off and oh, my God. Instead of doing that, why, you sit down there and learn to read through that scratchy needle, because he's stuck right in the middle of the terminal. That's what it is. He's stuck right in the middle of the modifier.

Now, if you haven't got all the modifier, the modifier won't turn it off. Your chances of finding all of the modifier are usually quite remote. Equally, I will be frank with you, he could just as easily be stuck in the oppterm's oppterm's oppterm's oppterm. And he isn't about to move off of that until you find the original part of the Goals Problem Mass.

He's probably stuck way deep into it someplace, some weird and impossible situation. There's various combinations of this. But we are talking – when I am talking to you about directions of how to do it, please, please recognize something. We are talking about something which is essentially as simple as a bunch of kids' blocks.

If you took two small blocks and two larger size blocks and then two big blocks and then two great big blocks, and you pair by pair stack these up in a line, you would get about as far as you'd have to go to blow a person to OT, see? That's at a guess. And here's this stack of blocks. All right. You've got to get down to these small blocks, or it's not going to run with any reality of the pc. And the pc's stuck up here in the third pair, so the needle is going tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick. "Planet builder, planet builder, planet builder." And you say, "Look at that piece of dirt."

And he says, "Well, that's awfully big."

And you say, "Well, what about this piece of dirt?"

"Well, I don't know. That's pretty big."

And you say, "Well, what's your terminal?"

"Oh, I don't know. I've always thought of myself as somebody who built planets." (If you could get it down to that; only he probably doesn't know anything about it at all.) "Oh, somebody who'd built planets, I guess. You know."
Total apathy. He couldn't – if you gave him a building jack, he couldn't raise up a little piece of sod, you know. And he's trying to buck into a package where somebody picks up a moon in one hand, you know and puts it in orbit casually, you see, and decides he doesn't like that planet, so takes the orbital centrifugal force out of its fellow planets, you see, or slows it down suddenly, you see, so it'll drop into the sun so he can remake it. This is the terminal that is ticking. And you've got a pc that's now ...

"When was the last time you picked something up?"

"Well, I think it was this morning. I was trying to pick up my fork when I was eating breakfast and I had an awful hard time doing it."

Well, you obviously are not going to run this huge, massive, strong, powerful terminal on this pc because it'll practically run forever. It's the wrong end of the 3D mass. You've got to get over here and you'll find out his terminal is a grasshopper. A grasshopper versus a cactus or something, you know. That's the term and oppterm. You see where you're going? You have a responsibility of getting something the pc can run. But there is this end of it available.

Now, oddly enough, there are tinier pieces of the Goals Problem Mass. And you start grabbing these tinier pieces and, of course, to some degree you are wasting time. And these tinier pieces of the Goals Problem Mass are best handled by Sec Checks and by the other – because they will blow – they are capable of blowing. Sec Checks, Problems Intensives, things like that.

You could find a lesser terminal than the pc's terminal which matches it up. You could find "Agnes." And Agnes might very well be part of the Goals Problem Mass. He's known Agnes for a week. And the opposition terminal to Agnes is "a policeman," and he's known the policeman for three days, you see? And that is the local, current game. It's the fact that Agnes is liable to turn him into the police, only he is this or that. Only, it's all part of the Goals Problem Mass, only he really is a policeman or something.

And it all stretched up here into present time and it's absolutely microscopic. You would handle it ordinarily in a session as a present time problem. And you will recognize as you're running pcs that you very often – very, very, very often will find that you have often handled a piece of the Goals Problem Mass on a pc without recognizing that it was because, of course, it's the most available pieces around – are pieces of the Goals Problem Mass.

No, we want those two solid terminals that will stay in, that we can really audit solidly so that we can graduate the pc on up and take care of him.

It's as simple as kids' blocks, how the thing is put together. There is nothing very complicated about how it's put together. Knowing that, you should be able to exert your wits and go through the complications of E-Metering and so forth, necessary to find those parts because they're not known to the pc and will only become known to you if you, of course, apply an E-Meter and very good auditing

All right. Well, I hope that these theoretical guesstimates and that sort of thing will assist you in some degree. And in my absence after next week and so forth, you'll probably all fall apart, but don't worry about it too much because I will be here next week, too. And you won't be in any desperate states – not very desperate anyway.
But anyway, the one thing that is startling about a 3D is that if put together right, the advance it makes on a case and the reality the case has on it; that is what is startling. When that is absent, you haven't got a 3D. You've got something else. You've got the terminals too far up the line. You've got something wrong. Put it together right so it's of comparable magnitude, so that the pc can run it, so there's reality on it, find it just exactly the way you've been taught. If you find extra pieces, you can even find out where they belong, too.

Okay?

Audience: Okay.

All right. Well, I'm very satisfied with the way things are going except you, of course. [laughter, laughs] And I will be looking over the many, many next days' auditings before I leave. But I wish tomorrow you would do something to try to apply this particular lecture to the pc that you are running and just see how it adds up, and you will get some interesting reality on it, or you will suddenly find out why your pc isn't running. Okay?

Thank you.